

WORKING PAPERS OF THE  
CENTER FOR RESEARCH ON SOCIAL ORGANIZATION  
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY  
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Paper #22

March, 1967

SOCIOLOGY

by

Albert J. Reiss, Jr.

Forthcoming: International Encyclopedia of the  
Social Sciences

## Definition of the discipline

A commonly accepted definition of sociology as a special science is that sociology is the study of social aggregates and groups in their institutional organization, of institutions and their organization, and of the causes and consequences of changes in institutions and social organization. The major units of sociological inquiry are social systems and their subsystems; social institutions and structure; social aggregates, relationships, groups, and organizations.

The most inclusive sociological unit is the social system, a system constituted by the interaction of a plurality of actors whose relations to each other are mutually oriented by institutions. A society is an empirical social system that is territorially organized, whose members are recruited by sexual reproduction within it, and persists beyond the life-span of any individual member by socializing new members to its institutions. Any social system has subsystems that are partial systems functionally related to the social system. Human ecological systems, kinship, legal, educational, and ideological or religious subsystems are examples of social subsystems.

Social institutions are general patterns of norms that define behavior in social relationships. Institutions define and legitimate how people ought to behave and they legitimate sanctions to be applied to behavior. Property and contract are social institutions. As an institution, contract consists of quite general norms that regulate entry into and the consequences of contractual agreements. As an institution it prescribes neither who shall enter into such agreements or their content, provided the content falls within institutionally defined limits. Social structure or social morphology is the integration and stabilization of social interaction through an organization of statuses and roles such as age, sex, or class.

Sociologists are primarily interested in human beings in social interaction, i.e., in actors taking account of one another in their behavior. The major systems or units of interaction of interest to sociologists are social groups, as for instance the family or peer group, social relationships, such as social roles and dyadic relationships, and social organizations, such as formal or bureaucratic organizations as the state, a corporation, or a

school system, territorial organizations as the community, or their component organizations such as schools, factories, or churches.

Although sociologists are principally concerned with human beings in social interaction they are interested in social aggregates or populations in their institutional organization.

Generally speaking, sociologists are interested in the analytical properties of these sociological units and make problematic relationships among them. Thus they are interested in such properties as legitimation, consensus, and stratification in the processes of institutionalization. They concern themselves with elements of social relationships such as power and dominance, or of interaction, such as coercion and reciprocity. They investigate the properties and processes of groups or organizations such as their capacity to take collective action toward goals, as in sanctioning deviant behavior or in allocating the resources of an organization.

The theories of sociology make problematic the relationship among the analytical properties of these units. The character of the theory defines the problematics. Human ecological theory in sociology, for example, is concerned

primarily with the causal interconnections in the 'ecological complex': technological accumulation at an accelerated rate; exploitation of the environment; demographic transition; and organizational revolution (Duncan, 1959, 1961). A macro-sociological theory such as that of Talcott Parsons originally made problematic how variable value and motivational orientations of actors are institutionalized and organized as social systems (Parsons, 1951, 1954). Recent elaborations of his theory focus more on the internal dynamics within social systems, though largely neglecting to make external relationships problematic (Parsons, 1960, 1966).

The writings of early sociologists were largely speculative or grand achievements of a synthetic sort that did not lend themselves to the development of a body of knowledge that was both cumulative and met the canons of science. Over time most sociologists have come to work with what Robert Merton calls theories of the middle range (1957). These are theories that include a limited number of interrelated concepts from which one may derive hypotheses that can be investigated through empirical research. An example from Mertons own writings

is that of reference group theory (1957, Ch. VIII).

The history of sociology discloses several major strategies for dealing with its theoretical and methodological problems. To a degree they represent schools within sociology, but the lines by no means are firmly drawn. The human ecologists and demographers are concerned with problems where social aggregates are investigated. They are particularly interested in the morphological or structural characteristics of these aggregates, such as their age, sex, race, education, and income. Another school is characterized as formal sociology, associated particularly with the work of Georg Simmel, the phenomenologists such as A. Vierkandt, and more recently with some investigations of small groups. The emphasis in formal sociology lies in studying societal forms, particularly forms of interaction or association such as dyadic relationships. Formal sociology focuses on the "essence" of phenomena where form is a principle of individuation and organization. The primary goal is description of human groups and processes in social relationships. A third school is characterized as historical-interpretative sociology and the emphasis is macroscopic rather

than microscopic as in formal sociology. Attempts are made to describe the general features of the history of man, to delineate the different spheres of the historical world, and to understand ideas as the expression of historical periods or events. The major writings of Max Weber and the German historical school, particularly the method of Weber, have served as a model for historical sociology in contemporary sociology (Aron, 1964). Most writing in contemporary sociology focuses however on relational properties among persons as social actors--characteristic of much work in social psychology--or on the relationship among properties of institutions and organizations in societies or social systems--characteristic of studies in social organization.

#### Relationship to other social sciences

The matter of the relationship of sociology to the other social or behavioral sciences is much debated. Is sociology as Comte would have had it the "queen" of the social sciences, or a general social science of societies? Or, is sociology a more specialized social science that systematizes problems that can be defined as sociological in character as distinct from economic, psychological or cultural?



The most systematic modern attempt to resolve this question is found in the writings of Talcott Parsons (1951, 1954, 1960, 1966). Parsons regards sociological theory as an aspect of the theory of social systems, thereby defining sociology as a special social science. Sociology is concerned "...with the phenomena of the institutionalization of patterns of value-orientation in the social system, with the conditions of that institutionalization, and of changes in the patterns, with conditions of conformity with and deviance from such patterns, and with motivational processes insofar as these are involved in all of these" (Parsons, 1951, p. 552).

The other major theory of social systems, that of economics, is "...concerned with the phenomena of rational decision-making and the consequences of these decisions within an institutionalized system of exchange relationships" (1951, p. 550). Within this framework, political science is viewed as a synthetic rather than a special social science, constructed as it is around a restricted set of variables concerned with political power rather than around a distinctive analytical scheme.

Parsons further regards the social system as but one of three analytical sciences of action, the other two being the theory of personality, and the theory of culture. The theory of cultural systems is the particular province of anthropology while that of personality systems is generic to psychology (Parsons and Shils, et. al., 1952; Parsons, 1951, Ch. XII).

Sociologists work on problems that are related to the subject matter of other disciplines, both humanistic and scientific. For the most part, however, these problems fall within fields within sociology and are worked upon from the sociological perspective. Thus problems of knowledge are treated in the sociology of knowledge. Though the sociology of knowledge in an important sense is an aspect of epistemology, it has not developed as an interstitial field between sociology and philosophy. The same may be said of such fields as historical sociology or sociolinguistics as they are presently developed within sociology.

Numerous disciplines emerged historically that are interstitial to their parent disciplines. The most notable cases in the history of sociology are human ecology (or human geography as it is developed in some countries), demography, and social psychology. Social psychology, a field

interstitial to that of psychology and sociology, is concerned primarily with personalities and motivational processes as they relate to the institutional organization of societies. The cases of demography and human ecology are somewhat different, perhaps not qualifying fully as interstitial disciplines. Human ecology broadly conceived is but an aspect of ecosystem theory and therefore is interstitial to the environmental and social sciences. The development of a theory of the ecosystem, however, lies in a rudimentary state; for that reason much of the work in human ecology is carried on within the separate environmental and social sciences rather than in a border discipline. The work in demography is carried on largely by sociologists and economists, though more recently biomedical scientists have joined them in a synthetic field of population studies.

#### Fields of sociology

There is no altogether rational division of sociology into fields of inquiry that are derived from a general sociological theory yet susceptible to relatively independent investigation and formulation as a body of knowledge. Lacking a commonly accepted sociological theory

that is susceptible to such rational division, sociologists have developed fields of interest around major units of sociological inquiry or around a sociological perspective on a set of problems.

The division of sociology into "social statics" and "social dynamics" was quite common in the nineteenth century after Herbert Spencer. With the emergence of sociology as an academic discipline, there was a tendency, particularly in American sociology, to develop a more detailed classification of sociology into subject-matter fields as a means of organizing the curriculum. At the same time, leading scholars, particularly when as Durkheim they served as editor of a major journal, felt called upon to divide sociology into "fields" where the sociological perspective was applicable.

The 1902 volume of L'Annee Sociologique presents such a scholarly classification by Durkheim and the editors of L'Annee of publications in sociology. They subdivided sociology into the fields of general sociology, religious sociology, juridical and moral sociology, criminal sociology and moral statistics, economic sociology, social morphology, and a miscellaneous group including aesthetic sociology,

technology, language, and war. The editors noted that the Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft, Revista Italiana Sociologia, and the Vierteljahrshrift für Wissenschaftliche Philosophie und Soziologie, utilized some other categories. Among them one finds in the Zeitschrift mass and individual psychology, medicine and hygiene, social history and social jurisprudence, and social philosophy and social ethics. Revista included among others, politics, social psychology, and demography, while the Vierteljahrshrift included among others, psychology and the science of language, aesthetics, and education. Quite clearly, by 1902 sociologists had identified most of the major fields of scholarly interest in sociology for the next five decades.

These fields of sociology were not given anywhere near equal attention in any country nor were the sociologists in any country to give more than token attention to some of these fields until quite recently. Interesting and important contrasts developed among the countries in the attention given to various fields. Some fields that developed quite early in the European countries were given only token attention in the United States until World War

II, after which they developed quite rapidly. Among the more important of these were political sociology, the sociology of law, and of religion. Among the fields that still merit only occasional attention in American sociology as contrasted with the attention given them in some European countries are the sociology of the creative and performing arts, of sport, and of language. Apart from their shaping the development of the sociology of science, American sociologists have done little work in the sociology of knowledge.

