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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

This dissertation is the report of an exploratory investigation in the sociology of sociology. More specifically, the study deals with the sociology of symbolic interactionism. The study's purpose was twofold: (1) to report and describe the nature and extent of the differences which divide symbolic interactionists with respect to their views on several pivotal sociological concerns and/or concepts, and (2) to attempt to account for these differences by recourse to the same types of explanatory frameworks sociologists employ to study the reasoning of nonsociologists. The Weberian inspired doctrine that sociologists can "rise above" influences exerted by the human relationships which admittedly constrain and shape the thought of others is explicitly rejected. It is assumed that theoretical differences among interactionists are somehow associated with the kinds of human relationships in which they themselves were and are involved. The word somehow is underscored to re-emphasize the fact that the investigation is exploratory in nature and that the analysis and interpretation of the data is therefore partially ex post facto. Briefly stated, three
variables, (1) institutions conferring respondents' Ph.D's, (2) patterns of staff-student relationships during respondents' doctoral programs, and (3) patterns of conjoint faculty appointments held by respondents, were examined. These variables were analyzed in order to establish whether variations in such relationships were associated, and in what directions, with variations in views subjects held concerning the nature and meaning of the key sociological concerns, self, social control, methodology, and social change.

Significance of the Problem
The sociology of knowledge.— The notion that the structure, and often the content, of human knowledge is intimately related to the structure of the society from which it emanates and in which it is forged is a time honored sociological contention, forcefully voiced, perhaps for the first time, in Marx and Engels' essay The German Ideology. The latest major sociological treatise purporting to document such a thesis is Claude Levi-Strauss' The Savage Mind. Durkheim and Mauss' work offers additional support for this hypothesis. In spite of pronounced theoretical differences among these authors, they share in common the fact that their


basic units of analysis are the knowledge systems of entire societies.

Other works have focused on units of analysis smaller than total societies in order to demonstrate that the structure of human relationship is associated with the structure of human thought. Some authors, i.e., Centers, Marx, Mannheim, and Mills, have dealt with social class, while others have examined knowledge systems as they relate to the structure of such kinship units as phratries; i.e., Levi-Strauss' reinterpretation of Paul Radin's study of Winnebago. Still others have been content to demonstrate that changes in the nature of human relationships within a single social institution lead to changes in that institution's supportive ideology—i.e., Parsons' essay documenting how changes in the nature of man's relation to man within the religious institution led to changes in the nature of the

---


assumed relationship between man and God. There are, in the sociological literature, numerous other works either demonstrating or purporting to demonstrate that the structure, pattern, and in many cases the very content, of human knowledge is inextricably bound to the structure of the human relationships from which they emanate. At least as it relates to the knowledge systems of nonsociologists, Mannheim's dictum that "there are modes of thought which cannot be adequately understood as long as their social origins are obscured"\textsuperscript{10} seems to have gained fairly wide acceptance.

The sociology of sociology.---Paradoxically, however, those sociologists, laboring under the heavy-handed influence of the Weberian doctrine of a "value-free" science have maintained that the sociologist can, through the employment of "objective scientific method," escape the influence which human relationships admittedly exert on others. Due partially to the combined influence of the postulate of a "value-free" sociology and the general lack of self-consciousness on the part of sociologists, systematic analyses of the social origins of current sociological theories are scarce.

Those few works which do attempt to bring a sociology of knowledge perspective to bear on the analysis of sociological thought systems are often of a character quite different from that of the previously cited works. While the more general works in the sociology of knowledge have attempted

\textsuperscript{10}Mannheim, op. cit., p. 2.
to relate the structure and content of human relationships (social structure or organization) to the structure and content of knowledge systems, many works in the sociology of sociology have simply attempted to illustrate how idea systems (culture) prevalent in the larger society come to be embodied in sociological theorizing. The later approach characterizes Zeitlin's\textsuperscript{11} treatment of the nature and varieties of social theory in general and a number of analyses of American sociology in particular, i.e., a prime concern of Shaskolsky's\textsuperscript{12} recent work is a demonstration of the fact that the conventional American values of self-determination and "rugged individualism" have worked their way into current American sociological theory. Additional works focusing on the writings of single authors pursue the same approach, i.e., Bendix\textsuperscript{13} analysis of the mirroring of the German burghers' values and interests in Weber's sociology; Novikov's\textsuperscript{14} demonstration of the "fit" between Parsons'\textsuperscript{11} M. Zeitlin, Ideology and the Development of Sociological Theory (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968).

\textsuperscript{12}L. Shaskolsky, "The Development of Sociological Theory in America--A Sociology of Knowledge Interpretations," The Ohio Valley Sociologist, XXXII (Spring, 1967), pp. 11-35.


social action theory and the ethic of the organization man; and Reynolds and Reynolds' contention that Levi-Strauss' postulating a basic human desire for order grows out of a fundamental French concern for "order lost," a concern shared by French sociologists as early as St. Simon and Comte.

One early paper in the sociology of sociology which does examine the social origins of sociological reasoning is Mills' analysis of the relationship between the ideology and the social backgrounds of social pathologists. Smith's recent "expose" of the teacher-pupil-colleague relationships binding the "Sunshine Boys" into an ideological unit is a small scale effort to lay bare the social origins of sociological perspectives.

Apart from Smith's paper, which in fact simply serves to illustrate the somewhat obvious fact that those who interact together come to share similar viewpoints, empirical studies examining the nature and types of relationships sociologists share with one another as they relate to the nature and types of theoretical perspectives which arise out of them are almost nonexistent. Yet, should it turn out

---


that the nature and state of our current sociological reasoning is in large measure a product of the types of organizational associations in which they have been developed, such a finding would be portentous indeed. Further, should it become possible to specify what types of relationships between and among sociologists led to what types of sociological theory a number of distinct advantages would be gained. First, by examining current patterns of organizational associations among sociologists, it would be possible to gauge what direction given "brands" of sociological theory are moving in. Second, we may then be able to specify just which types of relationships are apt to lead to the development of new and creative modes of social thought and which types of relationships are apt to retard or make impossible such developments. Third, if sociologists were able to establish the relationship between patterns of associations among sociologists and the patterns of their sociological reasoning we may be in a position to broadly forecast the nature of sociological theories which are apt to arise following a break down and shift in, or combining of, already existent patterns of relationships. Lastly, in light of the fact that most, if not all, recent attempts to combine or integrate existing theories have failed, perhaps an examination, in advance, of the patterns of social relations giving rise to the theories one wishes to integrate may prevent such failure in the future.
While any two theories one wishes to combine will vary in content, but not necessarily in form; it may well be that they have arisen out of similar sets or patterns of relationships among those sociologists expounding them. Such theories would seem to be the best candidates for combination as they are least likely to present directly conflicting images of man and society and are also least likely to employ drastically different systems of logic.

To recapitulate, research in the sociology of sociology which examines the relationship between sociologists relations with other sociologists and the patterns of their sociological reasoning is principally characterized by its absence. Should future research reveal that current sociological reasoning is to a considerable extent a resultant of the kinds of organizational affiliations in which sociologists are involved, the significance of such a finding can hardly be overstated. It was in the hope of making a small contribution to this problem area, whose potential significance is so great, that the present investigation was undertaken. The last section of this chapter presents a history of the present inquiry.

History of the Problem

In one sense, the present investigation is but a logical extension of a previous study undertaken by Ted R. Vaughan and myself. However, the outcome of the original study was not at all the intended one. The findings
reported were truly serendipitous. At the time we began the investigation in earnest, Vaughan and I were concerned with the general topic of social change. More specifically, we were interested in spelling out in propositional form exactly what a symbolic interactionist theory of social change would look like.

Obviously one way in which such an end could be obtained would be to closely examine the literature on social change written by symbolic interactionists, extract the relevant propositions found there, compile a listing of the noncontradictory ones, and lastly arrange such propositions in hierarchical fashion. However, in our opinion, such a method has at least one major shortcoming. The interactionist literature dealing specifically with social change is rather sparse; therefore, most statements pertaining to social change are mixed and mingled with other propositions. Hence, such writings would not only fail to yield clear-cut, unambiguous statements on social change but would also, due to their general scarcity, fail to adequately convey the breath of ideas pertaining to change which might exist in the minds of many interactionists. In order to avoid such shortcomings, we wrote directly to forty symbolic interactionists whose contributions to the sociological literature, as judged by five social psychologists, established them as key spokesmen for the interactionist perspective. Each of these forty sociologists received a letter asking the following question:
Do you feel that symbolic interaction theory is well suited for handling the topic of social change? If so, exactly what about the perspective lends it its strength in treating this topic? If not, what weak points in the framework impede its ability to deal effectively with social change?

Thirty-four of the interactionists contacted tendered their replies, of these thirty-one were usable. A content analysis of the returns revealed the presence of the following basic response patterns:

Category A: A relatively unqualified endorsement of symbolic interactionism's capability of handling change as a generic phenomenon, i.e., the framework was seen as a general theoretical scheme of human society within which all forms of change could be accounted for.

Category B: A statement that the perspective was incapable of treating change at the macro level but was conceptually geared to deal with micro-change, e.g., through socialization; i.e., symbolic interaction theory was seen as being largely concerned with the cultural transformation of individual behavior.

At this point we held our originally stated concern with social change *per se* in abeyance in order to redirect our efforts to another problem which now appeared to be worthy of investigation in its own right. To quote from the
article based on this original study:

Both the historical development of interactionism and the nature of its principal intellectual sources suggest the possibility of important differences within this tradition. As Rose has noted, symbolic interactionism has developed 'crescively with an idea here, a magnificent but partial formulation there, a little study here, a program of specialized studies there.' And Mead's posthumously published writings are . . . susceptible to various interpretations. To some extent, of course, such historical and stylistic features characterize other theoretical positions as well, but the indications are that the differences among interactionists may be as great as those between this and other theoretical perspectives.18

In our attempt to account for the observed response patterns we turned to a sociology of knowledge perspective. To us this meant, in part, that the educational programs and academic career patterns of the respondents be examined in order to establish whether or not such patterns were associated with the two divergent viewpoints on social change mentioned above. In order to facilitate such examination three variables were scrutinized: (1) institutions conferring respondents' Ph.D.s, (2) patterns of staff-student relationships during subjects' doctoral programs, and (3) patterns of conjoint faculty appointments held by respondents.

Briefly stated, the results of this analysis indicated that (1) those interactionists who saw symbolic interactionism as a general theory of human behavior capable of dealing

with social change in all its facets were characterized by extensive interconnectedness both during graduate study programs and post graduate faculty careers. Respondents who saw the framework as a limited, social psychological one capable of treating only microscopic change did not display a similar marked degree of interconnectedness. These findings, therefore, are not to be explained by recourse to the simple fact that persons in interaction with each other over long time periods and in numerous situations are apt to structure their thought along similar lines. As we stated in the article "In terms of the internal consensus, the positions are comparable. We cannot, therefore, attribute the observed relationships to mutual influence."19 We suggested as an alternative explanation the proposition that certain associational patterns are conducive to the development of certain types of reasoning.

The generalist (Category A) position stands in marked contrast to present day "mainstream" sociology, and the argument was offered that a network of highly supportive and protective alliances affords the opportunity to develop and argue an unconventional perspective. Therefore, in summarizing the data, we concluded that, as those interactionists who are loosely integrated tend to pursue an essentially conservative exegetical route in their theorizing and as respondents tightly knit together are unorthodox in their

19Ibid., p. 213.
views, "a cohesive, multi-bonded network of relationships is a necessary condition for the development of a social theory that challenges the theoretical status quo."\(^{20}\)

While the findings described above appear to have great potential significance, the study, reporting serendipitous results as it did, had basic shortcomings. The relatively small number of respondents forced a highly cautious interpretation of the findings and made generalization a risky business. Furthermore, it was exceedingly difficult to infer much about a respondent's total theoretical perspective when we only had access to his views on a single basic area of sociological concern, social change. Lastly, as our primary source of data on subject's post doctoral faculty appointments was a 1959 publication, all data on even this limited number of interactionists were not complete.

In order to remedy the above deficiencies, the study to be reported here (1) has gathered "up-to-date" data on the organizational affiliations of a large number of symbolic interactionists, and (2) has elicited their views not only on social change but also on such key areas of sociological concern as social control, self, and methodology.

The present investigation, then, is undertaken for a number of reasons (1) because of the significance of the

\(^{20}\)Ibid., p. 213.
implication that sociological knowledge may be limited or enhanced by the kinds of social situation in which it has originated, (2) because of the present writer's long term interest in symbolic interaction theory, and (3) because of the scarcity of empirical work in the sociology of sociology.

The following chapter describes the scope and method of the study.
CHAPTER II

SCOPE AND METHOD OF THE STUDY

In this chapter the design of the study is described. Descriptions of the sample, the questionnaire employed in collecting the data, and the techniques utilized in analyzing responses are presented.

The Sample of Interactionists

Statistically speaking, the present sample is not a representative one, for there is no known universe of symbolic interactionists. Instead, a list of potential respondents was compiled from the following sources and in the following manner:

1. The names of interactionists originally contacted by Vaughan and Reynolds, in what turned out to be the 'pilot' study for the present inquiry, were included.

2. Five prominent symbolic interactionists each provided a list of sociologists they considered to be closely associated with the symbolic interaction perspective.