The rather late development of some of these fields in American sociology is due to a variety of factors. Two stand out as particularly important. First, American universities separated sociologists more sharply from some academic disciplines than did the European universities. This was particularly notable in the case of law which in the United States is taught in professional schools apart from faculties in philosophy, sciences, and the humanities. Indeed, prior to 1940 American sociologists had little contact with professional schools other than those of social work and education. Furthermore, in their drive toward status as scientific disciplines all of the

social sciences in American universities were increasingly divorced from the humanistic disciplines and the arts. Even today this is true so that American sociologists undertake little work on the sociology of the creative or performing arts. Since history, more often than not, was defined as a humanistic discipline, American sociology was ahistorical. No doubt the fact that many American sociologists took the natural science model of investigation as a desideratum also led to a separation from both history and the humanities, including philosophy.

A second major factor accounting for the failure of American sociology to develop some of the problems of concern to European sociologists was their deliberate neglect of problems of value, their institutionalization, and their organization in American or other societies. While there were exceptions such as in the studies of immigrant groups by W. I. Thomas and Florian Znaniecki (1922), American sociologists generally took values for granted. They were inclined to make them problematic only in the limited sense that a science of sociology must be "value-free". Furthermore, values were not generally thought of as amenable to empirical investigation except as the

attitudes or opinions of persons. Comparative studies of values in belief systems such as in ideological, religious, or legal systems therefore were unlikely to be considered for investigation.

To be sure, American sociologists gradually began to investigate problems in some of these fields, but largely through other generic interests in sociology such as in the study of occupations and professions or on the social organization of work, rather than through an interest in comparative institutions or systems. Thus the sociology of law began largely with studies of lawyers, of medicine with studies of doctors and the social organization of doctor and patient relationships in hospitals, and of the arts through studies of musicians and writers.

American sociology, however, was almost unique in its attempts to develop methods of research as a special field within sociology. Although few American sociologists were innovators of any of the major techniques for gathering and analyzing data, they readily adopted them for training of sociologists and as bases for evaluating the state of "the science", albeit at times mistakenly so. Most recently,



American sociologists have rather self-consciously developed a field of mathematical sociology, noteworthy more for its attempts to formalize models of behavior or organization with the mathematics than for theoretical or substantive contributions to the discipline.

Though human geography continued to develop in European countries, it grew primarily outside of sociology. American sociologists, however, developed human ecology largely as a field within sociology. The only comparable development in Europe was that of social morphology in France under Durkheim and his disciple Halbwachs.

Up to 1940, American sociology appeared to have a substantial number of fields of inquiry other than the history and theory of sociology and methods of sociology. Nevertheless these fields actually converged into rather limited sets. One set included community study with human ecology, rural sociology, and urban sociology as major divisions. Another was that of social problems, with race relations, poverty and dependency, and juvenile delinquency being important specializations. Later social psychiatry with a strong mental health interest emerged as a specialization; now it is of considerably

less interest and falls within the major area of social psychology. The family and demography comprised the other major areas of interest. Sociology curricula also included courses that covered rather broad interests that after 1945 were to fragment into special fields. The main courses of this kind were social institutions, social organization, and social change.

The development of fields of interest in sociology is in itself a problem in the sociology of knowledge. While problem finding in sociology undoubtedly is a result of the growth of theory and method, it also is subject to social determinants within the society (Merton, 1959, pp. ix-xxiv). The problems of the immigrant in American society and more recently of the Negro minority undoubtedly influenced the development of a field of race and ethnic relations within American sociology more than any theory of culture contact or intergroup relations. Similarly, the strong interest in ideology within European political sociology, or of Marxist sociology in the East European countries and the USSR are intimately connected with changes in the political systems of those countries. The importance of historical conditions and events in determining the fields and problems of sociology undoubtedly

has been far greater than any influence from the cumulative development of the science. Naturally the resources available for investigation of given problem areas in any society affect their relative growth in any science, but the resources themselves are allocated according to the historical significance of the areas to a society.

The number of special areas of inquiry in American sociology today has grown so large that a typical program of the American Sociological Association includes some forty areas. The National Register of Scientific and Technical Personnel in the United States lists 53 specialties within sociology. Despite this fragmentation of sociological inquiry into a large number of specializations, they usually are grouped into broad fields of inquiry. Taking American sociology as a case in point, the emerging organization of the discipline can be described as follows: sociological theory and methodology; social organization including comparative institutions, comparative social organization, social structure or morphology; social groups. Demography, human ecology, and social psychology continue as major interstitial disciplines with strong

programs in academic departments of sociology or as joint programs with other sciences. There likewise remains a strong interest in what now is more generally called "applied sociology", including social planning and social problems.

Specialties within sociology are far more likely today than formerly to derive their core problems from sociological theory (Faris, 1964; March, 1965). There likewise is less separation of theory and methodology. More and more, too, sociologists who work either in the interstitial fields or in applied sociology define the problematics of the speciality in terms of generic problems of sociological interest (Lazarsfeld, et. al., 1965). The work of sociologists today in criminology, for example, no longer covers the synthetic field. Rather it focuses on the sociology of crime, problems of interaction between victims and offenders, of socialization into delinquent and criminal behavior, of sanctions and the formal organization of sanctioning systems, and of differential social risks and opportunities for crime that are structured into social systems. Within social psychology, sociologists have turned their interests to the more generic problems of

role socialization, the relationship of social structure and organization to personality, of social institutions to personality systems, and to explanations of conformity and deviant behavior of actors. Human ecologists give major attention to organized communal networks, the division of labor and its stratification, and the growth and organization of technology. Within demography, sociologists have turned increasingly to the questions of how social institutions, and social structure determine the basic demographic processes of fertility, mortality, and morbidity, of migration, and the structure of the labor force. Both formal and comparative demography are growing as areas of specialization.

The fields of comparative institutions and comparative social organization are not subdivided as yet into distinct analytical areas within these major divisions. Some analytical organization is apparent deriving either from an interest in some major analytical properties of units of social organization or institutions or from an interest in some set of problems in institutions and their organization. Interest in social change for instance may be reflected in specialization in the study of

collective behavior or social movements, or as more recently on social and economic development of the new nations. Specialization in social stratification or occupations and professions derives from the more generic interest in social structure or morphology. Formal or bureaucratic organization has emerged as a specialization in comparative social organization.

The sheer problem of becoming acquainted with the literature on institutions and their organization when coupled with the social organization of academic inquiry and training has led to a whole series of specializations that are related to institutions and their organization into subsystems of societies. Among the more prominent ones are economy and society, political sociology, industrial sociology, the sociology of education, of religion, of medicine, of law, of leisure and sport, and of science. Set somewhat apart is the sociology of knowledge with strong roots in epistemology as well as sociology.

There is growing interest as well in certain synthetic areas that may emerge as interstitial disciplines. Among these are sociolinguistics, the sociology of culture as in the study of popular culture, of mass

communication and public opinion. The applied areas of sociology include the traditional ones of criminology and juvenile delinquency, and mental health, social gerontology, and poverty and dependency. Following a hiatus with a shift from emphasis on social reform, there is a growing interest on empirical research related to problems and policy for formal organizations. Sociological applications are found in almost all major fields, therefore (Gouldner and Miller, 1965; P. F. Lazarsfeld, et. al., 1967).

#### Rise of sociology as a special science

Sociology as a more or less systematic body of knowledge emerged late among the scientific disciplines. The major problems in sociological theory--broadly conceived--recur in the writings of learned men of all periods. They relate to the nature of man as a consequence of group behavior and of the nature of social order. But the problematics of sociology and attempts to systematize them as a science either in the general sense of a science of society as a system with its own principles of organization and change or, in a more specific sense, of how values and norms enter into social organization, of how institutions are organized in societies,

or of how societies and their organized sub-systems change, arise only late in the nineteenth century.

The emergence of sociology among the sciences is itself treated as problematic within sociology, a problem in the sociology of knowledge. The preconditions for its emergence relate to general currents of thought that began with the enlightenment and to social changes in the nineteenth century which generated social problems and reform movements that in turn made problematic the nature of societies and their change.

R. M. McIver's concise account of the history of sociology in the first edition of the Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences holds that: "The rise of sociology comes with the perception that no order of social phenomena is adequate to comprehend, directly or indirectly, the manifold activities, processes and trends of society, a perception which itself was advanced by the increasing range and complexity of social relationships which began with the era of modern civilization" (p. 235).

The rise of sociology as a special discipline does not parallel in any exact sense its rise as a scientific discipline. Its rise as a scientific



discipline depended not only on a recognition that societies were systems with their own principles of organization and change but upon the application of scientific method and techniques of investigation that were applicable, if not unique, to the empirical study of societies. Both of these concerns were stated in a general way in the writings of I.A.M.F.X. (Auguste) Comte in his Cours de philosophic positive (1830-42) and the Systeme de politique positive (1851-54). Yet Comte was more of a godfather than a progenitor of sociology, providing its name and in positivism a philosophy that as it developed shaped the discipline as a science. Comte's conception of sociology as a general and special social science and the problematics of it are primarily of historical interest. His major concern was with the political and practical reorganization of society conceived of as a totality of human experience and thought. He believed more in the evolution of the human mind than in the evolution of societal forms and processes. He sought therefore to advocate rather than prove that the application of positivistic methods would establish that the evolution of the human mind follows definite laws.

Sociology emerged as a special discipline among the social sciences toward the end of the nineteenth century. To attribute its rise to a special date or to the writings of a particular man is somewhat arbitrary. Nonetheless, there is a strong presumption that France was the cradle of sociology as a science and that Emile Durkheim more than any other sociologist influenced its emergence as a special science of society. It likewise seems clear that American sociology assumed the dominant position in the development of the special science of sociology in the twentieth century through major advances in theory and methods of investigation.

Charting the rise of sociology as a special social science discipline in the nineteenth century, it appears that two major traditions of scholarship coalesced in Durkheim's work. One of these was a tradition of empirical research, the other the development of abstract conceptions of society.

There were two major elements in the tradition of empirical social research. The first of these to emerge was the collection and quantification of social data that were relevant to matters of the state, an early beginning of the policy sciences. The second, though it did not eschew

quantification, was more concerned with empirical observation of contemporary social life and the development of techniques for gathering as well as analyzing social data (Lazarsfeld, 1961).

The tradition of quantification of social research originated with the political arithmeticians in England through the work of Graunt and Petty and in Belgium and France through the development of "statistique morale". As the name political arithmetic implies, the object was to obtain descriptive statistics for the development of public policy and administration, though to be sure the rise of insurance systems and other interests of the mercantilists may have been as influential in their development (Lazarsfeld, 1961, p. 279). The description of local and state populations were among the first topics to be examined systematically so that the tradition of political arithmetic in England seems more directly linked to the development of modern demography than to sociology as a special science.

A second major development in quantification is that usually attributed to the Belgian, Adolphe Quetelet, and his development of "statistique morale" as distinct from his work on "physique morale". While Quetelet more than any other man associated with "statistique morale"

gained a large audience for his work, claims to priority of his research on "statistique morale" can be disputed. The concept itself and much early work not only on crime but on suicides, illegitimacy and similar phenomena appears in the work of M. de Guerry de Champneuf, Director of Affaires Criminelles in the French Ministry of Justice from 1821-1835. He was joined in this effort by M. le Comte de Chabral, Prefet de la Seine who published during the period 1821-1829, Recherches statistiques sur le ville de Paris et le Department de la Seine. These studies were made under the direction of F. Fourier and contained a judicial study of populations under his authorship. At the same time, the French physician, Parent-Duchatelet undertook research on public health that led to a series of publications of the same kind, the most famous being his study of prostitution that stands as one of the early contributions in human ecology as well as moral statistics (1837).

Making no attempt to settle claims to priority, it seems clear that early in the nineteenth century considerably more empirical work on "statistique morale" was underway in France than in Belgium. The attention this work attracted was not inconsiderable in acquainting all

learned Frenchmen with quantitative empirical research of social facts. Parent-Duchatelet, for example, did ingenious work in collecting and analyzing data on the social recruitment and social origins of Paris prostitutes. Durkheim perhaps was more acquainted with the tradition of quantitative research represented in "statistique morale" than that in "political arithmetic".

A second major branch of empirical research that developed most clearly in France is that associated with the work of Frederick Le Play. Though clearly interested in quantification, Le Play innovated in techniques for both gathering and analyzing data. While Le Play perhaps is best known for his emphasis on empirical observation of contemporary social life, particularly his studies of family budgets, he was much concerned with the development of social indicators and in classification as they relate to problems of analysis of social data (Lazarsfeld, 1961).

Despite Le Play's great originality, his work had no direct links with the development of sociology as a special science in France. The main reason for this appears to lie in the fact that Le Play was as much linked with his own reform movement that espoused a conservative view

of society as he was with social research. While his followers founded Science Sociale, they eventually divided into two camps, the one clearly reformist, the other identified more with his method. Durkheim meanwhile gained the dominant position in French sociology, perhaps owing in part to the fact that he was an influential member of the rising group of French intellectuals who had won in l'affaire Drey fuss.

The other main tradition before Durkheim was that of scholarly writing on societies and the development of elaborate theories of society: the geographical determinists such as F. Ratzel and H. T. Buckle, the social Darwinists such as H. Spencer and W. G. Sumner, and the organismic theorists such as A. Schaeffle, P. Lillienfeld, R. Worms, and J. Novicow. Others such as F. Engel's and K. Marx were more closely identified during their lifetime with their socialist doctrines or economic theories than they were with the development of sociology. Marx's influence in shaping sociological theory came later in presenting Weber with his problematics of sociology and in the development of Marxist sociology.

Almost all of these early writers failed either to differentiate sociology as a special science of society or to make it's status problematic. Even though most sociologists by the close of the nineteenth century wrote essays arguing the case for sociology as a special science of society, it remained for Durkheim to state and document the case most effectively by merging and making problematic the elements in both traditions.

Many sociologists view Durkheim as making the case for sociology through his quantitative empirical research on suicide where suicide rates were made problematic as sociological rather than psychological phenomena. It could as easily be argued that he made the case for historical and nonquantitative research in his other works, such as those on religion. But for Durkheim, method, not quantification, was the central issue. He sought the theoretical problems that are fundamental to a study of human social organization and the method that is central to it. Sociology, for Durkheim, was the study of social facts and his first major work after the French and Latin theses was Les Regles de la methode sociologique (1895). In his introduction to The Rules of Sociological

Method, Durkheim made explicit that he considered his predecessors as having failed to advance "beyond the vague generalities on the nature of societies, on the relations between the social and the biological realms, and on the general march of progress" (Durkheim, English translation edited by G. Catlin, 1938, p. lix). Indeed, he goes on to say that: "Sociologists have been content, therefore, to compare the merits of deduction and induction and to make a superficial inquiry into the most general means and methods at the command of the sociological investigators. But the precautions to be taken in the observation of facts, the manner in which the principal problems should be formulated, the direction research should take, the specific methods of work which may enable it to reach its conclusions--all these remained completely undetermined" (Durkheim, 1938, lix-lx).

Whether Durkheim succeeded in making the case for sociology as a special science--indeed for him a special synthesizing social science--is a debatable matter if one reads his essays on sociology and the social sciences. It likewise is clear that his attempts to classify the subject matter of the field--so apparent in the contents of L'Annee--were dissatisfying to him.



Yet he never gave up the attempt to classify sociology into fields of investigation. And whether his attempts to delineate sociology as the study of social morphology or as at a later point in terms of social elements consisting essentially of a common system of rules of moral obligation, his writings quite clearly established the major problematics of modern sociology in both a theoretical and a methodological sense.

The study of social facts, Durkheim concluded, requires the genetic or comparative method.

"Comparative sociology is not a particular branch of sociology; it is sociology itself, in so far as it ceases to be purely descriptive and aspires to account for facts" (Durkheim, 1938, p. 139).

What he did not foresee was that the debate as to method was far from settled. Not only were the old controversies to continue but they were to take new forms. Before long sociologists were to engage in often bitter controversy as to the empirical methods most appropriate to the study of sociology, its status as a science, and the role of quantification in sociological research. The battle lines soon were drawn as polemical positions.

Before considering the polemical positions, it may be helpful to review briefly the history

of quantitative research as it relates to the development of sociology. Though there is no comprehensive study of the history of social research either generally or as it relates specifically to sociology, a number of histories have been written that attempt to account for the rise of quantitative research and its development in particular countries. Oberschall (1962) carefully documents there was much empirical research in Germany from 1848 to 1914 but that it lacked in continuity and failed to become institutionalized either in the universities or in organizations such as the Verein für Sozialpolitik. Quantitative research, despite attempts by Weber and other sociologists in the twentieth century, did not become part and parcel of the development of sociology in Germany. Oberschall adduces several arguments to account for this failure. He finds the root cause in the German intellectual heritage, in the wave of historicism, and in the idealistic legacy of philosophy that favored an intuitive and phenomenological approach to scholarship. German sociology also failed to develop quantitative social research because it never was institutionalized as an academic discipline, partly due to the hostility from other

disciplines and the polemics that surrounded it, and partly due to the fact that academic sociologists such as Tönnies and Weber failed to overcome the value-climate of the university, collegial apathy, and lack of resources in their own attempts to establish empirical research. Perhaps they failed also because their own empirical attempts stand as failures, while their theoretical and historical research studies stand as achievements.

The strong quantitative traditions of French demography and of the Le Play school are reviewed by Lazarsfeld (1961). The social reform elements in the Le Play school in the long run separated it from sociology as a special discipline and the disciples of Le Play fell more to criticism of the master than to the development of his method and techniques for investigation. Science Sociale and the Le Play school never became identified in any full sense with the academy, thereby contributing also to its demise.

It is not clear, however, why Durkheim's quantitative work should not have had more of an influence on the development of French sociology since apart from work in demography, there is little French sociological work that

was quantitative until the post-war years. Even now, there is no dominant group in France that emphasizes quantification in sociology. There are several explanations, none entirely satisfactory. Durkheim did little important quantitative work during the years when the future cohorts of French sociologists were being trained, though M. Hwalbach published a more elegant quantitative study of suicide and F. Simiand branched into econometrics. The rapid development of ethnological research in French sociology and anthropology likewise may have served to stifle the quantitative tradition.

The case of quantitative social research in England is somewhat different. The early quantitative work of Charles Booth and Seebohm Rowntree continued slowly but surely as a tradition of social research in England up to the present time, particularly through the development of the social survey. The Webbs, partly through the early association of Beatrice Webb with Charles Booth, continued to foster social research in England as a basis for public policy. During the early thirties they authored a well known text on methods of social research (1932) that emphasized quantitative as well as observational techniques of social investigation.

The work of the English statisticians in sampling affected social research in England before it had a similar impact in the United States. Social investigation in England nevertheless developed primarily outside the universities and quite independent of sociology. Indeed, the government departments and several private foundations accounted for much of the empirical social research in England after 1930. Apart from the London School of Economics where through the influence of the Webbs, academic sociology fostered some quantitative social research, there was little quantitative sociological research of any sort in the universities of Britain up to the fifties.

Quantitative sociology was to have its greatest development in the United States, though it is not entirely clear why this should have been the case. Indeed the preconditions for its development were not altogether favorable. Despite early attention to censuses of the population and the development of public accounting systems that developed a plethora of statistics, there perhaps was less emphasis on empirical social research in the United States when sociology gained academic status than there was at the same time in England, France, Germany, or

Italy. Early sociologists such as Lester F. Ward who came from a natural science background showed little concern for empirical research. Others such as Sumner were primarily interested in general cultural or historical comparisons much as Spencer. Although Cooley's doctoral dissertation was a major empirical investigation of transportation, he was soon distinguished more for the art of introspection and reflective observation than for empirical research.

The first introductory text by Small and Vincent in 1894 reported an empirical study of a Kansas community by Vincent, yet it lacked the quantitative precision of the social surveys in England. Up to 1915 in fact, though there was a spate of studies of rural and village communities by sociologists in the United States, they lacked the quantitative sophistication of the social surveys that were being undertaken in the larger cities of the United States by other social scientists and of those in England.