3. Authors of basic texts and major manuscripts in the symbolic interaction tradition were added to the list.

4. Authors of theoretical chapters in the major symposium on interactionism were selected for inclusion.
5. Authors of several of the articles in the only book of readings on this perspective were likewise included. From this composite listing, and in consultation with three symbolic interactionists, a final list of 124 potential respondents was constructed. These 124 persons were considered by those consulted to be sociologists closely identified, both by other sociologists and probably in their own minds, with the symbolic interaction perspective. A questionnaire, to be described below, mailed to these 124 sociologists elicited 84 replies for a 67.74 per cent return. These 84 interactionists constitute the sample upon which the present investigation is based.

Character of the Data

This study has utilized two types of data, although both types were collected through the use of a single questionnaire. The first set of data are composed of respondents reactions to a number of alternative ways of defining key sociological concepts or areas of concern. The second set of data consists of information on subjects' (1) source and date of Ph.D., (2) staff-student relationships during doctoral programs, and (3) faculty or staff affiliations, including institutions affiliated with and dates so affiliated.

1Samples of the cover letter and letter of introduction which accompanied the basic questionnaire are presented in Appendixes II and III.
The Questionnaire: Part I.--The first section of the questionnaire on interactionism consists of a series of statements which in fact constitute divergent definitions of several areas of central concern to either sociologists in general or symbolic interactionists in particular. Respondents were presented at least four, and in one case six, ways of defining what a given area or concept "was all about." Subjects were afforded an opportunity to select, from among the alternative definitions offered, the definition which most closely approximated their own conception of (1) self, (2) social control, (3) methodology, and (4) social change. If none of the definitions or conceptions offered for a concept corresponded to the respondent's own definition, he was afforded the opportunity, and was indeed encouraged, to write in his own views in a blank space provided after each set of definitions. The alternative definitions for each concept, save social change, were selected in the following manner:

1. A rather extensive survey of the symbolic interaction literature was undertaken for the purpose of gathering, should such be found to exist, a large number of definitions used in the study of society. The questionnaire employed in this study also elicited respondents reactions to varying conceptions of the nature of social organization, socialization, and culture. These responses will be analyzed in a later work designed to provide a more detailed analysis of the varieties of symbolic interaction theory. The alternative definitions of social organization, socialization, and culture which were presented to subjects are contained in Appendix I.
alternative ways of defining each of the concepts to be
dealt with.

2. From this larger list a smaller number of definitions, each set representing the widest possible range of response found in the literature, was selected for each concept.

Alternative conceptions of social change were gathered in a different fashion. As a number of interactionists views on social change, from the 'pilot' study, were already in hand, a number of representative statements were simply selected from among them. As was the case with the definitions selected on self, social control, and methodology, these definitions of social change embrace a wide range of response. The concepts and accompanying definitions presented to respondents are as follows:

**Self**

1. . . . Think of self as: (1) a set of more or less consistent and stable responses on a conceptual level, which (2) exercise a regulatory function over other responses of the same organism at lower levels.

2. The magnitude of the self . . . is measured by the society it incorporates; the magnitude of the society . . . is measured by the self that it unites. 'The society' is the name for the 'unity,' but 'the selves' are that in which the unity is seen as multiple. There are as many societies as there are selves, and as many selves as there are societies. It is idle to ask which is prior or preponderant, or which influences the other and how, as to ask the same questions of the life and the living, the breathing and the breath.
3. ... we may practically say that he (the individual) has as many different social selves as there are distinct groups of persons about whose opinion he cares. He generally shows a different side of himself to each of these different groups.

4. As a body of orientation, the theory is well over a half century old, but only within the last four or five years have research methods appropriate to it been employed. ... But now that the major difficulty—lack of agreement about the class of phenomena to be investigated—has been resolved by the growing consensus that 'the self' is a set of attitudes, we are able to bring to bear on our investigations of the self the techniques for studying attitudes in general. ...

5. The people who communicate with any one person are not in communication with each other, and so they cannot come to any common understanding regarding him and his behavior. Therefore the reflection of himself which each individual gets from his communications is different for each group of which he is a member. He has as many selves as there are groups to which he belongs. ...

6. The self as that which can be an object to itself, is essentially a social structure, and it arises in social experience. After a self has arisen, it in a certain sense provides for itself its social experiences, and so we can conceive of an absolutely solitary self.

Social Control:

1. Self-control refers to behavior that is redirected in the light of the manner in which it is imagined to appear from the standpoint of other people who are involved in a cooperative task. Once a person defines a situation and locates himself within it in terms of a conventional role, he becomes cognizant of expected patterns of behavior both for himself and for the other participants. ... Social control rests largely on self-control.

2. A central interest for sociologists in the study of human relations is to examine the ways in which people, as members of a society, influence one another. The collectivity of these ways is called 'social control.' ... Mutual expectation is the way in which people control each other's behavior in their day-to-day relationships.
3. **Social control is the expression of the 'me' over against the expression of the 'I.'** It sets the limits, it gives the determination that enables the 'I', so to speak, to use the 'me' as the means of carrying out what is the undertaking that all are interested in.

4. **Social control (refers to) any means, or the sum total of means, by which a group influences or directs its individual members.**

**Methodology:**

1. ... in spite of all the word play of recent centuries, the physical and the existential remain different orders methodologically. If sociology studies existential experience, no form of empirical operationalism whatsoever can directly define and handle this subject matter.

2. If an operational definition cannot be established, this should cause the scientist to question seriously the utility of such terms for his research, and should lead to the conclusion that perhaps many of the commonly accepted concepts are not usable in scientific endeavors.

3. The most complete form of the sociological datum, after all, is the form in which the participant observer gathers it: an observation of some social event, the events which precede and follow it, and explanations of its meaning by participants and spectators, before, during, and after its occurrence. Such a datum gives us more information about the event under study than data gathered by any other sociological method. Participant observation can thus provide us with a yardstick against which to measure the completeness of data gathered in other ways. ...

4. While the symbolic interactionist frame of reference unavoidably entails complicated methodological procedures, it does not imply a return to introspection and speculation as the methods of sociology. Rather it implies that in sociology empiricism must be combined with types of interpretive operations not required in the physical and biological sciences.
Social Change:

1. . . . symbolic interactionism fills a void left by most other efforts to explain social change. Specifically it provides a framework for analyzing the collective behavior that intervenes between the first signs of breakdown of old norms, values, and institutions and the establishment of new ones. Thus it deals with the process of social change from unrest to institutionalization.

2. I have not found SI theory helpful in looking at the process of social change. Most of its concepts were developed in the context of short episodes of interaction at best, or with respect to phases of socialization. Processes of social change require wider contexts and longer term time spans.

3. The position of symbolic interaction . . . views human group life not as having a preestablished organization in fixed forms but as being continuously involved in a process of formation. . . . symbolic interaction presupposes that society is involved in the continuous process of meeting situations; the emphasis is on process rather than on expression of established organization and structure. This view of human group life as involved in a process of meeting situations signifies that change is indigenous to it. It also implies that instead of regarding social change as something which is unusual in the sense of being a departure from established ways of living, social change is seen as a natural occurrence in the life of people. . . . Let me conclude by declaring that quite contrary to any charge that symbolic interaction is unsuited for dealing with social change it provides, in my judgment, the proper framework for handling social change.

4. I feel that symbolic interactionist theory can handle change rather well from a social psychological view but only in limited fashion from a sociological standpoint. . . . It emphasizes change in the individual actors and stresses face-to-face, small group situations. As a social psychology theory, the view of change is adequate. . . . It is less adequate, however, as a sociological view of change, particularly
because of its weakness on the macro sociology level. Its eschewing of structural and cultural variables, or levels, and its denial of analytic significance to anything outside the person-person interaction surely limits the relevance of SI theory.

Presenting respondents with these alternative ways of "handling" each of these four areas of sociological inquiry constitutes this study's attempt to ascertain interactionists' views on substantive and conceptual issues.

The Questionnaire: Part II.—The second and last section of the questionnaire was concerned with eliciting information on interactionists' past and present academic affiliations. Respondents were asked (1) to list both the institution from which they received their highest degree and the year in which the degree was granted, and (2) to list the institutions with which they had been affiliated as staff members and the dates when they were so employed.

Mode of Analysis

This section reports briefly on the character of the techniques used to ascertain, describe, and illustrate the nature and extent of the relationships between respondents'

---

3 In addition to eliciting information pertaining to the formal, institutional ties among respondents, information on subjects' interpersonal relationships was also obtained. This information, coupled with that gathered on social organization, socialization, and culture, will provide the basic data for a future monograph on symbolic interactionism contemplated by the present author. The questions utilized to elicit this information on interpersonal relationships are presented in Appendix I.
patterns of institutional affiliations and their views on selected substantive and conceptual issues.

The sociometric diagrams.—Sociometric diagrams were constructed to illustrate the nature and type of institutional affiliations which respondents holding similar views on definitions of specific concepts share in common. It is obviously not an easy matter to merely describe in advance what such sociometric diagrams look like, illustrations are necessary. Therefore, one set of such diagrams, drawn from the Vaughan-Reynolds study, are presented in Figures 1 and 2.

Sets of sociograms similar to Figures 1 and 2 are presented for each of the four substantive issues dealt with in Chapter III. A simple glance at these sociograms reveals that those respondents giving a general and unqualified endorsement (Figures 1a, 1b, 1c) of symbolic interactionism's ability to deal with social change manifest a greater degree of interconnectedness than do subjects offering a qualified endorsement (Figures 2a, 2b, 2c) of the perspective's capabilities. However, it is easy to quickly assess the differential degree of connectedness only because the number of subjects in each set of sociograms is nearly identical. Many of the sociograms presented in the following chapter do not contain equal or even roughly approximate n's; therefore, additional measures are needed to supplement such sociograms.
Figure 2. Respondents Qualifying the Utility of Symbolic Interaction Theory to Deal with Social Change.

Figure 2a. Source of Ph.D. Degrees

Figure 2b. Staff-Student Relationships

Figure 2c. Conjoint Faculty Appointments

Measure of connectedness.—The measure of connectedness to be employed simply indicates what percentage of the total number of possible connections has actually been realized in a given sociogram. This particular measure is applicable solely to sociograms which permit only one connecting link between any two persons, therefore, it is utilized to analyze sociograms dealing with source of Ph.D. and staff-student relationships. Sociograms dealing with conjoint faculty appointments on the other hand permit multiple links between any two persons. These latter sociograms are therefore descriptively rather than statistically analyzed. With respect to the sociograms on source of Ph.D. and staff-student relationships a number of difficulties are also present. Maximum possible connectivity does not refer to the total number of connections which can actually be made among respondents in the present sample. For in order to accomplish this in sociograms dealing with source of Ph.D. all respondents would have to have received their Ph.D.'s from a single institution. In most sociograms there are more subjects than there are respondents receiving their degrees from any one institution. To realize maximum

\[ C_{Ma} = \frac{n(n-1)}{2} \]

The following formula has been used in computing the number of possible connections: where \( C_{Ma} \) = the degree of maximum possible connectivity, and \( n \) = the number of persons in the sociogram. For a detailed discussion of measures of connectedness see W. L. Garrison, "Connectivity of the Interstate Highway System," Papers and Proceedings of the Regional Science Association, VI (1960), pp. 121-137.
connectivity in terms of staff-student relationships each respondent would have to have been every other respondent's teacher. As many respondents received their degrees within the same four or five year period, it is obviously not possible to achieve maximum connectivity. Nevertheless, a comparison of the extent to which groups holding divergent viewpoints on key issues approach this empirically unattainable maximum should prove useful for descriptive purposes.

**Summary**

In this chapter the sample, the data, and the methods of the study have been described. To recapitulate, the sample was composed of 84 sociologists whose contributions to the literature on symbolic interactionism establish them as leading spokesmen for this perspective.

The data analyzed in this study have been of two types:

1. Responses to a questionnaire designed to record sociologists' views on the following areas of sociological concern: (1) self, (2) social control, (3) methodology, and (4) social change.

2. Responses to a series of questions designed to elicit information on the following items: (1) source of respondent's Ph.D., (2) staff-student relationships during respondent's doctoral program, and (3) respondent's faculty appointments.
Mention has been made of the fact that the relationships between views on the four key issues and patterns of institutional affiliations are examined through the use of a series of sociograms, supplemented where possible by additional measures of interconnectedness.

The chapter which follows will present the data on the relationship between particular patterns of institutional affiliation and specific kinds of theoretical orientations.
CHAPTER III

PATTERNS OF INSTITUTIONAL AFFILIATION AND
THE NATURE OF THEORETICAL ARGUMENT

The purpose of this chapter is to convey the study's basic findings. These "findings" are composed of the relationships found between respondents' patterns of institutional affiliation or association and the nature and type of the theoretical arguments (orientations) which they espouse. Specifically, the present chapter describes those patterns of organizational affiliation associated with divergent conceptions of the basic nature of (1) self, (2) social control, (3) methodology, and (4) social change. In addition a composite or total stance on all four issues is tallied for each subject. The various patterns of institutional association which characterize respondents having the same total scores are then examined.

Responses to the Interactionism Questionnaire

Responses to Part I, substantive issues.—As previously mentioned, each respondent was presented with four alternative definitions or views of social control, methodology, and social change and six differing conceptions of self. In addition, if none of the definitions offered approximated the
respondent's own views, he was encouraged to write in his personal definition. A content analysis was done on these personal definitions in order to ascertain whether they were truly different ways of viewing a given concept or whether they were merely ways of rephrasing the definitions originally offered. In the latter case, such responses were recorded as indicating a preference for an offered definition which they simply reworded. The number of write-in definitions tended to be fairly small. However, as both the total number of such replies and the percentage resisting assignment to the previously established categories varied for each of the four substantive areas, so too does the total number of subjects analyzed vary with each of the four issues. Those offering definitions which are not readily classifiable into the already existent categories do not tend to offer similar definitions among themselves. Their replies tend to be highly idiosyncratic. In any event, in no case is the number of "write-in" replies large enough to permit a sociometric analysis of such respondents as a separate group.

The total number of subjects utilized in analyzing responses to the section on self is 75. The areas of social control and methodology contain 80 and 81 subjects, respectively. The sociograms relating to social change contain the
largest number of respondents, 88.\(^1\) The sociograms analyzing patterns of institutional affiliation as they relate to subjects total scores on all four areas contain a total of 74 subjects.\(^2\)

While there are four alternative definitions offered for three of the four substantive areas and six definitions for the remaining one, actually a smaller number of basic stances embrace each set of definitions, each individual definition being merely a specific case of a more general type of response. For example, while four different conceptions of social control are offered, two of these definitions in fact equate social control with self-control while the other two make social control synonymous with control by others.

An additional characteristic of these two or three basic response patterns is that, under each of the four

\(^1\)The larger number of subjects analyzed under the topic of social change was made possible by the fact that a number of interactionists who were either dead, ill, or otherwise not disposed to respond at the time of the present investigation had already stated their views on social change in the pilot study reported in Chapter II. Furthermore, as the pilot study subjects' responses on social change were already recorded and analyzed, their responses to the present questionnaire's section on social change were not recorded.

\(^2\)In the case of subjects who had only provided usable responses to three of the four areas, their average score for the three items was computed and added on to their total score in order to provide a "four item" score.
areas, one of the patterns tends to be in step with conventional or "mainstream" American sociology while one, and in some cases two, of the patterns tend to be more unorthodox. Rather than analyzing each specific definition in isolation, this study describes and examines the differing patterns of institutional affiliations found to be associated with conventional and unconventional modes of response.

Responses to Part II, institutional affiliations.—A brief examination of responses to the second section of the questionnaire reveals that the 88 subjects received their degrees from a total of twenty-eight institutions. Of these 28 schools, one institution alone conferred 35 degrees, while another granted 14 Ph.D.s. Four other universities conferred 6, 5, 4, and 2 doctorates, respectively. The remaining twenty-two institutions each accounted for one degree. The time periods during which respondents' degree were conferred is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Number of Degrees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1925-29</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930-34</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935-39</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940-44</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945-49</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-54</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955-59</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-64</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965-67</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 88 respondents held a total of 267 staff appointments at 141 different institutions, for an average of 3.03
appointments per subject.\(^3\) The largest number of regular appointments at different universities held by any one respondent was eight. The shortest period of stay at a given institution was for less than one year, while the longest continuous appointment at a single university has lasted over 38 years. The average length of stay was 5.3 years. The largest number of respondents affiliated with any one institution over time was fifteen. The largest number of subjects at a single university at the same time was seven. Presentation of the findings on the relationship between the patterning of these institutional affiliations and the nature of the theoretical arguments constitutes the remainder of this chapter.

The structure of self and patterns of affiliation.—As previously mentioned, respondents were presented with six alternative ways of conceptualizing self. These alternatives, spelled out in detail in the preceding chapter, range from a "multiple self" conceptualization which contends that the person has as many selves as there are groups to which he belongs (alternative 5) to a definition depicting an absolutely solitary self conceived of as a social structure (alternative 6). Two of the four remaining definitions

\(^3\)As respondents were guaranteed anonymity, subjects are identified by number only. Furthermore, as an additional means of guarding subjects' identities, institutions with which respondents were affiliated were identified by letter rather than by name.
(alternatives 2 and 3) approach alternative 5 in that they conceive of self as being multiple in nature. Alternatives 1 and 4 are similar to alternative 6 as they also conceive of self as being unitary rather than multiple in character. In light of the context of contemporary American sociology one can safely say that alternatives 1, 4, and 6 constitute the more unorthodox way of visualizing self. Alternatives 2, 3, and 5, by viewing self as multiple in nature, imply an image of man as object, that which rather than acting merely reacts. Such an image of man, which Wrong characterizes as "Over Socialized," has been the stock in trade of the functionalists from Durkheim to Parsons. As structural functionalism is the dominant or orthodox orientation in American sociology, and as alternatives 2, 3, and 5 offer an image of man not dissimilar to that held by the functionalists, then the conception of self as being multiple in nature in the more conventional of the two basic responses. Figures 3, 4, and 5 illustrate the nature and extent of institutionalized relationships found among respondents stating a preference for the unitary nature of self.

Among the fifty subjects who preferred a unitary, and hence unconventional, conception of self, a fairly extensive network of relationships is observed. As shown in Figure 3, twenty of the fifty received the Ph.D. degree from just one

---

Fig. 3.—Source of Ph.D. Degrees Among Respondents
Supporting a Unitary Conception of Self.
university (Institution A), while one other university (Institution B) conferred the degree on ten of these fifty respondents. Four subjects received degrees from Institution D, three from Institution C, and three from Institution E. Only 10 of the 50 respondents are not connected with another subject receiving the Ph.D. from the same institution.

Ten of the twenty subjects holding degrees from Institution A received them during the period 1948-51; actually seven of these ten interactionists were members of the tight knit 1948-52 coterie noted by Vaughan and Reynolds. Only two of the twenty received degrees after 1954. Twelve of these twenty interactionists, at various times, served on the Institution A faculty and five of them, as shall be noted later, served conjointly. Three of the four interactionists taking degrees at Institution D received them in the 1964-65 period, while two of the three Institution E graduates received degrees in 1955. All ten Ph.D.'s conferred by Institution B were granted within an eleven year time period. Eight of these ten were concentrated in the 1953-55 and 1961-64 time periods. If all fifty respondents who visualized the self as being unitary in character had received their Ph.D.'s from the same institution, the total number of links connecting them would have been 1225. The actual number of connections made, 247 constitutes 20.16 per cent of the 1225 required for maximum connectivity.
Not only did many of the respondents study at the same institutions at approximately the same time, the programs in which many of them participated also involved as faculty members other respondents favoring a unitary conception of self. Figure 4 shows both the nature and extensiveness of these staff-student relationships.

As Figure 4 indicates, these staff-student relationships are quite extensive. Only nine of the fifty respondents were unconnected. The staff-student relationships depicted transpired within a total of ten universities. The largest concentration of staff-student relations was at Institution A. Of the twenty Institution A graduates, thirteen were students during a period in which two other respondents (44 and 45) served on the sociology faculty there. In addition, ten respondents were students while one other Institution A graduate (23) served on the faculty, and still another graduate (28) held faculty status there while eight respondents were students. Respondents 64, 29, 60, 6, and 48 were on the Institution A faculty while at least one, and in some cases as many as five, of the present respondents were students there. Institution B has the second largest concentration of respondents involved in staff-student relationships, seven persons being involved. Four respondents (23, 71, 34 and 54), three of them Institution B graduates, held faculty appointments there. Respondent 34 was a faculty member while respondents 40, 50 and 59 were students.
Fig. 4.—Staff-student Relationships Among Respondents Supporting a Unitary Conception of Self.
Respondent 23 served on the faculty while respondents 25 and 34 were completing their Ph.D.'s, and respondent 25 was a doctoral student at the same time that respondent 54 was on the sociology faculty. Five interactionists were involved in the patterning of student-staff relations at Institution D. Two interactionists (27, 71) held faculty positions at the same time that respondents 8, 24, and 82 pursued their graduate studies. Four interactionists were involved in staff-student relations at Institution F. Three respondents (7, 10, 29) were faculty members while respondent 62 worked toward his Ph.D. Respondent 55 studied under respondents 67 and 80 at Institution J. The remaining four institutions depicted in Figure 2 each had but a single faculty member and single student linked to each other. Seventy-nine connections are observed in Figure 4. This figure represents 6.45 per cent of the total number of connections which would have been observed had each interactionist in this group of fifty been linked to every other respondent.

There is, among these fifty interactionists who share a similar view of self, a fairly extensive network of academic connections when both the sources of their Ph.D.'s and the nature of their staff-student relations are considered. In addition to the fairly high degree of connectivity observed with respect to the graduate training of these respondents, their postgraduate patterns of academic relationships are also fairly extensive.
Fig. 5.—Conjoint Faculty Appointments Among Respondents Supporting a Unitary Conception of Self.
Figure 5 shows that forty-one of these fifty respondents have served on faculties with at least one other respondent who is similarly oriented. As forty-one interactionists are involved in this pattern the minimum number of faculty links between them would be twenty-one. The fact that the actual number of such connections is fifty-eight indicates the multi-bonded nature of these post-doctoral ties. Thirty of the forty-one had, at one time or another, faculty appointments with at least two other subjects of like persuasion. More important, however, is the fact that twenty-nine of these thirty interactionists held simultaneous appointments with at least two others holding similar conceptions of self.

In fact, although these joint appointments involved nineteen universities, the multi-bonded relationships were concentrated on the staffs of just nine institutions. While the patterns observed at the remaining ten institutions in three cases involve more than two interactionists in a single sociology department, in no case did more than two respondents hold simultaneous appointments. Seven of the nine institutions involved in the pattern of multi-bonded relationships each had three interactionists conjointly serving on their sociology faculties. Respondents 28, 47, and 71, who were later joined by respondent 83, served together at Institution R, respondents 46, 67, and 80 at Institution 3, subjects 4, 13, and 22 at Institution N, respondents 29, 49
and 62 at Institution L, respondents 8, 12, and 73 at Institution M, and interactionists 1, 3, and 46 conjointly served at Institution G. Institution D likewise contained on its sociology faculty a triadic relationship involving respondents 24, 27, 71. It should be noted that respondents 46 and 71 were each parties to triadic relationships at more than one university. The heaviest concentration of interactionists is observed on the staffs of Institutions Q and A. Four respondents (33, 56, 60, 64) were in the simultaneous employ of Institution Q. A total of nine interactionists served on the Institution A sociology faculty although all nine did not serve conjointly. Respondents 10, 29, and 64 served together as did respondents 28, 44, and 45. The smallest concentration occurred when only respondents 29 and 60 where on the faculty, and the largest concentration occurred when respondents 29, 44, 45, 48, and 60 conjointly served. It is interesting to note that two respondents (60 and 64) were involved in the extensive networks established at both Institutions Q and A. The total number of connections observed among these fifty interactionists with respect to their faculty appointments is fifty-eight. This figure represents 4.73 per cent of the total number of connections which would have emerged had every respondent been connected to each of the other forty-nine. It is worth noting that of the nine interactionists who had not served on faculties with other like-minded respondents, five were
graduates of the same university, Institution B.

By way of summary, the relationships found among interactionists favoring a definition of self as being unitary in character appear to be fairly extensive. We turn now to an examination of those relationships found to be associated with a conception of self as a multiple entity.

Figures 6, 7, and 8 present the sociometric data on the patterns of institutional affiliation for the "multiple self" respondents. In each of the three relationship patterns included in this study the "multiple self" group showed a substantially lower degree of interconnectedness than the "unitary self" group.

As shown in Figure 6, the sources of their degrees appear to be more widespread in light of the number involved. While the "multiple self" group of 25 subjects received their degrees from a total of 15 institutions, fifteen universities likewise embrace all the degrees conferred on members of the "single self" group which contains twice as many respondents. As was the case with the "single self" group, the institution granting the largest number of degrees was Institution A. However, these degrees were conferred over a more extended time period than those received by the "single self" respondents. Of the nine receiving degrees from Institution A only three were in the 1948-51 cohort which claimed the majority of the "single self" graduates of Institution A. Three of these respondents received their degrees prior to 1944, and the remaining three received their degrees in 1954, 1959, and
Fig. 6.—Source of Ph.D. Degrees Among Respondents

Conceiving of Self as Being Multiple in Nature.
1961. Two respondents received degrees from Institution B and two from Institution C. In the latter case the two respondents were not students at the same time. The remaining twelve respondents each received their degrees from a different university. There were a total of thirty-eight links between this category of respondents. Had all respondents received their degrees from the same institution, 300 connections would have been made. In this case only 12.67 per cent of the total possible connections were realized as compared with the 20.16 per cent figure recorded by the "unitary self" group. The contrast between Figures 3 and 6 demonstrates the difference between the two groups with respect to the concentration of degree sources and similarity of graduate experience.

As shown in Figure 7, staff-student relationships even more vividly differentiate the unitary and multiple self groups.

Among the subjects in the "multiple self" group only five had been students at the same time that another respondent was a staff member at the same institution. Respondents 2, 14, and 30 shared as their mentor at Institution A respondent 38. Respondent 79 was the teacher of respondent 69 at Institution D, and respondent 42 studied with respondent 81 at Institution F. Seventeen of these twenty-five, as contrasted with nine of fifty in the "unity self" category, were not linked to any other interactionist in their group.
Fig. 7.—Staff-student Relationships Among Respondents
Conceiving of Self as Being Multiple in Nature.
with respect to staff-student relations. The pattern of staff-student relationships presented in Figure 7 sharply contrasts with that presented in Figure 4. Only five connections are made between faculty and students in Figure 7. Of the total number of connections possible if all respondents were to be linked with all other only 1.67 per cent were made as compared with the 6.45 per cent figure realized by the "unitary self" category.