At the same time, however, some statistical studies appeared in sociology. The students of Franklin Giddings at Columbia University were introduced to statistics in their training. One of the early sociological dissertations in the Faculty of Political Science at Columbia by

Adna F. Weber (1899) was a statistical study of the growth of cities in the world during the nineteenth century. The first volume of The American Journal of Sociology included a paper on population statistics by Walter Wilcox, one of what was soon to become a long series of papers on population statistics.

More important, however, in the development of empirical sociology in the United States was the rise and place of academic sociology in the universities, a matter to be discussed shortly. Higher degrees necessitated the writing of both master's theses and doctoral dissertations. These theses and dissertations soon were to become a reservoir of empirical research on contemporary social life. The studies were not necessarily quantitative nor did they at first usually involve quantitative analysis. They were empirical nevertheless in the broad sense that they involved an original investigation of some aspect of social life. Though attempts usually were made to ground them in some more general theory of social life, they soon were to build more on the literature of previous investigations, generating a genuine tradition of empirical research, albeit one that was not usually cumulative as a body of scientific

knowledge. Many of these early empirical studies were closely tied to the social reform and social progress movements in American Society. They did not fit a model of comparative research. More often than not they were but a single case-- a community, an organization, a social movement.

As sociology evolved in the United States, there developed an almost obsessive concern with the status of sociology as a science. There were those who would make it one and those who argued it could not be one. Polemical discussion may have been equally balanced but it was to a degree an unequal contest since the "scientific" group fostered a strongly empirical tradition that increasingly involved the quantification of social data and the invention of techniques of investigation while the latter resorted more to older grounds for argument in the philosophical and historical traditions.

To be sure, American sociologists were not alone in the argument but the lines were more sharply drawn there, partly due to their numbers and partly due to the growing volume of empirical investigation itself. At times the polemical arguments overshadowed concern for its use in a man's own work. Thus the distinguished Italian sociologist Vilfredo Pareto in his



Trattato di sociologica generale (1916) argued persuasively for the development of a sociology that eschewed all value judgments, relying on the logico-experimental method for its development. Yet his discussion of the residues and derivations as motivations in action or of the circulation of the elites rests primarily on illustrative social data.

Beginning in the twenties, debates among American sociologists about appropriate methodology, methods, and techniques for sociological investigation overshadowed controversies about the state of sociological theory. There soon developed a polarization of positions and of persons. On one side the principle spokesmen were the European trained sociologists P. A. Sorokin and Florian Znaniecki. On the other were the American trained sociologists whose principle spokesmen were George Lundberg and Stuart Dodd, and the less vocal though prolific scholar, W. F. Ogburn and his student Samuel A. Stouffer.

Sorokin and Znaniecki maintained that the social sciences are cultural sciences. Socio-cultural phenomena are fundamentally different from physiochemical or biological phenomena, Sorokin argued, in that they have three major components: (1) immaterial, spaceless, and

timeless meanings; (2) material objects that objectify the meanings; and, (3) human beings who bear, use and operate these meanings with the help of material objects (1943, p. 4). The cause and effect models of the traditional sciences do not apply to sociocultural phenomena he maintained, because the members of a sociocultural class are bound by the property of cultural meanings, not by their intrinsic properties. Ergo sociocultural sciences require a special methodology, that of logic-meaningful causality or the "integralist method" (Sorokin, 1943, Ch. II). Znaniecki argued that the cultural sciences differ from other sciences because of the "humanistic coefficient", an infusion with value and meaning that is culturally defined. The appropriate method of sociology he maintained is analytic induction (1934, Ch. VI). The arguments of Sorokin and Znaniecki rested in epistemology.

This period also brought forth debate around medieval philosophical issues. Were social concepts nominal or real? Did sociology eliminate free will through social determinism? Were sociologists guilty of solipsism and cultural relativism? Though many sociologists never comfortably resolved these issues, in

practice their position was not unlike that of W. F. Ogburn (see OBGURN, W. F.). A minority, however, advanced phenomenological arguments and "verstehen sociologie".

The line that separated the major positions in the controversy involved less the issue of quantification of social data than the logical bases for determining cause and effect relationships among them. The quantitative school with its espousal of statistics, particularly methods of correlation, and of laboratory or natural experiments followed, in the view of their critics, J. S. Mill's logic. The application of his logic to social phenomena was in error. Thus Sorokin was not averse to quantification of social data, but to the logic of models of quantitative analysis. To a substantial degree, R. M. MacIver raised similar doubts in Social Causation, maintaining that social causation in contrast with physical and biological causation involves the socio-psychological nexus (1942, Ch. 14). The "quantifiers", as they came to be called, were attacked on other grounds. They were testing simple tautological hypotheses and engaging in research on problems that were trivial in sociological theory. Robert Lynd's, Knowledge for What? (1939), stands as an outraged

cry against these and other tendencies in American social science during the twenties and thirties.

Following World War II, the battle grounds shifted somewhat to arguments about the nature of operatism in sociology and the criteria for selecting among analytical models in social investigation. These controversies never assumed the polemical proportions of the pre-war period. Indeed many sociologists today speak of interaction effects in a statistical as well as in a theoretical sense. The recent entrance of mathematical sociology on the scene while met with scepticism by many sociologists is hardly controversial within the discipline.

Perhaps the most important thing that happened in the intervening years to stem the controversy was that sociological theory and methodology became less separated. This was due in part to the writings of Talcott Parsons in his monumental efforts to bring sociological theory to bear upon sociological inquiry. Whether or not they accepted Parsons theories, sociologists became more self-consciously aware of its importance to their own investigation. Robert Merton became the principal spokesman for the integration of sociological theory and

empirical investigation. The new spokesman for quantification in sociology such as Paul Lazarsfeld and Louis Guttman worked toward a closer integration of models of quantitative analysis with sociological theory. Above all, however, the many empirical studies in sociology themselves matured so that they derived more from problems in a sociological theory and became more sophisticated in their technical execution. Certain major empirical investigations that addressed themselves to problems in sociological theory likewise exerted considerable influence much as the studies of W. I. Thomas and Florian Znaniecki and those of the Chicago school under E. W. Burgess and Robert Park had in the twenties. The studies of the Research Branch of the United States Armed Forces culminating in the four volume The American Soldier, undoubtedly stands as an early post-war model for the integration of sociological theory and empirical quantitative investigation and analysis. The Indianapolis studies of fertility under Clyde Kiser and P. K. Whelpton reoriented investigation in demography to social and psychological factors in fertility. The work of T. Adorno, et. al., in The Authoritarian Personality and other major studies in prejudice

likewise signaled a shift in investigations in social psychology to empirical study of the relationship between personality and social structure, a problem neglected after the work of Thomas and Znaniecki. Despite the reassessments of these studies that followed, they undoubtedly were very influential in shaping the investigations of post-war cohorts of American sociologists.

Throughout much of this period Marxism and other socialist doctrines were a major influence on European sociology. The historical materialism of Marx may even have hindered the development of an empirical sociology in Europe during this period. Why was Marx less influential in the United States? To be sure, American sociology bore the hallmarks of acquaintance with the problems of Marxian sociology. While the writings of W. F. Ogburn, Robert Lynd and later those of C. Wright Mills perhaps owed a greater intellectual debt to the writings of Marx than did those of many sociologists, they were not Marxian sociology. And despite this attention, the influence of Max Weber and Emile Durkheim was far more influential on the development of American sociology than were those of Marx.

There perhaps are a number of reasons why Marxian sociology never developed in the United States. It could readily be argued that the ideological and the political climate of the United States was hostile to its development; certainly it never encouraged its development as it has in other countries. But that would hardly explain its lack of receptivity among the intellectuals in sociology. Perhaps as C. Wright Mills suggested, the social origins of American sociologists precluded such interests. Yet many American sociologists in their youth were thoroughly acquainted with Marx. Perhaps more to the point is the fact that American sociologists were more highly committed to an empirical sociology than to any ideological or theoretical position. Some of the problems of sociology lay in Marx, but only some, and a science of sociology lay in theory and problems that were subject to empirical investigation. Within this context Marxian sociology and historical materialism seemed somehow old-fashioned.

Has sociology arrived then at the status of a special science? Sociologists might argue that this is in itself a sociological question. But there are bases for arguing it has achieved

that status in American society. Though any claims to maturation as a science are relative to criteria of what constitutes an established science, it seems reasonably clear that at least in some areas of sociology, knowledge gained through scientific investigation is cumulative (Berelson and Steiner, 1964). Likewise it is apparent that the decline in polemics about sociological theory and methodology paved the way for their closer integration. Taken together with the growing volume of findings that replicate, these bespeak a level of maturation where sociologists are about their work as scientists if they are not already there.

Furthermore, sociologists and social psychologists in the post-war period were successful in developing their research institutes so that they fostered the goals of research training and scholarly investigation. Though founded earlier, The Bureau of Applied Social Research at Columbia University, The Institute for Social Research at The University of Michigan with its Survey Research Center and Research Center for Group Dynamics, and The National Opinion Research Center at The University of Chicago soon grew into major centers of sociological research and served as models



for the development of smaller centers at other universities. With it all, the cost of doing research increased sharply and the research grant became a way of life for the sociologist as scientist.

By 1960, most graduate students in sociology in American universities received financial support for study comparable to that of students in the traditional sciences. American sociology after a brief period of waiting became a program division in the National Science Foundation and before long was admitted to the Behavioral Sciences Division of The National Research Council. Though membership in the prestigious National Academy of Sciences still awaited American sociologists, all other professional and scientific barriers to full status had been scaled.

Why then should American sociology have achieved this status as a scientific discipline before sociology achieved it in other countries? Apart from the reasons implicit in what already has been said, the trends toward quantification in the other social sciences in the United States, particularly in psychology, undoubtedly were very influential. To a substantial degree, modern psychology as a science grew most rapidly in the United States. The interpenetration of these

disciplines in social psychology undoubtedly influenced the development of American sociology as a science. At the same time psychology shaped the course of American sociology so that its methods of investigation are more adapted to the studies of individual actors than to their organizations. The other major models for quantification came from demography and statistics. They, too, shaped its character, since they were more adapted to the study of social aggregates than to the relationship among properties of organizations. Research investigations in the fields of comparative institutions and social organization, therefore, often display less technical sophistication than those in the interstitial fields of demography and social psychology. The core of sociology, if we allow it is social institutions and their organization, is only now developing its own methods of investigation (March, 1965).