The extent of the conjoint faculty appointments of these interactionists was also less than the unity self category. Figure 8 indicates that these twenty-five respondents had seven faculty relationships contrasted with fifty-eight for the fifty "unitary self" respondents. Furthermore, these seven conjoint appointments were located in seven different institutions. In other words, all faculty relationships for the "multiple self" group were dyadic. In addition, nearly all seven of the relationships observed were of relatively short duration, whereas many of the "unity self" category respondents have been bound together for lengthy time periods. Respondents 77 and 20 served conjointly on the sociology faculty at Institution F, respondents 42 and 81 served at Institution E. Respondents 15 and 79 were on the faculty together at Institution D, and respondents 36 and 38 shared a similar relation at Institution X. Respondents 14 and 20 conjointly served at Institution M, respondents 14 and 30 were together at Institution W, and respondents 2 and
Fig. 8.—Conjoint Faculty Appointments Among Respondents Conceiving of Self as Being Multiple in Nature.
68 conjointly served in Institution S's sociology department. Thirteen of these twenty-five respondents had never served on the faculty at an institution where another member of the "multiple self" group simultaneously served. Only nine of the fifty "unitary self" respondents were isolated in a similar fashion. Had all twenty-five members conjointly served at a single institution, 300 links would have been forged between them. However, only 2.33 per cent of this total, compared with 4.73 per cent for the "unitary self" group, was realized.

In summary, the graduate experiences of the "multiple self" category respondents was not as homogeneous or interconnected as that of the "unitary self" interactionists. With respect to faculty appointments, the "unitary self" group is also more homogeneous than the "multiple self" category. All conjoint faculty appointments among the "multiple self" respondents were dyadic, whereas the "unitary self" interactionists frequently concentrated in groups of three or more.

Patterns of relationship and patterns of thought: The nature of social control.—While four definitions of social control were presented to respondents, in fact two of the definitions are quite similar in that they make social control synonymous with control by others. On the other hand, the remaining two definitions are also similar in that they both equate social control with self control. Those defini-
tions equating social control with control by others are clearly more in line with sociology's current theoretical status quo than are those definitions which conceive of social control as resting on self control. Lenski, for example, argues that "... conservatives have generally maintained that evil has its origin in the egoistic drive of the individual and that the function of society is to restrain and redirect these harmful tendencies. ..." Hence, for the conservatives social control means control by others, control over man's basically "evil," nature in order to serve the common good. As man is conceived of as being basically bad, he is not seen by the conservatives as capable of controlling and directing his behavior in a manner which benefits the social collectivity. Lenski further argues that those sociologists opposed to mainstream sociology view man as basically good, and hence, from the viewpoint of the radical or conflict theorists the control of man's behavior for the attainment of collective goals not only can but should rest on self control.

Figures 9, 10, and 11 illustrate the patterns of relationships found among interactionists who equated social control with self-control.

The network of relationships observed among respondents equating social control with self-control is more extensive

---

than that seen among subjects who made social control synonymous with control by others. However, the differences noted between those favoring conservative conceptions of social control and those preferring an unorthodox stance are not as marked as were the differences recorded between those offering conventional and those offering unorthodox definitions of self. Nevertheless, on all three points of comparison, source of Ph.D., staff-student relationships, and conjoint faculty appointments, the relationships among those holding to an unconventional view of social control were more heavily intertwined.

As shown in Figure 9, twenty-three of the thirty-five respondents in the "social as self control" category received the Ph.D. from just two universities (Institutions A and B). A total of twelve institutions conferred degrees on these thirty-five subjects, and only seven respondents did not receive degrees from institutions granting the Ph.D. to other interactionists in this group. In other words, twenty-eight of these thirty-five respondents received degrees from a total of just five universities. Of the eight Institution B graduates, three received the degree in the 1953-55 period, while four were granted their Ph.D.'s in the years from 1964 to 1966. All but one of the respondents from Institution B were students at the same time at least two other members of the "social as self-control" group were working on the doctorate. Furthermore, the one student not in residence at the
Fig. 9.—Source of Ph.D. Degrees Among Respondents
Equating Social Control with Self-Control.
same time other interactionists were later served on the Institution B faculty when three of the 1964-65 graduates were students.

Six of the thirteen Institution A graduates received the Ph.D. in the 1948-51 time period, three received degrees between 1925 and 1933, and three subjects completed their Ph.D.'s in the 1958-59 period. Two of the three Institution C respondents received their degree in the same year, 1943. The two Institution D interactionists were also students together. The ties, with respect to source of Ph.D., recorded among these interactions were quite extensive. Nearly nineteen per cent (18.66) of the 595 possible connections which could have been realized, had all respondents received the Ph.D. from but one institution, were actually observed.

Not only did many of the "social as self control" respondents study at the same universities during the same time periods, the doctorate programs in which they participated frequently included at least one, and for some as many as three, "social as self-control" subjects on the faculty at the same time. As shown in Figure 10, eleven of the thirteen Institution A graduates were students during the time when one other of the thirteen (respondent 66) served on the faculty. In addition, four other Institution A graduates (respondents 28, 45, 48, 60) likewise served on the faculty there at times when at least two, and in one case six, other "social as self-control" respondents were students.
Fig. 10—Staff-student Relationships Among Respondents
Equating Social Control with Self-Control.
The two interactionists (respondents 8 and 69) receiving degrees from Institution D studied there at a time when respondents 27, 71, and 79 were faculty members in the sociology department. Respondents 61 and 79 were students at Institution C when respondent 1, also an Institution C graduate, was on the sociology faculty. Respondents 17, 40, and 58 worked toward the Ph.D. at Institution B at the same time that another Institution 3 graduate, respondent 34, was on the faculty. Respondent 71, an Institution B graduate himself, also served on the faculty at the time respondent 68 was completing his degree requirements. Respondent 70 studied at Institution P while respondents 45 and 66, both graduates and former faculty members of Institution A, served on the Institution P faculty. Lastly, respondent 1 was on the faculty when respondent 12 studied at Institution E. The actual number of staff-student links observed, 36 constitutes 6.05 per cent of the 595 required for maximum connectivity. However, only ten of the thirty-five subjects were not linked to at least one other like-minded interactionist.

A similar degree of connectivity is observed when the pattern of conjoint faculty appointments of the "social as self-control" group are compared with their patterns of staff-student relationships. As shown in Figure 11, thirty-six conjoint faculty appointments are observed among these thirty-five symbolic interactionists. This is the same total
Fig.11.—Conjoint Faculty Appointments Among Respondents Equating Social Control with Self-control.
number of connecting links seen in Figure 10. Many of these appointments involve three or more interactionists simultaneously serving on the faculty of a single sociology department. Furthermore, many of these relationships tend to be of fairly long duration. In addition, these thirty-six conjoint appointments involve a total of only eight institutions. Since only twenty-three interactionists are involved in this pattern, the minimum number of faculty links between them would be thirteen. The fact that the actual number of such connections is thirty-six indicates the multi-bonded nature of these post-doctoral ties.

In fact, although these joint appointments involved eight institutions, the multi-bonded relationships were concentrated on seven institutional staffs. Four of the twenty-three (45, 58, 60, 66) conjointly served at Institution A. Four others (8, 12, 14, 73) served at Institution M at the same time. A number of these relationships were triadic in nature. Respondents 48, 52, and 68 held simultaneous appointments at Institution S. Respondents 28, 71, 83 were together at Institution R. When respondent 71 left Institution R to enter a triadic relationship with subjects 27 and 79 at Institution D, respondent 31 joined respondents 28 and 83 to re-form the triad at Institution R. Respondents 1, 45, and 66 conjointly served at Institution P, while a similar relationship at Institution Q was entered into by respondents 33, 56, and 60. The fact that several members of these triads
also entered into dyadic relations at different institutions with still other respondents in the "social as self-control" group indicates that faculty appointments among members of this group tend to cluster together. It is worth noting that nine of the twelve who had not served on faculties with other like-minded interactionists received their degrees from just two universities (Institutions A and B).

By way of summary, the relationships found among respondents who equated social control with self-control tend to be fairly extensive, particularly when compared with the patterns of relationships observed among those subjects who make social control synonymous with control by others. The following section of this paper examines the sociometric patterns characteristic of this latter group.

Figures 12, 13, and 14 present the sociometric data on the patterns of institutional affiliation for the "control as control by others" respondents. In each of the three relationship patterns included in this study, the "control as control by others" groups revealed a lower degree of interconnectedness than the "control as self-control" group.

Figure 12 indicates that these forty-five respondents received their degrees from a total of twenty universities whereas the "social as self-control" group received their Ph.D.'s from a total of just twelve institutions. Had all these respondents received their degrees from the same university, 990 connections would have been made. Only 151
Fig. 12.—Source of Ph.D. Degrees Among Respondents
Equating Social Control with Control by Others.
or 15.25 per cent of the total possible connections were made as compared with the 18.66 per cent realized by the "social as self-control" group. However, the difference between these two groups with respect to sources of the Ph.D. are not as widespread as those recorded between respondents offering conventional and those supporting unconventional concepts of self.

Twenty-one of the forty-five respondents received their degrees from just two institutions; however, twenty-three of the thirty-five "social as self-control" group likewise received degrees from only two institutions. With the exception of eight of the seventeen Institution A graduates who received degrees in the 1948-52 period, and in marked contrast with the "self-control" group, few respondents holding degrees from the same university were students together. The differences between these two groups become more apparent when patterns of staff-student and conjoint faculty relationships are examined.

As shown in Figure 13, twenty of these forty-five respondents compared with ten of thirty-five for the "self-control" group, were not connected to any other like-minded respondent in a teacher-pupil relationship. In marked contrast to the extensive, multi-bonded network of teacher-pupil relations recorded for the "social as self-control" group, nearly all relationships between members of the "social control by others" group were dyadic in nature. Only
Fig. 13.—Staff-Student Relationships Among Respon­
dents Equating Social Control with Control by Others.
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three of the respondents (23, 29, 44) were mentors for more than one student at the same institution. In this case, all three held faculty positions at Institution A. All other relationships simply involved one student being tied to one or more faculty members at any given institution. A total of eight institutions were involved in this pattern. Only 32 or 3.23 per cent of the maximum possible connections were made compared with the 6.05 per cent figure realized by the "self-control" group.

The conjoint faculty appointments held by these forty-five interactionists were not as extensive as those held by respondents in the "social as self-control" category. Figure 14 indicates that these respondents held conjoint appointments at a total of fourteen different institutions. Save for those relationships existing at Institutions A and F, all conjoint relationships observed involved only two interactionists. Furthermore, these relationships tended to be of relatively short duration. The total number of conjoint faculty appointment held by the "control as control by others" group was thirty-four. This figure represents 3.43 per cent of the figure required for maximum connectivity as compared with the 6.05 per cent figure realized by the "self-control" group.

In summary, with respect to all three patterns of institutional affiliation considered, the unconventional "social control as self-control" category was characterized...
Fig. 14.—Conjoint Faculty Appointments Among Respondents Equating Social Control with Control by Others.
by a fairly extensive degree of interconnectivity, an exten-
siveness of relationships not shared by respondents in the
"social control as control by others" group.

Social change and institutional affiliation.—As was
the case with respect to both the concepts self and social
control, those respondents taking an unconventional stance
with respect to the topic of social change tend to be involved
in more extensive patterns of intra-category relationships
than do respondents holding to a more conventional position.
While subjects were presented with four statements concern-
ing social change, two of the statements, numbers 1 and 3,
actually convey the same message. Statement 2, it will be
recalled, contends that symbolic interactionism is not help-
ful in looking at the process of social change. Only three
respondents selected this alternative, and as none of the
three received their degrees from the same institution, ever
shared staff-student relationships, nor ever served together
as faculty members this response category need not be of
further concern to us. The analysis to be presented here
then consists of comparing the patterns of institutional
affiliation found to be associated with two basic categories
of response:

Category A (statements 1 and 3): A relatively unquali-
fied endorsement of symbolic interactionisms' ability to deal with social change as a
generic phenomena; i.e., the interaction
orientation is seen as a general theory of human behavior within which all forms of social change can be accounted for.

Category B (statement 4): A qualified endorsement of symbolic interactionism's ability to deal with social change. The perspective is found wanting at the macro level but is seen as adequate for treating micro change, e.g., through socialization; i.e., the perspective is viewed as a social psychological theory largely concerned with the cultural transformation of individual behavior.

Thus, while eighty-five of eighty-eight interactionists subscribed to the notion that the framework is capable of handling social change, their difference, which are quite profound, lie in the extent of comprehensiveness assigned to the theory in this connection. Setting aside any value judgments which may be made with reference to these two positions, one position, the unqualified endorsement response is much more unorthodox in the context of contemporary American sociology. The figures and accompanying discussion presented below deal with the relationship between the extent of comprehensiveness assigned the theory and the patterns of interrelationships characteristic of those engaging in the differential assignment.
Fifty-four of the eighty-eight respondents gave an unqualified endorsement of symbolic interactionism's capability for handling social change. Among these respondents who offered an unqualified endorsement a multibonded network of relationships is observed. As shown in Figure 15, twenty-five of the fifty-four received the Ph.D. degree from just one university, Institution A. Furthermore, of the remaining twenty-nine "unqualified endorsers" twelve received the Ph.D. from yet another university, Institution B. In addition, a total of seven other respondents received degrees from three other institutions (C, D, and P). Only ten of the fifty-four "unqualified endorsement" subjects did not receive the Ph.D. from an institution conferring the degree on at least one other subject in this response category. Had all fifty-four interactionists received their degrees from but one university 1431 connecting links would have been forged. The actual number of contacts made, 371, constitutes 25.93 per cent of the 1431 required for maximum connectivity.

The staff-student relationships observed among the "unqualified endorsement" group likewise tend to be fairly extensive. As shown in Figure 16 a total of 104 staff-student relationships took place at eight different universities. Yet these relationships tend to be heavily concentrated at a single university, Institution A. Respondent 66 had twenty-two other respondents in this same response category as Ph.D. students during his long tenure on the sociology faculty.
Fig. 15.---Source of Ph.D. Degrees Among Respondents Supporting the General Proposition that Symbolic Interaction Theory Can Handle Social Change.
Fig. 16.—Staff-student Relationships Among Respondents Supporting the General Proposition that Symbolic Interaction Theory Can Handle Social Change.
Respondent 88 was on the sociology faculty during the period in which nineteen "unqualified endorsers" worked toward their doctorates. In addition, respondents 44 and 45 simultaneously served on the Institution A sociology faculty at a time when eleven other "unqualified endorsement" respondents were students there. Respondents 29, 48, and 60 each had four like-minded respondents as students during their faculty days at Institution A, and six unqualified endorsers were pupils when respondent 28 was an Institution A faculty member. Three respondents (32, 48, 49) were students when respondent 38 served on Institution A's faculty, and respondent 30 was still a student when respondent 64 joined the sociology department there as a faculty member.

Respondents 71, 76, and 79 were on the faculty at Institution D when respondents 69 and 75 were students there. Respondent 71 later joined the Institution B faculty at a time when respondent 68 was a student. Respondents 40, 50, 58, and 59 were Institution B students during the period in which respondent 34 served on the faculty. Respondent 66 served on the Institution P faculty while respondents 49, 53, and 70 were students. At the time respondent 70 was a student respondent 45 was also on the sociology faculty, and respondent 55 served as a faculty member while respondent 49 completed work on the Ph.D. Finally, respondent 70 later joined the Institution P faculty during the time period in which respondent 53 was a student. Relationships observed.
in the remaining four universities in which staff-student connections occurred tended to involve only one student and only one professor. With respect to the extent of interconnectedness of staff-student relations, 7.34 per cent of the figure required for maximum connectivity was realized.

In addition to the fairly high degree of connectivity in the graduate training of the "unqualified endorsement" respondents, their patterns of conjoint faculty appointments are also moderately extensive. Figure 17 shows that these respondents shared eighty-three conjoint appointments at twenty-one different institutions. However, the relationships observed at thirteen of these Institutions (WW, VV, U, RR, Z, T, X, S, E, F, UU, ZZ, and O) are simply dyadic, never involving more than two "unqualified endorsers" at any one time, even though some of these institutions (Z, S, E, and F) have had over time a number of these interactionists as faculty members. Therefore, the conjoint faculty relationships observed among the "unqualified endorsers" tend to be concentrated at just eight institutions (R, A, P, D, J, L, K, and Q). Respondents 46, 67, and 80 conjointly served at Institution J, and respondents 56, 60, 64, and 65 held simultaneous appointments at Institution Q. Respondents 29, 30, and 72 served conjointly at Institution K, and later respondent 49 joined respondents 29 and 62 at still another institution, Institution L. Four interactionists (28, 70, 76, and 83) served together at Institution R.
Fig. 17.—Conjoint Faculty Appointments Among Respondents Supporting the General Proposition that Symbolic Interaction Theory Can Handle Social Change.
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later joined the faculty of Institution D and served with yet another "unqualified endorser," respondent 79. Respondent 31 then came to Institution R and served conjointly with respondents 28 and 83. Respondents 37, 55, 66 and 70 conjointly served at Institution P.

The heaviest single concentration of conjoint faculty appointments saw respondents 38, 44, 45, 48, 60, 66, and 88 serving together at Institution A. In total, and at various times, eleven of the "unqualified endorsement" respondents served on the Institution A faculty with at least one other interactionist of similar persuasion. Of the total number of connections necessary for maximum connectivity eighty-three or 5.80 per cent were made. Only twelve of the fifty-four interactionists who gave a relatively unqualified endorsement of interactionism's capability for handling social change had not served with at least one other like-minded respondent. The patterns of relationships among those giving an unqualified endorsement tend to be more extensive than those among respondents who hedged their bets on symbolic interactionism's ability to treat social change. We turn now to an examination of those associational patterns characteristic of this latter group.

Had all the "qualified endorsement" respondents received the Ph.D. from but one institution, 465 links would have resulted. As shown in Figure 18 the actual number of connections observed, 65 constitutes 13.98 per cent of the
Fig. 18.—Source of Ph.D. Degrees Among Respondents Qualifying the Utility of Symbolic Interaction Theory to Deal with Social Change.
figure needed to establish maximum connectivity. The corresponding percentage realized by the "unqualified endorsement" group was 25.93. These thirty-one "qualified endorsers" received their degrees from a total of fifteen separate institutions. Ten institutions each graduated one respondent apiece, hence twenty-one respondents received degrees for just five universities. Respondents 1 and 20 received degrees from Institution C but were not students during the same time period. Respondents 17 and 25 received the Ph.D. from Institution B but were not students together. Respondents 7, 12, and 27 were granted the doctorate from Institution E, yet only respondents 7 and 27 pursued their degrees at approximately the same time. Respondents 4, 8, 24, and 82 took degrees at Institution D. Lastly, ten respondents received degrees from Institution A; however, only four of them were members of the tight-knit 1948-52 coterie previously referred to.

The patterning of staff-student relationships among "qualified endorsers" is also less extensive than that recorded among the "unqualified endorsers." The qualified endorsement group realized only 4.09 per cent of the contacts required for maximum connectivity whereas the unqualified endorsement respondents reached the 7.34 per cent level. As shown in Figure 19, the "qualified endorsers" forged nineteen staff-student links at seven different universities. As four of these seven institutions (G, TT, H, and Y) each
Fig. 19.—Staff-student Relationships Among Respondents Qualifying the Utility of Symbolic Interaction Theory to Deal with Social Change.
accounted for only one staff-student connection, a total of 15 staff-student links were established at three universities.

Respondents 8, 24, and 82 were students together at Institution D during the same time period when respondent 27 was on the sociology faculty there. Respondent 86 was on the social faculty at Institution E during the time period in which respondents 7, 12, and 27 were students. Respondent 85 joined the Institution E faculty as respondents 7 and 12 were completing the doctorates. Respondent 1 joined the Institution E faculty after respondent 7 received the Ph.D. but before respondent 12 completed his graduate work. Lastly, respondent 23 served on the Institution A faculty during the same time period in which respondents 2, 5, 6, 13, 22, and 85 pursued their graduate careers. It is interesting to note that respondents 1 and 23 each served on the faculties of three separate universities during time periods in which one other "qualified endorsers" were working towards their doctorates at these institutions.

As shown in Figure 20, the area of conjoint faculty appointments represents the point at which the "qualified" and "unqualified endorsers" most closely approximate each other in terms of extensiveness of connections.

The "qualified endorsers" realized 4.95 per cent of the number of connections required for maximum connectivity, whereas the corresponding figure realized by the "unqualified
Fig. 20.—Conjoint Faculty Appointments Among Respondents Qualifying the Utility of Symbolic Interaction Theory to Deal with Social Change.
endorsers," 5.80 per cent was not appreciably higher. However, in light of the fact that the twenty-three contacts established took place in twelve different university settings, these relationships among the "qualified endorsers" are not multibonded in nature. This pattern, therefore, stands in contrast to the multibonded contacts found among respondents in the unqualified endorsement category.

In only two of the twelve universities involved were there ever more than two "qualified endorsers" on the faculty at the same time. Respondents 8, 12, and 14 served together at Institution M. Respondents 4, 13, and 22 held conjoint faculty appointments at Institution N.

By way of summary, with respect to all three areas analyzed, the extensiveness of relationships was greater among those respondents who gave an unqualified endorsement of interactionism's capability of handling social change than it was among subjects whose endorsements of interactionism's capabilities were qualified. We turn now to an examination of those patterns of institutional affiliation found to be associated with varying stances taken by symbolic interactionists with respect to the question of methodology.

Patterns of relationships and methodological stance.— Respondents were presented with four statements each conveying in capsule form different conceptions of what a proper methodology for sociology should or should not be. These statements, spelled out in Chapter II, range from a blanket
condemnation of empiricism (Statement 1) to a whole-hearted endorsement of the necessity of the operational definition (Statement 2). In fact, however, three basic conceptions of proper methodology are contained in the four statements. Statement 3 explicitly, and statement 1 implicitly, propose participant observation as the methodological stance par excellence. Statement 2 champions the cause of empiricism and the operational definition. Lastly, Statement 4 favors a methodological approach which combines logical empiricism with other types of interpretive procedures and operations.

Statement 4, which favors combining empiricism with other methodological techniques, is certainly the most conventional of the three basic stances. It mirrors the methodological concerns of the theory-method people in sociology, a school of thought which some contend has now broken apart, yet which still appears to be the dominant view in contemporary American sociology. Beginning in the early 1940's empiricism rose to the fore as the favored methodological stance in sociology, and although its position does not appear to be as dominant as it once, pure empiricism still holds a fairly large number of adherents. While pure empiricism is not as conventional a methodological stance as the middle of the road methodological position embodied in Statement 4, it is clearly not the minority

---

position that the participant observer response (Statements 1 and 3) tends to be. The patterns of relationships found to be associated with these three methodological stances are presented below. The analysis begins with an examination of those institutional relationships characteristic of the "participant observers," the most unconventional of the response categories.

Among the thirteen subjects who preferred participant observation as a methodological technique an extensive network of relationships emerged. As shown in Figure 21, seven of these respondents received the Ph.D. from just one university, Institution A. Twenty-one of the seventy-eight connections required for maximum connectivity were made. These twenty-one links constitute 26.92 per cent of the figure which would have been recorded had all thirteen subjects received degrees from the same university.

As seen in Figure 22 the staff-student relationships of these interactionists also tend to be extensive. Seven of the thirteen (respondents 77, 67, 64, 70, 5, 63, and 60) had studied with respondent 66. Six of these seven relationships took place at Institution A, and all six respondents were students there at approximately the same time. Fifteen and thirty-eight hundredths per cent of the total number of connections required for maximum connectivity were recorded.
Fig. 21.—Source of Ph.D. Degrees Among Respondents Preferring Participant Observation as a Methodological Technique.
Fig. 22. Staff-student Relationships Among Respondents Preferring Participant Observation as a Methodological Technique.
Figure 23 reveals that the patterns of conjoint faculty appointments observed among the "participant observers" are also fairly extensive. If all thirteen respondents had conjointly served at a single university, seventy-eight contacts would have been established. The twelve links between these symbolic interactionists constitute 15.38 percent of the number of links needed for maximum connectivity. These conjoint faculty appointments took place in four separate institutional settings. Respondents 66 and 70 were tied together at Institution P, and respondents 62 and 77 conjointly served at Institution F. Respondents 60, 64, and 65 simultaneously served at Institution Q. Respondents 60 and 64 later joined respondent 66 at Institution A. Respondent 62 also served with respondent 60 on the Institution A faculty while respondents 5 and 64 likewise conjointly served there. Over time, five of the thirteen "participant observation" respondents held faculty appointments at Institution A.

The relationships observed among respondents favoring a participant observer stance on methodology are, as we shall soon see, more extensive in nature than those relationships shared by either the empiricists or the "empiricism--other technique" group.

The patterns of institutional affiliation among those sixteen subjects taking an empiricist stance with respect to methodology, while not as extensive as the relationships...
Fig. 23.—Conjoint Faculty Appointments Among Respondents Preferring Participant Observation as a Methodological Technique.
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among the "participant observers," were fairly extensive. As indicated in Figure 24, these sixteen respondents received degrees from a total of eight universities. Respondents 79 and 83 were granted degrees by Institution C, yet they did not study there during the same time period. Subjects 23, 73, and 81 received degrees from Institution A, but they received them during different periods of time. Institution B conferred the Ph.D. on respondents 25, 71, 74, and 76. The latter three subjects received the doctorate during a two year period in the middle 1950's. Respondents 24, 75, and 82 received their Ph.D.'s from Institution D, and they studied their during the same time period. Ten and eighty-three hundredths per cent of the total number of connections required for maximum connectivity were recorded. This figure stands in marked contrast to the 26.92 percentage figure recorded for the "participant observation group."

The patterning of staff-student relations among the "empiricists" are fairly extensive, although not quite as extensive as those observed among respondents speaking in favor of participant observation. As shown in Figure 25, of the 120 connections needed for maximum connectivity 16 or 13.33 per cent were made. The corresponding percentage figure for the participant observation group was 15.38 per cent. The staff-student relationships among the "empiricists" involved a total of five universities. However, four of these five institutions each accounted for only one
Fig. 24.—Source of Ph.D. Degrees Among Respondents Preferring Empiricism as a Methodological Stance.
Fig. 25.—Staff-student Relationships Among Respondents Preferring Empiricism as a Methodological Stance.
connecting link. Respondent 27 was a student at Institution E at the same time that respondent 81 was on the sociology faculty. Respondent 26 studied with respondent 23 at Institution Y. Respondent 25 was the student and respondent 23 the faculty member at Institution B. Respondent 11 was on the faculty at Institution C at the same time that respondent 72 worked toward his Ph.D. degree. Staff-student relationships for the "empiricists" were concentrated at Institution D. Respondents 27, 71, 76, and 79 were all on the Institution D sociology faculty at the same time that respondents 24, 75, and 82 completed work on their doctorates.