#### Rise of sociology as an academic discipline.

The rise of sociology as an academic discipline with formal instruction in the universities leading to a doctorate occurred first in the United States. Only slowly did sociology develop as a distinct discipline within the

universities of other countries. In no country, other than the United States, has provision been made for formal instruction in sociology in academic departments or faculties throughout the system of higher education. Furthermore, only within the United States, has formal instruction in sociology spread to pre-college curricula.

To be sure, in the nineteenth century, universities outside the United States harbored instruction in sociology either through the lecture system common to the universities of Europe or on occasion when a university created a chair in sociology for a distinguished scholar. More commonly, however, a professor in economics, history, law, political economy, or philosophy offered instruction in "sociology"--though usually not by that name. Georg Simmel's academic appointments were in philosophy; those of Max Weber and Pareto, in economics. Durkheim was among the few Europeans in the nineteenth century to attain academic title as a sociologist, as a professor of sociology and education in the Faculty of Letters in the University of Paris.

The first recorded instance of formal instruction in a course called sociology within the United States occurred at Yale University where in 1876 Professor William Graham Sumner

offered such a course. Until his death in 1910, Sumner was identified at Yale, however, as a professor of political and social science. L. L. Bernard (1909, 1945) and Albion W. Small (1915) and Jessie Bernard (in Lundberg, 1929) in their discussions of sociological instruction in the United States give accounts of the early courses in sociology and the beginning of academic departments. The period 1889 to 1892 brought formal instruction in sociology to 18 colleges and universities in the United States (Bernard in Lundberg, 1929, Chart I). But it remained for the opening of the University of Chicago in 1893 to establish the first academic department in the United States with work leading to the doctorate in sociology. By 1900, there were 19 colleges or universities that included formal instruction in the curriculum.

At the outset, departments of sociology in the United States more often were established as joint departments than as ones devoted entirely to offering instruction in sociology. By far the most common alliance was made with economics, with history a distant second. Where sociology was not entitled to departmental status, either separately or conjoined with another department, it usually was taught in departments of economics,

history, philosophy, political science, or in a general department of social sciences.

Despite the fact that the first department of sociology at the University of Chicago was a joint department of sociology and anthropology, anthropology was not generally linked with sociology in this early period. Actually sociology in the United States gradually added anthropology to its offerings so that by the 1920's there were a substantial number of departments of sociology and anthropology. By 1965, however, most of these academic partnerships had been dissolved as anthropology achieved status as a separate academic discipline.

The rise of academic instruction in sociology undoubtedly was related to the organization of higher education in the societies that produced scholars in sociological writing. While it might appear that the general conditions of the society should be most important in explaining the rise of academic sociology in the United States as contrasted with other countries, such conditions probably are more closely associated with the rise of sociological inquiry than of its organization in the academy.

Two very important conditions appear to have led to the establishment of sociology as an

academic discipline in the United States rather than in any other country. First, sociology in the United States was oriented toward the pragmatic as well as the theoretical and philosophical. While sociology formed in some instances an uneasy alliance with practitioners, there was an overriding concern with an empirical science based on research about the problems of the growing society. The early publications of the American Journal of Sociology in contrast with those of L'Annee Sociologique were as much devoted to "applied sociology" as to "theoretical or scientific sociology".

A second major factor undoubtedly was the rapid growth of mass public education in the United States following the Civil War of the 1860's. With the rapid expansion of the universities beginning in 1897, there undoubtedly was less pressure within the university to restrict professorships to established disciplines and for professors to compete for students, of which there were large numbers. Indeed, while there was some antagonism from the other social sciences in American as in European universities, the department form of organization in American universities made it possible for these very departments to add instruction in sociology

without much loss to their programs.

Equally important may have been the administrative organization of American universities and the role of its president. There is abundant evidence that the separation of administration from direct faculty control in the American university made it much easier for new subject matters to enter the American university, sociology among them. Surprisingly too, at least seven American university presidents themselves first offered formal course work in sociology at their university in the period up to 1900. By 1910, most colleges and universities in the United States were offering courses in sociology (Bernard, 1945, p. 535). The actual establishment of separate departments of sociology occurred at a much slower rate. By 1960 most American universities and colleges had a department of sociology, although only 70 of the American universities were offering the doctorate in sociology. The number of higher degree programs in sociology in the United States, however, probably is greater than that in all other countries.

Perhaps a factor that was significant in the development of American sociology as a consequence of its institutionalization within

the universities was the fact that quite early the student was exposed to sociology through the basic textbook. The earliest of these textbooks in sociology was An Introduction to the Study of Society by Albion W. Small and George E. Vincent of the Department of Sociology at the University of Chicago (1894). This was followed in 1896 by F. H. Giddings, Principles of Sociology. These textbooks influenced the training of large numbers of undergraduate students in sociology and influenced their recruitment into graduate training. The textbook indeed is a hallmark of instruction in undergraduate education in the United States. Despite the seeming diversity in approaches of authors, they represent an important element in standardizing the discipline.

American sociologists have most carefully documented the development of academic sociology and its growth as a science and a profession. Among the major surveys documenting the rise and development of American sociology are those by Small (1915), Wirth (1947), Odum (1951), Lundberg, et. al. (1929), Ross (1945), Bernard (1943), and Shils (1947). There is no single work that chronicles the rise and development of sociology as an academic discipline in other



countries of the world, though Twentieth Century Sociology (Gurvitch and Moore, 1945) and Contemporary Sociology (Roucek, ed., 1959) provide brief overviews of the rise of sociology and its development for major countries of the world.

Instruction in sociology did not grow at a uniform rate in the European countries, England, Russia, The Orient, or in Latin America. From time to time chairs or positions were added at this or that university, but up to World War II the largest concentrations in academic sociology were in America and Germany.

Despite the spectacular success Herbert Spencer attained in popularizing sociology not only in England but in America as well--he was a "best seller" in the United States (Hoffstadter: 1944, Ch. 2)--, the monumental work of Booth and Mayhew, and that of Hobhouse, Ginsberg, and Wheeler (1915), academic sociology developed very slowly in England. Perhaps one of the major reasons it developed so slowly in Britain was the successful development of British social anthropology and to consolidate in the British universities through the work of Radcliffe Brown and Malinowski, the former defining the field as 'comparative sociology' (Mac Rae, 1961, pp. 22-24).

The American sociologist Edward Shils in accounting for the failure of sociology to establish itself in England during the first half of the twentieth century argues that its failure lay in the development of British society and most particularly in the academic elite. Sociology failed to develop in the universities, he argues, because the academic elite of Britain refused to raise questions about contemporary life in England. This elite sustains and nurtures itself and excludes those from outside, inhibiting a sociology based on investigation of its own society (Shils, 1960). British social anthropology quite comfortably studied colonial societies.

Although the precursors of sociology Montesquieu and the Encyclopedists, the god-father of Sociology Comte, and many of its early distinguished practitioners such as Espinas and Le Play were French intellectuals, sociology was much distrusted in French academic circles. It remained for Durkheim to gain for sociology status in the university, first through a lectureship created for him at the University of Bordeaux in 1887 and then at the Sorbonne where he was called in 1902. Henri Peyre suggests that the resistance to

sociology in French academic circles was so intense that it probably accounts for the dogmatic fervor in Durkheim's writings (Foreword in Durkheim, 1960, p. ix).

As in Britain and to a degree in the United States for a part of the twentieth century, French academic sociology was closely fused with anthropology. While in the United States sociology dominated the partnership in France, as in England, the reverse was true so that academic sociology grew more slowly. Nonetheless certain main branches of academic sociology emerged in France through the influence of Durkheim and his disciples--the sociology of education, of religion, of law, and of the economy (Gurvitch, 1945). Though sociology spread in this way among the several faculties of French universities, quantitative sociology is centered largely outside the universities in a number of institutes. On the whole, French sociology maintains a breach between the sociology of the academy that is more philosophical and historical and that of the institutes which is more quantitative.

German sociology lacked from the outset the public recognition and support it had in England and the United States through Spencer's sociology. While sociology early became the concern of

scholars who were established in chairs at major German universities, sociology remained a humanistic rather than a scientific discipline, never gaining even widespread support among the humanists (Koenig in Roucek, 1959, pp. 779-781).

Germany, more than any other country, produced sociological writers in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries who exercised a major influence on modern sociological theory--Karl Marx, Ferdinand Toennies, Georg Simmel, Max Weber, and Karl Mannheim. The academic connections of this group of scholars with German universities were tenuous, however, for one reason or another. Marx was an itinerant intellectual; Simmel held a regular professorship in philosophy at the University of Berlin only late in life; Weber taught at Heidelberg only sporadically, largely due to illness; Karl Mannheim became a refugee scholar at the London School of Economics. Of the distinguished group, only Toennies spent his entire academic career at the University of Kiel. Although sociologists were found in most German universities before 1933, they were as likely to hold chairs in political economy or philosophy as in sociology. No strong center of sociological inquiry emerged within the German university system since both university traditions and

organization and the nature of sociological inquiry among German sociologists tended to restrict academic sociology to a professor and his assistants.

Undoubtedly the development of academic sociology in Germany suffered more from disruptions within German society than it did in other European nations. The disruption surrounding World War II from 1934-1946 profoundly affected the course of academic sociology in German universities. Despite the fact that by 1933 most German universities were offering lectures and degree courses in sociology so that substantial cohorts of young German sociologists had been trained by that time, almost all fled within a few years of the rise of the Nazi government. Only Alfred Weber and Leopold von Wiese among the major sociologists in Germany in the twenties remained in the German universities throughout the period of Nazism.

With the defeat of the Nazi government, sociology reestablished itself in the major universities of Western Germany by 1955. The chairs were usually offered to refugee sociologists who lacked a strong training in quantitative sociology. With few exceptions, they

have fitted rather comfortably into the philosophical and historical traditions of German sociology.