The conjoint faculty appointments held by the "empiricists" were slightly less extensive than those held by the "participant observation" response group. As seen in Figure 24, sixteen conjoint appointments were held by these sixteen respondents at a total of five different universities. These sixteen links constitute 13.33 per cent of the figure required for maximum connectivity. This figure is slightly lower than the 15.38 per cent figure attained by the "participant observers." Overall, the "empiricists" did not tend to be as tight-knit as the "participant observers." Nevertheless, they shared more extensive relations among themselves than did those respondents who felt that empiricism should be combined with other observational techniques.
Fig. 26.—Conjoint Faculty Appointments Among Respondents Preferring Empiricism as a Methodological Stance.
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The degree of connectivity with respect to source of Ph.D.'s was relatively extensive for the "combined techniques" response group. The 15.99 per cent of the figure required for maximum connectivity actually achieved is higher than the 10.83 per cent figure recorded by the "empiricist" group but considerably lower than the 26.92 per cent figure realized by the "participant observation" response category. These 52 interactionists received their degrees from a total of twenty-two universities. However, from only five of these twenty-two universities did more than one respondent receive the Ph.D. Furthermore, only two respondents (1 and 20) received degrees from Institution C, and only two subjects were granted the Ph.D. by Institution D. None of these four respondents were students during the same time periods. Respondents 7, 12, and 42 took degrees at Institution F, yet they were not students together. As shown in Figure 27, respondents receiving degrees for the same institution received them in large numbers from just two universities. Nine interactionists (17, 34, 40, 50, 54, 56, 58, 59, and 84) were granted degrees by Institution B. Respondents 17, 40, 50, 58, and 59 studied at Institution B during the same time period. The largest single concentration of interactionists came at Institution A where subjects, 28, 13, 10, 29, 22, 30, 36, 37, 2, 6, 39, 14, 43, 44, 45, 46, 48, 49 and 57 received the degree. Eight of the nineteen Institution A graduates (respondents 6, 13, 28, 44, 45, 46, 48, and 51) received their doctorate between the years 1948 and 1951.
Fig. 27.—Source of Ph.D. Degrees Among Respondents Favoring a Combined Techniques Approach to Methodology.
As indicated in Figure 28, the staff-student relationships among the "combined techniques" respondents were not nearly as extensive as those observed for either the "participant observation" or the "empiricism" response categories. The "combined techniques" respondents shared 56 staff-student relationships at eight different universities. These 56 connecting links represent only 4.22 per cent of the figure required for maximum connectivity. This compares with the corresponding figures of 15.38 per cent and 13.33 per cent recorded for the participant observation and empiricism groups, respectively. The staff-student ties at Institutions ZZ, P, E, TT, I, and H were all dyadic in nature, i.e., only one "combined techniques" respondent served as student and only one respondent as faculty member at each of these six universities during the same time period. At Institution B respondents 40, 50, 58, 59, and 17 were all working on their Ph.D.'s during the time period in which respondent 34 served on the sociology faculty there. A rather extensive pattern of staff-student relationships was observed at Institution A. Respondents 28, 10, 29, 36, 38, 6, 44, 45, and 48 each served on the Institution A faculty at times when at least one other "combined techniques" respondent was a Ph.D. student there. Furthermore, of these eight interactionists serving on the Institution A faculty, seven were themselves Institution A Ph.D.'s. Respondent 36 had only one like-minded respondent (10) as a student when...
Fig. 28.—Staff-student relationships Among Respondents Favoring a Combined Techniques Approach to Methodology.
he served on the sociology faculty. However, respondents 44 and 45 each had ten other "combined techniques" subjects as students during their four year stay on the Institution A faculty.

Compared with the patterns of conjoint faculty appointment held by both the "participant observer" and "empiricism" group, the conjoint faculty appointments of the "combined technique" group are not extensive. Only 6.49 per cent of the figure required for maximum connectivity was realized compared with the 13.33 per cent figure recorded for the empiricism group and the 12.82 per cent mark observed for the participant observation response category. Among these fifty-two subjects a total of 86 links were established at twenty different institutions.

In contrast to the multibonded relationships observed among both the participant observers and among the empiricists, the conjoint faculty appointments of the "combined technique" group tended to involve only two linked-minded respondents serving together at any one institution. This was the case with respect to fifteen of the twenty institutions in which these respondents conjointly served. In fact, with respect to fourteen of these fifteen institutions not only did all conjoint appointments involve only two respondents, but at no other time did any of the other like-minded respondents ever hold an appointment at these particular universities. A total of four respondents (9, 28, 31 and
47) were at one time or another affiliated with Institution R, but no more than two of them ever conjointly served on the faculty there. As shown in Figure 29, the conjoint faculty appointments of these respondents were concentrated at just five universities. Respondents 8, 12, and 14 served together at Institution M, and during an earlier period respondents 14 and 20 conjointly served there. Respondents 4, 13, and 22 held simultaneous appointments at Institution N. Following the departure of respondents 4 and 13, respondent 15 subsequently joined respondent 22 on the sociology faculty. Respondents 10, 20, and 29 served together at Institution F. Respondent 7 later joined respondent 10 following the departure of respondents 20 and 29.

Respondents 2, 48, and 52 conjointly served at Institution S, and respondent 54 later replaced respondent 52 to keep this relationship triadic. At one time or another seven of the fifty-two "combined techniques" subjects held faculty appointments at Institution A. Respondents 28, 44, and 45 conjointly served there in the late 1940's. Respondents 38, 44, 45, and 48 held conjoint appointments at Institution A during the early 1950's. Finally, the middle and late 1950's marked the period during which respondents 10, 29, and 38 conjointly served at Institution A.

In summarizing the patterns of relationships found among respondents who held to differing methodological
Fig. 29.—Conjoint Faculty Appointments Among Respondents Favoring a Combined Techniques Approach to Methodology.
stances the following conclusions can be stated:

1. The most extensive patterning of relationships occurred among respondents taking the most unconventional methodological position (the participant observation response category).

2. The least extensive set of relationships was found among those subjects favoring the most orthodox of the three methodological positions examined (the combined techniques response category).

3. Those respondents favoring the "empiricism" approach to methodology shared relationships slightly less extensive than those shared by the "participant observers" but far more extensive than those shared by the "combined techniques" subjects.

Degree of conventionality and extensiveness of relationships.—Each of the areas analyzed in this chapter, self, social control, social change, and methodology has been examined with respect to a single dimension—i.e., with respect to whether or not a given set of definitions represents an orthodox view. Those patterns of relationships found to be associated with conventional definitions of a given concept or issue were compared and contrasted with those patterns found to be related to more unorthodox views. On each concept or issue for which a respondent preferred an orthodox definition he was assigned a score of 1. If an unorthodox definition was selected a score of 2 was assigned.
As there were two different unorthodox definitions of methodology offered, one more unorthodox than the other, it was possible to score from 1 to 3 points on this concept. The lowest possible total score was 4, and the highest score attainable was 9.

In the hope of obtaining a clearer picture of the relationship between the nature of theoretical arguments and the patterning of institutional relationships, respondents were placed in three basic groups (1) the conventional group (total scores of 4 or 5), (2) the semiconventional group (total scores of 6 or 7), and (3) the unconventional group (total scores of 8 or 9). The remainder of this chapter examines those patterns of relationships found to be associated with each of these three groups.

The trends which manifested themselves in examining self, social control, social change, and methodology are also present when the patterns of institutional affiliation characteristic of the conventional, semiconventional, and unconventional general response groups are analyzed. The most extensive patterning of relationships occurred among subjects belonging to the unconventional response group while the least extensive relationships were observed among members of the conventional response cohort. The semiconventional group's relationships were more extensive than those of the conventional group but not nearly as extensive as those of the unorthodox group.
As shown in Figure 30, the connecting links between interactionists receiving the Ph.D. from the same university are numerous for the unconventional response group. These twenty-nine respondents received degrees from a total of nine universities. Respondents 61 and 79 received Ph.D.'s from Institution C and received them in the same year. Respondents 69 and 75 were granted degrees during the same year by Institution D. Twenty respondents received degrees from just two universities. Eight of these interactionists received the Ph.D. at Institution B, and five of these received them during a two year time period, 1953-1955. Twelve subjects were recipients of Institution A doctorates. Six of these Institution A graduates were granted degrees between 1948 and 1951. Hence the great majority of these respondents not only received degrees from the same universities but they also tended to pursue their graduate programs during the same time periods. A total of 95 connecting links existed between these interactionists. This figure represents 23.39 per cent of the total number of links required for maximum connectivity.

The pattern of staff-student relationships among the unconventional response group was also quite extensive. Forty-one staff-student contacts were established at just five universities. These forty-one multi-bonded connections constitute 10.09 per cent of the figure need for maximum density of relationships. Respondent 62 was a student at
Fig. 30.—Source of Ph.D. Degrees Among Respondents
Supporting an Unconventional Social Theory.
Institution F during the period when respondent 77 was a faculty member there. Respondent 70 was a Ph.D. candidate at the same time that respondents 45 and 66 served on the Institution P faculty. Respondents 69 and 75 studied under respondents 27, 71, 76, and 79 at Institution D. Respondent 68 studied under respondent 71 at Institution B, and respondent 34 was an Institution B faculty member when respondent 40 was a student there.

As shown in Figure 31, the heaviest concentration of staff-student relationships among the unorthodox response category subjects occurred at Institution A. Respondent 66 was the mentor of ten Institution A Ph.D.'s. Respondent 45 was on the sociology faculty there during the time period in which nine other members of the "unorthodox" group worked toward the doctorate. Respondents 64, 5, 49, and 48 were students at the same time that respondent 60 served on the sociology faculty. Respondents 28 and 48 were faculty members during time periods in which three other "unorthodox" respondents were Institution A students. A total of twenty-nine staff-student contacts were established at Institution A.

The conjoint faculty appointments held by members of the "unconventional" group were fairly extensive. As shown in Figure 32, the 35 conjoint faculty appointments held by these respondents involved a total of eleven different institutions. These 35 contacts constitute 8.62 per cent of the figure required for maximum connectivity. The relationships at seven of the institutions involved were dyadic in
Fig. 31.—Staff-student Relationships Among Respondents Supporting an Unconventional Social Theory.
Fig. 32.—Conjoint Faculty Appointments Among Respondents Supporting an Unconventional Social Theory.
that no more than two respondents ever simultaneously served on their faculties. Respondents 56, 60, 64, and 65 jointly served at Institution Q while subjects 27, 71, 76, and 79 served together on the Institution D faculty. Respondents 28, 71, 76, and 83 saw simultaneous service on the sociology faculty of Institution R. Lastly, respondents 28, 45, and 66 conjointly served at Institution A, and following the departure of respondent 28 subjects 45, 48, 60, and 66 were all on the sociology staff there. Hence, many of these conjoint faculty appointments were multi-bonded in nature.

As seen in Figure 33, the sources of graduate degrees for the semiconventional response group, while not as uniform as those of the unconventional cohort, are fairly extensive. These twenty-two respondents received their degrees from a total of eight universities. Respondents 1 and 72 received degrees from Institution C, but they were not students during the same time period. Respondents 8, 24, and 82 received the doctorate within a two year period at Institution D. Respondents 25, 50, 54, and 59 received Institution B doctorates, and respondents 25 and 54 studied together as did respondents 50 and 59. Respondents 39, 81, 36, 57, 29, 46, 23, 44, and 37 were granted the Ph.D. by Institution A. Respondents 39, 23, 46, and 44 received their degrees during a two year time period in the late 1940's. The 45 connections observed constitute 19.48 per cent of the
Fig. 33.—Source of Ph.D. Degrees Among Respondents Supporting a Semi-conventional Social Theory.
number of links required for maximum connectivity.

As indicated by Figure 34, the staff-student connections between members of the "semiconventional" group tended to be rather sparse. Only eleven staff-student links were forged. This figure represents 4.76 per cent, as compared with 10.09 per cent for the unorthodox group, of the figure required for maximum connectivity. These staff-student relationships transpired at four different universities. Respondent 13 was a student at Institution E while respondents 1 and 81 were on the sociology faculty there. Respondent 72 was a pupil of respondent 11 at Institution C. Respondents 23 and 54 were Institution B faculty members at the time when respondent 25 was a Ph.D. student. At Institution A respondents 57, 46, 23, and 37 were students during the period in which respondent 44 was on the sociology faculty there. Respondents 37 and 57 were also students at the same time that respondent 23 was an Institution A faculty member.

Compared with the conjoint faculty appointments of the "unorthodox group" the simultaneous appointments of the semiconventional group were sparse indeed. As shown in Figure 35, these respondents held only six conjoint appointments, and furthermore they held them at six separate universities. These six links represent only 2.60 per cent of the figure needed for maximum connectivity. The corresponding percentage figure for the "unorthodox group" was 8.62.
Fig. 34.—Staff-student Relationships Among Respondents Supporting a Semi-conventional Social Theory.
Fig. 35.—Conjoint Faculty Appointments Among Respondents Supporting a Semi-conventional Social Theory.
In contrast to both the unconventional and the semiconventional groups, the conventional group is characterized by a markedly lower degree of connectivity when sources of the Ph.D. are compared. As shown in Figure 36, these latter twenty-three respondents received their degree from a total of fifteen universities. The twenty-nine links observed represent 11.46 per cent of the figure required for maximum connectivity. The corresponding figures for the unconventional and semiconventional groups were 23.39 and 19.48 per cent, respectively. Respondents 7 and 42 received degrees from Institution E. Eight respondents received the doctorate from Institution A. However, these respondents received their degrees during different time periods and very few of them were students together.