Sociology emerged as an academic discipline in Russia with the founding of a Department of Social Sciences at Moscow that included a chair of sociology. The Department was closed in 1924 (Kozlova and Cheboksarov, 1956). Despite some empirical research by younger Russian sociologists during this period, Russian sociology up to this point was largely based in philosophy and history and soon became Marxist sociology. Up to 1966, most sociologists in the U.S.S.R. taught and did research within philosophy faculties and institutes (Fischer, 1966, p. 127). It should be noted that sociology throughout the Soviet period of Russian history has come under the direct control of the ideological branch of the Communist Party. Soviet sociology defined as Marxist sociology has been widely taught both within and outside the universities, though until recently without special academic or faculty recognition.

Sociology entered as an academic subject in the Tokyo Imperial University almost as early as it entered the curriculum of any American university. Ernest Fenollosa, an American philosopher, came to Tokyo University in 1878 and offered

lectures in shakaigaku (sociology) based on the work of Herbert Spencer. A chair of sociology was established in Tokyo Imperial University in 1893 (Odaka, 1950). Prior to World War II, the principal centers of academic sociology in Japan were at Tokyo and Kyoto, each of which represented a "school" of sociological thought. The Tokyo School was regarded as more empirical than that of Kyoto which was regarded as formal and phenomenological (Odaka, 1950, p. 404).

The relatively late arrival of sociology in the universities of India perhaps reflects a combination of factors stemming from the essentially philosophical orientation of Indian intellectuals who were generally unreceptive to an empirical sociology. There was resistance to its establishment from the university system, inevitably exacerbated by their civil service structure. Were it not for the dominance that English intellectuals held over Indian education, the philosophical traditions of European sociology might have established themselves in the Indian University, though the compatibility of the German and Indian philosophical traditions is less than ideal.

Not until 1917 was sociology introduced as a course in an Indian University when it was

offered in the economics department at Calcutta University. Even today, Calcutta University with nearly 100,000 students (including those in affiliated departments) does not have an independent department of sociology (Clinard and Elder, p. 582). Bombay University established the first department of sociology in 1919. Almost all doctoral work in sociology in 1965 was concentrated at the universities of Bombay, Delhi, Agra, Baroda, and Lucknow with neither Calcutta nor Madras universities offering that degree. Most Indian universities still lack honors courses in sociology leading to a sociology degree.

The political structure and climate of Latin American republics and their universities hindered the development of sociology as an academic discipline. Nonetheless today chairs in sociology are to be found in nearly all Latin American republics--in Faculties of Law, Philosophy, or Social Sciences, and on occasion in Schools of Sociology. Though the division is by no means clearcut, the countries of the Atlantic were more likely to develop an academic sociology based on European, particularly Hispanic, traditions and writings while those of the Pacific developed a more empirical sociological tradition



(Bastide in Roucek, 1945, Ch. XXI). Since 1945 most of the larger republics have at least one major institute devoted primarily to sociological research. The greatest range of academic programs representing the fields of sociology are found in the universities of Brazil and Mexico, although Argentina with the largest number of universities has experienced a renaissance in sociology since the Peron era.

The development of sociology in the Eastern European nations was closely linked to their political independence. While there were scholars within eastern European universities prior to 1920, there was no recognition of sociology as an academic discipline. The growth of sociology within the universities was slow up until World War II with only Poland and Hungary developing major centers of sociology. In the post-war period sociology in the East European countries was dominated until quite recently by Marxist sociology.

Among the countries of southern Europe, only Italy could lay claim to the development of a sociological tradition in the universities prior to World War II. However, sociology did not emerge with separate departmental status, being confined usually to faculties in law, philosophy,

or economics. As in Germany, so in Italy, the rise of fascism created a climate that was inhospitable to academic sociology as it was developed in other countries.

Despite their small size, the most rapid growth of sociology in the post-World War II period probably has occurred in the Scandinavian countries. Apart from Finland, there was little academic sociology in these countries before that time. Even today, however, given the relatively small scale of higher education in these countries, most sociologists hold post outside the universities.

Any overview of the rise and development of sociology both as an intellectual and an academic discipline makes apparent that its rise and growth depends upon the social and political conditions of nation states. This is perhaps even more the case for sociology as an academic than as an intellectual discipline.

For the most part sociology as an academic discipline has experienced its greatest growth under conditions of the industrialized modern democratic state and of mass public higher education. The growth of academic sociology undoubtedly suffered most in countries where totalitarian governments regarded it as a

dangerous subject matter on ideological grounds, thereby depleting the universities through the flight of sociologists on academic appointment. This was particularly true for the period of national socialism in Germany from 1934 to 1946, in the Soviet Union from 1924, in Japan for much of its history, and in the Eastern European countries from the late thirties. The two great wars also had major affects on the training of new cohorts of sociologists and the careers of established sociologists in countries that were either occupied or under seige of war. Clearly the growth of academic sociology in France, England, and some European nations suffered during the period of the wars.

Nonetheless, the structure of the system of higher education and of the universities undoubtedly played the most important role in developing academic sociology in all countries. There was strong resistance from the traditional faculties to the entrance of sociology and to any claims that it might be a science. Since in almost all countries appointments to the faculty were closely controlled by the faculties, rather than by a separate administration, the development of academic sociology encountered considerable resistance in all but the American

universities. Furthermore, in most countries higher education was more elitist than mass in character and the university system itself provided relatively few opportunities for the development of sociology on a substantial scale.

A major factor for the establishment of academic sociology, particularly as a science, is the character of financial resources that can be allocated for empirical research. Such resources historically came to universities primarily through the private foundation and through government subsidies or grants. In countries such as England and the United States, the private foundation played an important role in the early development of sociology as an empirical science. Increasingly, however, the role of government in support of research played an important role in all countries. Sociology thus became dependent upon the State for its growth as a research enterprise. In the countries where sociology increasingly gained this form of state support, it has grown most rapidly as a research discipline. The growth of sociology as intellectual discipline reflects this resource base as well. A rural sociology and a sociology of social problems among other fields of sociology grew under the impetus of the availability of financial

resources for research, particularly state resources.

It should be clear that the aforementioned conditions were most easily satisfied within the context of American society where sociology early achieved status as an academic discipline and where it has had its greatest growth as a theoretical and empirical science. The conditions of free inquiry both within and without a university, of mass public education with a loosely organized university system, and of large resources for financial support of research appear essential then to the rise and rapid development of sociology as an academic discipline and as a science. Sociology is among the sciences that are dangerous to the state and to society; their growth as disciplines is intimately balanced with the state of the society!

#### Professional training of sociologists

The sociologists of the late nineteenth and twentieth century were largely scholars who had been trained in branches of knowledge other than sociology. In the German, French, and American universities they were largely products of the faculties in law, economics, political economy, and philosophy. With the establishment

of academic departments or chairs in sociology in the universities, the training of sociologists gradually fell to scholars or professionals who had been trained in sociology. Yet for much of its history sociologists have relied less on the kind of academic training a man received as qualification for an academic appointment or certification as a sociologist than on the sociological character of his writings or research.

In no country has professionalization of sociology moved as far as in the United States. Although the American Sociological Association still admits to membership persons who do not hold a degree in sociology, fellows or active (voting) members with few exceptions must hold the Ph.D. degree in sociology.

The American university provided the best opportunity for the rapid growth of sociology as a profession. Structured as they are around academic departments that provide doctoral training by the mid 1960's, there were some 70 universities in the United States offering graduate work in sociology leading to the doctoral degree. By 1965, their annual output was over 260 doctoral degrees in sociology. The production of Ph.D.'s in sociology in American universities, however, is highly concentrated;

three universities gave about a quarter, 9 almost half, and 23 gave four-fifths of all doctoral degrees conferred in sociology in the United States during the 1950-60 decade (Sibley, Ch. 4).

The largest single concentration of professionally trained sociologists today is in the United States, though the numbers in all European countries, England, India, Japan, and Latin American has grown substantially since 1950. Indeed by 1960 almost every new nation had a few sociologists. Almost 2000 sociologists assembled in 1966 at the Sixth World Congress of Sociology of the International Sociological Association with no country accounting for more than one-tenth of those in attendance.

The United States provides the most detailed information on professional sociologists, though it is difficult to estimate their numbers since much depends upon the definition used. There were an estimated 3000 holders of doctor's degrees in sociology in the United States in 1966. In 1964, 2,703 sociologists were registered in the National Science Foundation Register of Scientific and Technical Personnel (Hopper, p. 71). Active members and fellows

(almost all of whom hold the doctorate in sociology) in the American Sociological Association numbered 3,626 in 1965.

Sociologists in the United States, in contrast with many other countries in the world, are primarily employed in colleges and universities. Of those in the National Register in 1964, 77 per cent were so employed (Hopper, Table 4). Though no comparable statistics are available for other countries, a substantially smaller proportion appears to be employed in universities in most other countries except for Canada. The civil service and research institutes appear to account for a growing proportion of the employment of all sociologists in England, Europe, America, and the U.S.S.R.

The extent to which sociologists are employed professionally outside of universities depends to a great extent on the development of applied "sociologies" in a country, e.g., whether sociologists train professional sociological criminologists, welfare administrators, or planners. Unlike psychology, sociologists have not organized their professional training around specialized clinical training programs. Within the United States in fact the main difference in the size of the professional associations



of psychologists and sociologists can be accounted for by the large number of clinical psychologists in the American Psychological Association.

While sociologists in both England and the United States historically were linked to the profession of social work, by 1940, most large sociology departments in the United States had withdrawn from even pre-social work curricula. Though there are a few doctoral programs in sociology and social work at leading American universities, there is no close link between professional sociologists and professional social workers.

The growth of sociology as a scientific discipline has led, in fact, to less curricular emphasis on areas that formerly were classified as "applied" sociology. Within the United States the decline in emphasis on training applied sociologists can be attributed in large part to professional efforts to establish sociology in the status of a science, but it is also due in part to the fact that other disciplines and practices such as social work assumed this function.

All of this does not gainsay the fact that sociologists in most countries are deeply involved

with the problems confronting the society. They are, but their roles are primarily those of scientific investigator and policy scientists. Increasingly, too, sociology has developed sub-fields of specialization that are related to practice in other professions, e.g., medical sociology and a sociology of education.