Figure 37 reveals that the number of staff-student relationships among the "conventional response" group was small indeed, especially when compared with the extensive nature of the staff-student ties between members of the "unorthodox response group." These conventional response group subjects had a total of eight staff-student ties at two universities. Respondent 18 was a pupil at Institution H during the period in which respondent 10 served on the sociology faculty there. Respondents 14, 30, 2, and 22 studied under respondent 38 at Institution A. Respondents 14 and 30 also worked toward the doctorate at a time when respondent 10 served on the Institution A faculty. Lastly,
Fig. 36.—Source of Ph.D. Degrees Among Respondents Supporting an Orthodox Social Theory.
Fig. 36.—Source of Ph.D. Degrees Among Respondents Supporting an Orthodox Social Theory.
Fig. 37.—Staff-student Relationships Among Respondents
Supporting an Orthodox Social Theory.
respondent 30 finished work on the Ph.D. during the period when respondent 6 held a faculty appointment at Institution A. The eight staff-student contacts established among these respondents constitute 3.16 per cent of the figure necessary for maximum connectivity. The corresponding figures for the unconventional and semi-conventional groups were 10.09 and 4.76 per cent respectively.

As shown in Figure 38, the conjoint faculty appointments held by members of the conventional response category were slightly more extensive than those held by the semi-conventional group but markedly less extensive than those characterizing the "unconventional response group." The seven conjoint appointments held by these respondents constitute 2.77 per cent of the connections required to achieve maximum connectivity. The corresponding figure for the semiconventional group was 2.60 per cent while the unconventional group recorded an 8.62 per cent figure. Five universities were involved in the conjoint faculty appointments examined. No more than two conventional response group subjects were ever together at a single institution. Respondent 14 served with respondent 30 at Institution W, and respondent 10 conjointly served with respondent 38 at Institution A. Respondents 14 and 20 held conjoint appointments at Institution M. Respondents 10 and 20 were together at Institution F, and when respondent 20 left, respondent 7 joined respondent 10. Respondents 13 and 22 served together
Fig. 38.—Conjoint Faculty Appointments Among Respondents Supporting an Orthodox Social Theory.
at Institution N. Respondent 15 later joined the Institution N faculty and conjointly served with respondent 22.

By way of summary, the patterns of relationships among members of the semiconventional group were slightly more extensive than those among members of the conventional group. However, the patterns of relationships among the unconventional group members were far more extensive than those among members of either of the other two groups.

**Summary**

This chapter has presented the study's basic findings. Data on the relationships between subjects' definitions of self, social control, social change, and methodology and their patterns of institutional affiliation were presented and examined. In addition, a total score was recorded for each subject with respect to the conventionality or unconventionality of his definitions of each of the four areas dealt with. The patterns of relationships which characterized respondents who had similar total scores were examined.

Tersely stated, the results of the study indicated that respondents holding to unorthodox definitions and positions were characterized by more extensive institutional relationships among themselves than were the proponents of more conventional theoretical positions.

The findings reported in this chapter have been presented in skeletal form, that is to say little or no
interpretation has accompanied the data contained in the sociograms. Such interpretation and related discussion has been reserved for the next and last chapter of this dissertation.
CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this exploratory investigation has been to ascertain whether or not divergent theoretical positions within the larger symbolic interaction tradition are associated with differing patterns of institutional relationships between subjects taking divergent stances, and hence with similar patterns among respondents holding to the same basic positions. More specifically, this study has examined those patterns of institutional affiliation found to be associated with varying conceptions of the nature and meaning of self, social control, social change, and methodology. As the basic responses to each of these four areas can be divided into either conventional or unconventional replies, the investigation has focused on the relationships found to exist between orthodox and unorthodox theoretical stances and those varying patterns of institutional relationships which presumably give rise to these types of sociological theorizing. Three types of institutional relationships were examined: (1) source of respondents' Ph.D.'s, (2) staff-student relationships among respondents, and (3) conjointly faculty appointments held by subjects.
The findings are reported in the preceding chapter. However, summation of these findings may prove useful in interpreting and assessing their significance; therefore, the findings are summarized in the first section of this concluding chapter. A discussion of the meaning and significance of the findings is presented in the second section. In addition, the implications of this study's findings for future research in the "sociology of sociology" are considered.

**Summary of the Findings**

Since Chapter II of this report contains a summary of the methods employed in obtaining the data which have been analyzed, further exposition is not considered necessary. Rather, it is the purpose of this section to present a general resume of (a) the patterns of institutional affiliation found to be associated with alternative conceptions of self, social control, social change, and methodology, and (b) the association found between particular patterns of institutional relationships and the nature of theoretical argument in general.

**Unitary versus multiple nature of selfhood.**—Respondents who saw the self as being unitary in nature tended to be characterized by a multibonded network of relationships. Not only did an examination of their graduate training reveal a high degree of connectivity, but their postgraduate
patterns of academic relationships were also seen to be quite extensive. Among subjects who characterized the self as being multiple in nature a substantially lower degree of interconnectedness was observed.

Social control: Control by others versus self-control.
Among subjects who equated social control with self-control an extensive network of interconnections emerged with respect to both graduate student and conjoint faculty ties. These multibonded types of relationships were not shared to the same degree by those respondents who made social control synonymous with control by others.

Social change: Qualified versus unqualified endorsement.—Those respondents who gave an unqualified endorsement of symbolic interactionism's capability for handling social change tended, more than those giving a qualified endorsement, to: (1) received the Ph.D. from the same institutions, (2) study under the same men, and (3) serve together on the same faculties.

Methodology: Participant observation, empiricism, and compromise.—By far the most extensive and multibonded network of relationships recorded was that observed among those subjects favoring participant observation as the most meaningful methodological technique. The degree of connectivity between respondents devoted to the merits of the operational definition was slightly greater than that observed among
respondents who favored a "combined technique" approach to social research.

Degree of connectivity: Conventional versus unorthodox stances.—As previously mentioned, as each one of the four areas dealt with offered respondents a choice between conventional and unconventional responses; it was possible to get for each subject a total score on the conventionality-unconventionality dimension. Respondents were then placed into three groups, conventional, semiconventional, and unconventional depending on their total scores. The extent of interconnectedness observed among the semiconventional respondents was slightly greater than that recorded for the conventional group. However, the degree of connectivity recorded among the "unorthodox" respondents was much more marked than it was for the other two groups. Compared with the conventional semiconventional subjects, those interactionists whose theoretical positions run against the mainstream of current American sociology tended to:

1. receive the Ph.D. from fewer universities,
2. have a greater number of staff-student contacts with like-minded respondents,
3. serve together on the same faculties in larger groups and over longer periods of time.
Discussion of the Findings

To briefly recapitulate the findings, there exist, within the symbolic interaction framework, qualitative differences as to (1) the nature of both self and social control, (2) the framework's ability to deal with social change, and (3) the proper methodological perspective for sociological research. The study has, in the main, singled out for analysis two basic categories of adherents:

1. Those interactionists whose responses to this study's questionnaire were highly unorthodox in the context of contemporary American sociology. These respondents tended to view self as being unitary in nature, to equate social control with self-control, to give an unqualified endorsement of interactionism's ability to treat social change due to its being a general theory, and to prefer either participant observation (methodology responses 1 and 3), as a basic research technique or empiricism (methodology response 4) as a methodological stance. These respondents tended to have an image of man as either subject (self-response 1) or as both subject and object (self-response 6). By equating social control with self-control (social control responses 1 and 3) these respondents also reject the conservative view of man as "essentially band."

2. Those interactionists whose responses were orthodox or conventional in character. These subjects tended to view self as being multiple in nature, to make social control
synonymous with control by others, to offer a qualified endorsement of interactionism's utility in handling social change due to its being only a social-psychological theory, and to prefer as their methodological stance a position which favors combining empiricism with other types of interpretive operations. These respondents tended to have an image of man as object (self-responses 2, 3, and 5). By equating social control with control by others (social control responses 2 and 4), these interactionists seem to harbor an image of man which sees him as being "basically bad" in nature.

The "unorthodox" interactionists were characterized by a marked interconnectiveness both during graduate training and during their post-graduate faculty careers. On the other hand, those interactionists who were more conventional or mainstream in their views did not share these patterned relationships with one another to nearly the same degree.

These findings suggest a number of things. On the surface, however, they appear to suggest the frequently observed fact that persons who relate to and interact with each other in multiple settings and over long time periods are apt to structure their thought along similar lines. Yet, this explanation would only serve to explain, and only partially at that, the unorthodox category of respondents. As Vaughan and Reynolds have previously argued, "this explanation would not account for the homogenity of thought
among the other interactionists, unless they are viewed as constituting a residual category—which they are not.\(^1\) The orthodox interactionists are grouped together not because they reject the self as being unitary in nature or because they reject empiricism or participant observation as being the only proper methodological techniques. Neither are they grouped together because they reject the notion that social control and self-control are really the same thing nor because they do not feel interactionism is capable of treating large scale change. They stand together because they selected in common a set of alternative conceptions regarding the very nature of self, social control, methodology, and social change. These alternative conceptions taken in toto represent segments of a different theoretical position, a position which carries with it a different image of man and society and a different view of the assumed relationship between the two. Tersely stated, the orthodox position simply represents a different "brand" of symbolic interactionism. Symbolic interactionism is too often regarded as a unitary theoretical position\(^2\)—which in reality

\(^1\) Vaughan and Reynolds, op. cit., p. 213.

\(^2\) Martindale, for example, assumes a unity within symbolic interactionism, suggesting a concern with and uniform interpretation of attitudes, meaning, and self as central to this perspective. See D. Martindale, The Nature and Types of Sociological Theory (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1960), pp. 339-375.
it is not. As both the orthodox and unconventional positions are quite comparable in terms of internal consensus, the marked differences observed with respect to the patterns of relationship's characteristic of each cannot be accounted for by recourse to the old mutual influence or "flocking together makes birds of a feather" argument.

If one cannot, therefore, attribute the observed relationships to mutual influence, to what can the observed differences be attributed. It is here suggested, as Vaughan and Reynolds have previously suggested, that the structure of relationships is associated with the nature of theoretical arguments. That is, certain associational patterns are conducive to the development of certain types of sociological reasoning. As previously mentioned, when the very nature of the orthodox and unorthodox positions is examined we find that they do not merely differ by degree of conventionality; they are different kinds of theorizing which rest upon divergent conceptions of social reality and human behavior.

As Vaughan and Reynolds note, "the generalist's (unorthodox respondent's) view of change as a continuous process is predicated upon the notion that men conjointly construct their lives rather than merely being acted upon by and responding to forces external to them." Such a

---

3Vaughan and Reynolds, op. cit., p. 213.
4Ibid.
"notion" is clearly revealed in the unorthodox subject's preference for definitions of the self as a unitary phenomenon. Such conceptions of self and social change, emphasizing as they do the creative and creating aspects of actors' joint actions, are perfectly compatible with a view which sees social control as resting, at least in part, on self-control. Furthermore, if one's prime concern is with understanding how individuals conjointly construct and give meaning to their lives then participant observation seems a logical choice for a methodological tool.

In contrast to this unorthodox position, those respondents offering conventional arguments view symbolic interactionism as being primarily concerned with the process by which *homo sapiens* are transformed into human beings. Social change is conceived of as being a process whereby man the object "takes on" and/or internalizes certain aspects of the larger culture. Man is seen as the receptacle of culture, "things" are put into him; man is acted upon by and reacts to forces and circumstances both external to him and beyond his control. Hence social control, for the most part, rests on control by others (external forces).

The associations reported in this paper are those recorded between particular patterns of institutional affiliation and particular types of theoretical perspectives. The data marshalled here lend strength to the argument,
previously offered by both Vaughan and Reynolds\(^5\) and Gouldner,\(^6\) that a strong, multibonded net of supportive relationships is a necessary condition for the creation and development of an unconventional theoretical perspective if that perspective is to make itself felt. While these protective and supportive alliances are probably of maximum importance during those periods when the iconoclastic perspective is being created and extended, the data indicate that once such extensive networks of relationships are established they tend to carry over into those time periods during which the knowledge system is being transmitted and refined rather than erected, argued, and defended. To reiterate, the data presented in this dissertation support the contention that an extensive, cohesive network of relationships is a necessary condition for the development of a sociological perspective which challenges the theoretical status quo. The data further suggest that those interactionists who are loosely tied together tend to concern themselves with developing those aspects of symbolic interaction theory which appear to be compatible with the dominant and conservative theoretical position in contemporary American sociology.

\(^5\)Ibid., p. 213.

Implications of the Findings

The most readily apparent, and in the long run perhaps the most significant, implication of this study's findings is the message it should convey to those sociologists who feel that they can somehow, preferably through the use of "objective scientific method," rise above the influence exerted by those factors which they themselves admit constrain the reasoning of all other *homo sapiens*. These findings indicate that the very nature of sociological knowledge systems is a product of the kinds of organizational associations that sociologists find themselves party to.

Secondly, due to the fact that those types of organizational relationships which permitted the creation and development of unconventional symbolic interaction theory have broken up, the findings indicate that the unorthodox and *status quo* challenging variety of interaction theory may cease to exert a major impact on contemporary American sociology. Furthermore, the implications of such findings obviously extend beyond the parameters of symbolic interactionism to sociological theory in general. For roughly twenty years now departments of sociology have experienced rather pronounced shifts in their structure and distribution. While many departments have experienced growth in both size and areas of specialization embraced, the general trend appears to have been that of scattering sociologists to a large number of schools instead of concentrating them in a
small number of major universities. As has been suggested elsewhere, "This proliferation and fragmentation may be token a demise of the kind of setting in which creative, unorthodox social thought is produced."  