Scientific, learned, and professional associations  
of sociologists

As sociologists gradually gained recognition within the universities of their country, they continued to face the problems of insularity surrounding their discipline. All too often the early academic sociologists wrote quite unaware of the work of sociologists within as well as outside their own countries. Though Durkheim went to Germany for a period, he does not seem to have encountered Simmel. The American sociologist, Lester F. Ward, wrote much of his early work unaware of major American scholars in sociology. Actually while most of the early sociologists belonged to learned societies or intellectual circles within their own countries, their diverse scholarly origins often gave them little contact with one another. Following the model of other learned societies, however,

sociologists established learned or scientific societies of sociologists, some with overtones of professionalism. Either these associations or a dominant school or scholar early established a journal devoted primarily to communication among sociologists.

The early American sociologist Lester F. Ward in a U. S. Education Report of 1900 on the Social Economy Section of the Paris Exposition of 1900 wrote of sociology and its development in somewhat prophetic terms, though that was not his intent. "All the countries of the world are contributing to the sociological movement, but the activity is greater in some than others. It is perhaps least in England. In Germany it has a distinctive character, with a tendency to evade the name of sociology.... In the United States this activity is most intense and very real and earnest. But there can be no doubt that it is in France, the cradle of the science, that sociology has taken the firmest hold upon the thinking classes, and it is here that we find the largest annual output, whether we confine ourselves to the literature or include in our enumeration the practical application of sociology in the form of institutions, such as the Musée Social, for carrying on lines of

operation calculated to educate and enlighten the people in social matters."

American and French sociologists were among the first to develop a learned society of sociologists, a journal of sociology, and among those who early and consistently worked toward establishing the status of sociology as a scientific discipline and a profession. These events did not occur at the same period in their history. Overall, however, American sociology moved most rapidly in shaping sociology as a distinct discipline so that within sixty years of its founding, sociology had an established place not only within the universities but within almost all organized parts of the society.

No doubt the rapid increase in the number of sociologists in America made these developments more feasible there. Yet it is clear that even in the early days when there were fewer than 100 members, American sociologists assumed a leadership role in developing means for scholarly communication and association.

Albion W. Small established the second sociological journal in 1895 at The University of Chicago. In the first issue of the journal, Professor Small made it clear that in The

American Journal of Sociology..."a large number of American scholars, with many representative European sociologists, will try to express their best thoughts upon discoverable principles of societary relationships...". Small not only invited original papers from an advisory board of European sociologists and their colleagues, but he translated portions of their published writings to avoid, as he put it, the development of a provincial science.

Small later reported that there were many who tried to dissuade him from publishing even the first issue of the journal on the grounds there was not enough sociological writing to fill such a journal (1916, p. 786). Nonetheless, he issued the first number in July, 1895 even though he did not have enough articles for the second issue in September. In response to his pleas, Ward and Ross submitted papers and with an occasional translation of the writings of European sociologists, Small soon established The American Journal of Sociology as a success.

The first sociological society was the Institut International de Sociologie. It formally came into being with the meeting of its first Congress in Paris in October of 1894. The Institut published the Annales de L'institut

International de Sociologie under the editorship of Rene Worms beginning in 1895. Also under the editorship of Rene Worms, the first journal of sociology, Revue Internationale de Sociologie had appeared in 1893. The Institut was an international association of sociologists that held congresses of sociologists until 1960.

Following World War II, the complexities of political relationships among nations carried over into the organizational structure of the international body of sociologists. There were objections to the fascist sympathies of some members and officers of the Institut International de Sociologie and to the circumstances under which the organization had continued to function under totalitarian governments during the war. Not long after the founding of UNESCO a number of sociologists including M. Ginsberg of England, G. Gurvitch and M. Davy of France, and Louis Wirth of the United States persuaded that body to call a Constituent Congress to found a new international organization of sociologists. Meeting in Oslo in 1948 with 24 delegates from 21 countries, the International Sociological Association was organized with Louis Wirth as the first president. The First World Congress of Sociology of the ISA was held in Zurich,

Switzerland in 1949 with 124 delegates from 30 countries. By 1966, the Sixth World Congress of Sociology at Evian, France was attended by almost 2,000 sociologists from all countries of the world where there are academic appointments in sociology, other than mainland China.

Perhaps because French sociologists always have played a major role in the international organizations of sociologists, they failed to develop any viable national organization of sociologists. In addition to the vital role French sociologists played in constituting the first international organization of sociologists and the founding of the oldest sociological annual, The Revue, the distinguished French sociologist, Emile Durkheim established L'Annee sociologique as a regular journal in 1898. During the fifties, French sociologists were influential in establishing the multilingual Archives Europeennes de Sociologie. Earlier, French demographers had established Population.

The second sociological society to be formed was the Sociological Society of London, organized at a General Meeting in November, 1903 with Sir James Bryce as the first president. Four meetings of the Society were held in the Spring and Summer Terms of 1904, for papers and discussions.

These were first issued in 1905 as the first volume of Sociological Papers, the official journal of the Society. Later the Papers became the Sociological Review with a waning of the Sociological Society. Not until 1951 were British sociologists to develop a national organization with the founding of the British Sociological Association. The 1961 membership was somewhat in excess of 500 (Mac Rae, 1961, p. 25). In 1951, the British Journal of Sociology appeared, but neither The Review nor the Journal has received the international attention given the more specialized subject matter journals of British sociologists, Population Studies and The British Journal of Delinquency.

In December, 1905 about 100 American sociologists gathered as members of the American Historical, Economic, and Political Science Associations in Baltimore, Md. to consider their dissatisfaction with these cognate societies giving little opportunity for sociologists to present their work at annual sessions. They concluded the meeting by forming The American Sociological Society (now the American Sociological Association). The first meeting of The Association was held in 1906 in connection with the meetings of the cognate societies. Lester



F. Ward was elected its first president and William Graham Sumner and Franklin H. Giddings were vice-presidents. The American Journal of Sociology became the official organ of this new society with its officers being advisory editors. In 1936, the Society severed its relationship with the Journal and established The American Sociological Review as its official journal. In the interim two other sociological journals had made their appearance, Social Forces at the University of North Carolina in 1922 under the editorship of Howard Odum and Sociology and Social Research with Emory Bogardus as editor at The University of Southern California.

During the thirties the rural sociologists severed their ties with The Society on grounds of neglect of their special interests and formed the Rural Sociology Society with Rural Sociology as their official journal. The sociologists interested in social problems did likewise in the fifties, founding the Society for the Study of Social Problems and an official journal, Social Problems. In part to forestall further fragmentation, the Society has since approved specialized sections within the parent society. Three additional official journals have been added representing section interests.

J. L. Moreno's journal Sociometry was acquired by the Association and now is devoted solely to papers in social psychology. More recently, the Society acquired the journal Educational Sociology, retitled the Journal of The Sociology of Education. Similarly, the journal Health and Human Behavior came under The Association's wing and is published as Health and Social Behavior.

As the American Sociological Association grew, it developed self-consciously as a professional association as well as a learned society. The official journal carried news of job changes and opportunities and gradually came to include an Employment Bulletin. The problems of professionalization were eventually to be debated within its covers. As it grew in size, comprising by the early fifties almost 4000 members (including associate and student members), it established a special role of executive secretary. By the early sixties, it had a national office in Washington, D.C. headed by a professional sociologist. During 1966 it developed a special journal devoted to matters of the profession, The American Sociologist.

As sociology grew in the United States regional, state, and even local societies grew as well. Some have even developed or 'adopted'

official sociological journals. Many American sociologists hold membership in both a regional and the national body of sociologists. The American Sociological Society in its growth has become a body of professionals as well as scholars. No other national association has moved so far in recognizing both professional and scholarly interests within an association of sociologists. Associations of sociologists outside the United States function more generally to sponsor annual or biennial meetings devoted almost entirely to scholarly interests.

Though most nations with academic sociologists today have joined with others in forming associations outside of the international societies, they generally follow the model of the scholarly or learned society rather than that of American sociologists which promotes both scholarly and professional interests.

Under the leadership of Weber and his contemporaries German sociologists founded the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Soziologie. The association was disbanded with the exodus of sociologists under the government of the National Socialist Party in 1934, though its last (seventh) convention had been held in Berlin in 1930. Leopold von Weise, professor of sociology at

Cologne, was its president at the time of its demise and served as its first president when it was revived in 1946. It continues as the major learned society of German sociologists. There are no official journals of the association.

The major sociological journal in Germany for much of the period before 1930 was the Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik. Max Weber served for a time as editor and practically all of his sociological writings were first published in the Archiv. From 1921-34 the Koelner Vierteljahrshrift für Soziologie was published under the editorship of Leopold von Wiese. This journal came forth under his editorship again in 1948 as the Koelner Zeitschrift für Soziologie, though Rene Koenig assumed the editorship in the early fifties and continues as its editor.

Soviet sociology remained without any organization of sociologists until the mid 1950's when the Soviet Sociological Association was founded. The first national meeting of Soviet sociologists did not take place until February 1965, however (Fischer, 1966). In 1965 the first Soviet sociology journal, Social Research (Sotsialnye issledovaniia) appeared. Just how many Soviet sociologists there are in the U.S.S.R. is difficult to estimate, though about 600

sociologists took part in the first national meeting of Soviet sociologists in 1965 (Fischer, p. 128).

Not until 1924 was a nationwide sociological society formed in Japan with the establishment of the Nihon Shakai Gakkai (Japan Sociological Society). Up to 1943 the official publications of the Society were the Shakaigaku Zasshi (Journal of Sociology) and the Nempō Shaigaku (Annual of the Japan Sociological Society). At the close of World War II, the official journal publication became Shakaigaku Kenkyū (Sociological Research).

The pre-war membership in the Japan Sociological Society numbered around 700. With the rapid growth of academic sociology in the post-war period, their numbers are greater, though it is difficult to ascertain how many hold higher degrees in sociology.

There is some difficulty in estimating the number of sociologists in India. The total membership of the Indian Sociological Society in 1963 was only 268 of whom Clinard and Elder estimate 16 per cent were foreigners (1965, p. 582). While the civil service and other institutes may employ sociologists who are not affiliated with the professional society, the

total number of Indian sociologists undoubtedly is extremely small, possibly one of the lowest per capita ratios among the nations with an established university system.

The main Indian sociological journal is the Sociological Bulletin, founded in 1952 as the official publication of the Bombay Sociological Society. Sociological publication in India appears also in the International Journal of Comparative Sociology.

The Universities in Scandinavian countries other than Finland and Denmark, gave almost no formal recognition to academic sociology before 1946. Though the scale of sociology still is small in any country of Scandinavia, there is considerable association among sociologists from the several countries. By 1956, they had established a separate journal Acta Sociologica. Most articles in Acta are published in the English language, though an occasional article appears in the French or German language.

One of the early journals to include within the title, sociology, is the Revista di sociologia, that appeared in Italy in 1897.

Without a doubt, the founding of sociology journals was an important factor in the early development of academic and scientific sociology.

The early sociology journals often were a vehicle for the publications of a 'school of sociology' or the writings of an editor and his students. L'Annee was clearly Durkheim's journal; Rene Worms dominated the Revue; for a time Weber shaped the Archiv; Howard Odum and his students used Social Forces to foster regional sociology; and, J. L. Moreno developed a school in Sociometry. Even the American Journal of Sociology and Sociological Papers which at the outset were more generally open to submission of papers from any sociologist, were influenced respectively by Albion Small and Victor Branford. While a particular school or group of individuals and on occasion a leading figure still plays a role in founding or editing a sociology journal, most sociology journals today, whether general or specialized, are more universalistic in their standards.

## Bibliography

- Ahmad, Imitaz, "Note on Sociology in India", The American Sociologist, Vol. I (August, 1965) 244-247.
- Aron, Raymond, German Sociology, Glencoe: The Free Press, 19--.
- Becker, Howard and Boskoff, Alvin, Modern Sociological Theory in Continuity and Change, New York: Dryden Press, 1957.
- Berelson, Bernard, and Steiner, Gary A., Human Behavior: An Inventory of Scientific Findings, New York: Harcourt Brace & Co., 1964.
- Bernard, L. L., "The Teaching of Sociology in the United States", American Journal of Sociology, XV (September, 1909), 164-213.
- \_\_\_\_\_, "The Teaching of Sociology in the United States in the Last Fifty Years", The American Journal of Sociology, L (May, 1945) 534-548.
- Bernard, Luther Lee and Bernard, Jesse, Origins of American Sociology, New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1943.



- Booth, Charles, Life and Labour of the People in London, London & New York: Macmillan & Co., 1892-97, 4 vols. (Originally published as Labour and Life of the People of London.)
- Bottomore, T. P., "Sociology In India", The British Journal of Sociology, 13 (June, 1962) 100-105.
- Bowley, A. L., The Measurement of Social Phenomena, London, 1915.
- Bryson, Gladys, Man and Society: The Scottish Inquiry of the Eighteenth Century, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton Univ. Press, 1945.
- Bukharin, Nicholas, Historical Materialism: A System of Sociology, New York: International Publishers, 1925.
- de Champneuf, M. de Guerry, Statistique Morale de la France, Paris, 1833.
- de Chabral, M. le Comte, Recherches statistiques sur la Paris Ct le Department de la Seine, Paris, 1821-29.
- Clinard, Marshall B., & Elder, Joseph W., "Sociology in India: A Study in the Sociology of Knowledge", The American Sociology Review, 30 (August, 1965) 581-587.

Comte, Auguste, Cours de philosophie positive, 6 vols., Paris, 1830-42, 5th ed., translated by H. Martineau, 2 vols., 3rd ed., London, 1893.

\_\_\_\_\_, Systeme de politique positive, 4 vols., Paris 1851-54, 3rd ed., 180-95; English edition, 4 vols., London, 1875-77.

Duncan, O. D., "From Social System to Ecosystem", Sociological Inquiry, 31 (1961) 140-149.

Duncan, O. D., and Schnore, L. F., "Cultural, Behavioral, and Ecological Perspectives in the Study of Social Organization", The American Journal of Sociology, 65 (1959) 132-146.

Durkheim, Emile, Montesquieu and Rousseau, Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1960.

Faris, R. E. L. (ed.), Handbook of Modern Sociology, Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1964.

Fischer, George, "Current Soviet Work in Sociology", The American Sociologist, 1 (May, 1966) 127-132.

Giddings, Franklin H., Principles of Sociology, New York, 1896.

Gurvitch, Georges, and Moore, Wilbert E., Twentieth Century Sociology, New York: The Philosophical Library, 1945.

Hobhouse, L. T.; Wheeler, G. C.; and Ginsberg, M.,  
The Material Culture and Social Institutions  
of the Simpler Peoples, London, 1915.

Hoffstadter, Richard, Social Darwinism in American  
Thought, Philadelphia, Univ. of Pennsylvania  
Press, 1944.

Hopper, Janice A., "Sociologists in the National  
Register of Scientific and Technical Personnel",  
The American Sociologist, Vol. 1, No. 2  
(February, 1966) 71-78.

Kozlova, K. I. and Chebo Ksarov, N. N., "The Social  
Sciences in the U.S.S.R.", Soviet Survey, 10  
(November, 1956) 1-19.

Lazarsfeld, Paul F., "Notes on the History of  
Quantification in Sociology", Isis, 52  
(June, 1961); 277-333.

Lundberg, George; Bain, Read; and Anderson, Nels,  
Trends in American Sociology, New York:  
Harper & Brothers, 1929.

Lynd, R. M., Knowledge For What? The Place of  
Social Science in American Culture, Princeton:  
Princeton University Press, 1939.

Mac Iver, Robert Morrison, Social Causation,  
Boston: Ginn & Co., 1942.

Mc Rae, Donald G., Ideology and Sociology, New

York: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1961.

Mannheim, Karl, Ideology and Utopia, London: Kegan

Paul, French, Trubner & Co., Ltd., 1940.

\_\_\_\_\_, Man and Society in an Age of Recon-  
struction, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul,  
Ltd., 1948.

\_\_\_\_\_, Freedom, Power, and Democratic  
Planning, New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1950.

\_\_\_\_\_, Essays in the Sociology of Knowledge,  
Edited by Paul Kecskemiti, London, Routledge  
and Kegan Paul, 1952.

March, James G. (ed.), Handbook of Organizations,

Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1965.

Mayhew, Henry, London Labour and the London Poor:

A Cyclopedia of the Condition and Earnings of  
Those That Will Work, Those That Cannot Work,  
and Those That Will Not Work, London: G.  
Woodfall and Son, 1851.

Mayhew, Henry, and Benny, John, The Criminal Pri-

sons of London and Scenes of Prison Life,  
London: Griffin, Bohn, & Co., 1862.

Merton; Robert K., Social Theory and Social Structure, Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1957.

Merton, Robert K.; Broom, Leonard; Cottrell, Jr.; Leonard S., Sociology Today, New York: Basic Books, 1959.

Moser, C. A., Survey Methods In Social Investigation, London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1958.

Obserschall, Anthony R., "Emprical Social Research in Germany, 1948-1914", Columbia University: Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Faculty of Political Science, 1962.

Odaka, Hunio, "Japanese Sociology: Past and Present", Social Forces, 28 (May, 1950) 400-409.

Odum, Howard, American Sociology: The Story of Sociology in the United States Through 1950, New York: Longman's Green, 1951.

Parent-Duchatelet, A. J. B., De La Prostitution Dans La Ville de Paris, Bruxilles: Societe Belge de Librarie, Hauman Cattoir et le., 1834.

Vilfredo Pareto, Trattato di sociologia generale, 2 vols., Florence, 1916, 2nd ed., 3 vols., 1923.

Parsons, Talcott, The Social System, Glencoe: The Free Press, 1951.

\_\_\_\_\_, Essays in Sociological Theory, Glencoe: The Free Press, 1954.

\_\_\_\_\_, Structure and Process in Modern Societies, Glencoe: The Free Press, 1960.

\_\_\_\_\_, Societies: Evolutionary and Comparative Perspectives, New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966.

Parsons, Talcott and Shils, Edward A., Toward A General Theory of Action, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1952.

Popper, Karl, The Poverty of Historicism, Boston: The Beacon Press, 1957.

Ross, Edward A., "Fifty Years of Sociology in the United States", The American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 50 (May, 1945), pp. 489-501.

Roucek, Joseph S., Contemporary Sociology, London: Peter Owne, Ltd., 1959.

Saksena, R. N. (ed.), Sociology, Social Research, and Social Problems in India, New York: Asia Publishing House, 1961.

Shils, Edward A., "The Present Situation in  
American Sociology", Pilot Papers, Vol. II  
(June, 1947) 8-36.

\_\_\_\_\_, "On the Eve", Twentieth  
Century, Vol. 167 (May, 1960) No. 999, 445-  
459.

Sibley, Elbridge, The Education of Sociologists  
in the United States, New York: Russell Sage  
Foundation, 1963.

Small, Albion, "Fifty Years of Sociology in the  
United States", The American Journal of  
Sociology, 1895-1915.

Small, Albion W. and Vincent, George, An Intro-  
duction to the Study of Society, New York:  
The American Book Co., 1894.

Sorokin, P. A., Sociocultural Causality, Space,  
Time, Durham, N.C.: Duke Univ. Press, 1943.

Webb, Sidney, and Webb, Beatrice, Methods of  
Social Study, London: Longmans Green & Co.,  
1932.

Weber, Adna F., The Growth of Cities in the Nineteenth Century: A Study in Statistics, Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, New York, 1899.

Wirth, Louis, "American Sociology, 1915-1947", The American Journal of Sociology, Index to Volumes 1-L11, 1895-1947, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1947, 273-281.

Znaniecki, Florian, The Method of Sociology, New York: J. J. Little & Ives Co., 1934.

\_\_\_\_\_, Cultural Sciences, Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1951.