Implications for future research in sociology of sociology.—The significance of the present findings would be greatly enhanced if they could be replicated on other samples of sociologists whose theoretical orientations differ from that of symbolic interactionism. More specifically, investigations of the other major theoretical perspectives in contemporary American and European sociology such as structural-functionalism, Marxism, and social action theory would seem to be called for. Such studies could employ a format similar to the one utilized in the present investigation. Alternative conceptions of key areas of concern to all sociologists would be presented to all respondents. In addition, alternative definitions of concepts associated with a given theory would be presented to sociologists who are proponents of that particular perspective. In this way it would be possible to examine not only those issues which divide a given perspective but also those issues which separate one general perspective from another. Furthermore, if such data could be gathered, it may be possible to indicate those factors which make for a common

7Vaughan and Reynolds, op. cit., p. 214.
intellectual stance between certain varieties of different theoretical orientations. That is, if sociologists supporting variety X of general theory Y share and have shared among themselves the same types and patterns of relationships that sociologists supporting variety A of theory B share and have shared among themselves, then perhaps variety X of theory Y may somehow be compatible with variety A of theory B. Such an initial approach to theory integration would seem to be more valuable than those recent attempts at integration which have assumed in advance that different theories can somehow be made to fit together because (1) each deals with a different aspect of "reality,"\(^8\) or (2) because each is macroscopic or each is microscopic.\(^9\)

In addition to gathering information on formal bonds, such studies should also obtain information on sociologists' patterns of interpersonal relationships. While such interpersonal relationships may be of only secondary importance when compared with the formal bonds, they would be helpful nonetheless. For example, knowing that a given symbolic interactionist lists among his closest friends sociologists whose theoretical orientations are decidedly functionalist in nature may provide additional insight into how it is that the thought of some interactionists more closely resembles

\(^8\)Lenski, *op. cit.*

the thought of Talcott Parsons than it does that of George Herbert Mead.

As an earlier article has stated, "the implication that our knowledge is limited or enhanced by the kinds of social situation in which it has originated would seem to demand our thorough investigation. . . ."¹⁰ It is hoped that the present study has made a small contribution toward that end.

¹⁰Vaughan and Reynolds, op. cit., p. 214.
APPENDIX A

THE INTERACTION QUESTIONNAIRE
This questionnaire is divided into two main sections. The first part presents a number of questions relating to interactionists' views on substantive and conceptual issues. The last section of the questionnaire is concerned with eliciting information on interactionists' interpersonal relations and identifications as well as on their past and present academic affiliations.

PART I

I. The following sets of quotations, all taken from the interactionist literature, deal with socialization, self, culture, social control, and social organization. Please check the one quotation which most closely approximates your own definition of the concept. If none of the quotations even approximates your own definition in the blank space provided after each set of quotations. The underlining is for emphasis and is mine.

A. Self

☐ 1. "... Think of self as: (1) a set of more or less consistent and stable responses on a conceptual level, which (2) exercise a regulatory function over other responses of the same organism at lower levels."

☐ 2. "The magnitude of the self... is measured by the society it incorporates; the magnitude of the society... is measured by the selves that it unites. 'The society' is the name for the 'unity,' but 'the selves' are that in which the unity is seen as multiple. There are as many societies as there are selves, and as many selves as there are societies. It is idle to ask which is prior or preponderant, or which influences the other and how, as to ask the same questions of the life and the living, the breathing and the breath."

☐ 3. "... we may practically say that he (the individual) has as many different social selves as there are distinct groups of persons about whose opinion he cares. He generally shows a different side of himself to each of these different groups."

☐ 4. "As a body of orientation, the theory is well over a half century old, but only within the last four or five years have research methods appropriate to it been employed. ... But now that the major difficulty—lack of agreement about the class of phenomena to be investigated—has been resolved by the growing consensus that 'the self' is a set of attitudes, we are able to bring to bear on our investigations of the self the techniques for studying attitudes in general."
5. "The people who communicate with any one person are not in communication with each other, and so they cannot come to any common understanding regarding him and his behavior. Therefore the reflection of himself which each individual gets from his communications is different for each group of which he is a member. He has as many selves as there are groups to which he belongs. . . ."

6. "The self, as that which can be an object to itself, is essentially a social structure, and it arises in social experience. After a self has arisen, it in a certain sense provides for itself its social experiences, and so we can conceive of an absolutely solitary self."

B. Social Control

1. "Self-control refers to behavior that is redirected in the light of the manner in which it is imagined to appear from the standpoint of other people who are involved in a cooperative task. Once a person defines a situation and locates himself within it in terms of a conventional role, he become cognizant of expected patterns of behavior both for himself and for the other participants. . . . social control rests largely on self-control."

2. "A central interest for sociologists in the study of human relations is to examine the ways in which people, as members of a society, influence one another. The collectivity of these ways is called 'social control.' . . . mutual expectation is the way in which people control each other's behavior in their day-to-day relationships."
3. "Social control is the expression of the 'me' over against the expression of the 'I.' It sets the limits, it gives the determination that enables the 'I,' so to speak, to use the 'me' as the means of carrying out what is the undertaking that all are interested in."

4. "Social control (refers to) any means, or the sum total of means, by which a group influences or directs its individual members."

C. Culture

1. "The important idea in the concept of culture is that there are common understandings as to how individuals are to behave toward one another. . . . The people who have this culture, or common understandings, are a society, and they are a society because they have this culture, not because they live together . . . or anything else."

2. "The term 'culture' is generally used to refer to behavior patterns. . . ."

3. "The totality of norms upon which the various transactions in any collectivity rest may be referred to as the culture of that group."
D. Socialization

1. "Socialization is a product of a gradual accumulation of experiences with certain people, particularly those with whom we stand in a primary relation, and significant others are those who are actually involved in the cultivation of abilities, values, and outlook. ... Since primary relations are not necessarily satisfactory, however, the reactions may be negative."

2. "A person's total system of definitions, his integrated configuration of meanings, constitutes his world; and no other world exists for him unless, and until, other selectors emerge. ... The implanting and incorporation of selector-systems is called the process of socialization."

3. "Socialization, broadly, refers to the process by which the human organism acquires the characteristic ways of behaving, the values, norms, and attitudes of the social units of which he is a part."

4. "Socialization (refers to) the process by which the individual acquires his human behavior patterns—the learning process."

"A culture consists of shared meanings and values that the members of a group share in common."
E. Social Organization

1. "Social organization: (1) the structure of common meanings and values of a society (since meanings and values are often structured into institutions, the social organization is the totality of institutions), (2) a condition of society in which the members have most of their meanings and values in common."

2. "The term 'social organization' refers to a social relation in which the individuals so behave as to prevent the disruption of their mutual influences by extraneous events."

3. "From a structural point of view the framework of social organization consists in the members of the group and their cultural relationships. While the introduction of any new culture trait produces problems of readjustment and disorganization, it is also true that social organization is a result of cultural integration. That is, the attitudes, the folkways, mores, laws, and institutions make up a system of social controls which the group imposes on its members. In a sense, the social structure seems to be synonymous with culture, since culture affects the framework of social organization. On the other hand, social organization is at once the product of the total culture and a part of it, rather than the sum total of man's achievements."

4. "The unity of the social mind consists not in agreement but in organization, in the fact of reciprocal influence or causation among its parts, by virtue of which everything that takes place in it is connected with everything else, and so is an outcome of the whole. ... this differentiated unity of mental and social life, present in the simplest intercourse but capable of infinite growth and adaptation, is what I mean ... by social organization."
II. In the space provided below please list, in order of importance, what you consider to be the most indispensible concepts for sociological reasoning:

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

III. The following set of quotations, drawn from the literature on symbolic interactionism, deals with methodology. Please check the quotation which most closely approximates your own conception of the area. Again, if you feel that none of the alternatives even approximates your own view please write in your own definition in the black space following the last quotation.

Methodology

☐ 1. "... in spite of all the word play of recent centuries, the physical and the existential remain different orders methodologically. If sociology studies existential experience, no form of empirical operationalism whatsoever can directly define and handle this subject matter.

☐ 2. "If an operational definition cannot be established, this should cause the scientist to question seriously the utility of such terms for his research, and should lead to the conclusion that perhaps many of the commonly accepted concepts are not usable in scientific endeavors."

☐ 3. "The most complete form of the sociological datum, after all, is the form in which the participant observer gathers it: an observation of some social event, the events which precede and follow it, and explanations of its meaning by participants and spectators, before, during, and after its occurrence. Such a datum gives us
more information about the event under study than data gathered by any other sociological method. Participant observation can thus provide us with a yardstick against which to measure the completeness of data gathered in other ways. . . ."

While the symbolic interactionist frame of reference unavoidably entails complicated methodological procedures, it does not imply a return to introspection and speculation as the methods of sociology. Rather it implies that in sociology empiricism must be combined with types of interpretive operations not required in the physical and biological sciences."

IV. The following series of quotations are taken from a number of previous responses by symbolic interactionists to the following open-ended question: Do you feel that symbolic interaction theory is well suited for handling the topic of social change? If so, exactly what about the perspective lends it its strength in treating this topic? If not, what weak points in the framework impede its ability to deal effectively with social change? Please check the quotation which would most closely approximate your own response to the question. Again, if none of the quotations even approximates what your own response to the question would be, please write your own views in the blank space provided following the last quotation.

Social Change

1. "... symbolic interactionism fills a void left by most other efforts to explain social change. Specifically it provides a framework for analyzing the collective behavior that intervenes between the first signs of breakdown of old norms, values, and institutions and the establishment of new ones. Thus it deals with the process of social change from unrest to institutionalization."


2. "I have not found SI theory helpful in looking at the process of social change. Most of its concepts were developed in the context of short episodes of interaction at best, or with respect to phases of socialization. Processes of social change require wider contexts and longer term time spans."

3. "The position of symbolic interaction . . . views human group life not as having a preestablished organization in fixed forms but as being continuously involved in a process of formation. . . . symbolic interaction presupposes that society is involved in the continuous process of meeting situations; the emphasis is on process rather than on expression of established organization and structure. This view of human group life as involved in a process of meeting situations signifies that change is indigenous to it. It also implies that instead of regarding social change as something which is unusual in the sense of being a departure from established ways of living, social change is seen as a natural occurrence in the life of people. . . . Let me conclude by declaring that quite contrary to any charge that symbolic interaction is unsuited for dealing with social change, it provides, in my judgment, the proper framework for handling social change."

4. "I feel that symbolic interactionist theory can handle change rather well from a social psychological view but only in limited fashion from a sociological standpoint. . . . It emphasizes change in the individual actors and stresses face-to-face, small group situations. As a social psychology theory, the view of change is adequate. . . . It is less adequate, however, as a sociological view of change, particularly because of its weakness on the macro-sociology level. Its eschewing of structural and cultural variables, or levels, and its denial of analytic significance to anything outside the person-person interaction surely limits the relevance of SI theory."
PART II

Some questions in this last section are of necessity highly personal. Needless to say all replies will be treated as highly confidential. However, please feel free to skip any question(s) which you find offensive or see as constituting an invasion of privacy.

1. If given your choice, in order of preference, which persons (please give actual names) would you appoint as editor of:

American Sociological Review
1.
2.
3.

American Journal of Sociology
1.
2.
3.

Sociometry
1.
2.
3.

2. Please list the names of persons (if any) to whom you send your books and/or articles for comment and criticism prior to submitting them to journals or publishers:

1. 4.
2. 5.
3. 6.
4.
5.
6.
7.
8.
9.
3. Which sociologists (if any) do you count among your closest friends?
   1.  
   2.  
   3.  
   4.  
   5.  
   6.  
   7.  
   8.  
   9.  

4. Whom do you consider to be the best of the symbolic interactionists?
   A. Past interactionists:
      1.  
      2.  
      3.  
      4.  
      5.  
      6.  
      7.  
      8.  
      9.  
   B. Present interactionists:
      1.  
      2.  
      3.  
      4.  
      5.  
      6.  
      7.  
      8.  
      9.  

5. Whom do you recall as being your best teacher:
   1.  
   2.  
   3.  
   4.  
   5.  
   6.  
   7.  
   8.  
   9.  

6. Whom do you consider to be the best students that have studied under you?
   1.  
   2.  
   3.  
   4.  
   5.  
   6.  
   7.  
   8.  
   9.
7. Please list the institution from which you received your highest degree and the year in which you received it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Please list the institutions with which you have been affiliated prior to and including your present position. Also please list the dates when you were affiliated with each institution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Date(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>G.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.</td>
<td>H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.</td>
<td>J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.</td>
<td>K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.</td>
<td>L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.</td>
<td>M.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

THE LETTER OF INTRODUCTION
Dear Colleague:

I should like to solicit your assistance with a research project undertaken by Larry Reynolds, a friend and former student of mine. Reynolds has designed the enclosed questionnaire for administration to a selected population of living sociologists — those who have published at least one work that, in his judgment, falls within the tradition of symbolic interactionism, broadly conceived.

It is my expectation that this project will contribute materially to the "sociology of sociology." Because of this expectation, I feel justified in urging your valuable cooperation. By donating several minutes of your time you can aid in what I consider a truly worthwhile enterprise.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Bernard N. Metzler
Central Michigan University
APPENDIX C

THE COVER LETTER
About a year and a half ago Professor Ted Vaughan and I collected a number of symbolic interactionists' responses to an open-ended question on social change. The results of that study revealed that substantial differences of opinion exist among interactionists both with respect to their conceptions of the nature of social change and with respect to symbolic interactionism's utility in treating the topic.

This finding underscores a fairly well known point: in some cases the differences between interactionists are as great or greater than those between some interactionists and sociologists who adhere to noninteractionist perspectives. Yet to date there has been neither a systematic description of these differences nor an attempt to account for their emergence and persistence.

I hope through the use of the enclosed questionnaire to obtain the information required in order to undertake such an analysis. I will be glad to send you a copy of the results, as well as any articles which may grow out of such a study. Your response will be greatly appreciated. Let me thank you in advance for your interest and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Larry T. Reynolds
Department of Sociology
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio
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