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TRENDS IN THE HISTORY OF CONTEMPORARY SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY:
A QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS

by
Pamela Hewitt Loy

Trends in social psychology are examined through a content analysis of 240 journal articles which represent the psychological (Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology), sociological (American Journal of Sociology), and interdisciplinary (Sociometry) approaches to the field. Changes in social psychology are discussed by decade from the 1920's to the 1970's, in terms of patterns in theory use, causality, methods, and literature citations. The results indicate that there is some overlap in theory use (symbolic interaction and perceptual theory), independent variable use differs by parent disciplinary orientation (psychological: individual, sociological: society, interdisciplinary: group), research is moving in the direction of more controlled designs, and methods of data analysis have gone from a predominance of description to a greater use of inferential statistics. There is little interdisciplinary research cooperation, or cross-disciplinary use of references. A comparison of differences between branches does not provide clear evidence for an increasing integration or an increasing dissimilarity between branches over time. There are some characteristics of the discipline itself which
prevent its eventual integration. It is proposed that in order for social psychology to become a unified field of study, the professional role of the social psychologist must first gain academic legitimacy.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

An historical study of trends in social psychology is an ambitious sounding endeavor that should ideally be qualitative and quantitative, theoretical and empirical, and predictive and descriptive. Such a study could legitimately be undertaken using any one or a combination of the approaches provided by the sociology of science, the social psychology of science, the psychology of science, the sociology of knowledge, and the philosophy of science. Although to fulfill adequately the obligations of such an undertaking would constitute a lifetime occupation, the current research project is a more modest attempt to make certain factually supported statements about the development of social psychology in the United States.

STATE OF THE DISCIPLINE

The field of social psychology is generally considered an infant of dual parentage, i.e., the product of an historical theoretical marriage between psychology and sociology. The notion that social psychology was or is currently a unified area with a specific orientation and object of study is a minimally tenable position usually based upon optimistically opinionated conjecture rather than factually supported evidence. Such a viewpoint is taken by Gordon Allport (1968) in his often-cited article on the historical
background of social psychology which appears in the *Handbook of Social Psychology*. Allport states that "in spite of its apparent lack of autonomy, social psychology has its own core of theory and data and its own special viewpoint." (Allport, 1968:3). Perhaps Allport is referring only to the social psychology in the field of psychology. It does appear this way in his somewhat one-sided description of the development of social psychology, as well as his statement that "social psychology is above all else a branch of general psychology." (Allport, 1968:4). Even if his statement is only applied to the psychological branch, the case for the existence of a unified area within this one field rests on doubtful grounds. Statements such as that of Allport on the homogeneity of social psychology might be comforting to that melange of individuals who label themselves social psychologists. However, the content of current textbooks in the field suggests that his conception of social psychology is not adequately supported by the facts. It is the view of the author of the current research that Deutsch and Krauss present a more realistic account of the current stage of development of social psychology:

Social psychology is in its infancy. It has only begun to identify a distinctive subject matter relating to human interaction. Being in its infancy, it is still largely dominated by theoretical approaches that are based on implicit conceptions of the nature of man. (Deutsch and Krauss, 1965:12).

It should be added that these implicit conceptions of the nature of man referred to by Deutsch and Krauss are the philosophical foundations of very different theoretical
approaches. The implications of this situation are impor­
tant to the search for a "common ground" upon which these
conceptions might be based and also to the study of the state
of the discipline over time and within the parent fields of
sociology and psychology.

Cottrell and Gallagher (1941) point out another pro­
blem facing social psychology which provides additional evi­
dence of a lack of integration on another more basic front.
This is the problem of delineating the boundaries and con­
tent of the field itself. They state that "one of the most
clearly marked trends in social psychology has been the con­
sistent refusal by social psychologists to define and limit
their subject with exactness." (Cottrell and Gallagher,
1941). It would seem that the definition of the field of
study and the establishment of its academic boundaries should
be a primary requisite for its existence. It is under­
standable and even expected that in the beginning of its
development, the definition of the field would still be
under discussion. When a new area comes into the academic
arena, it must differentiate itself from those fields which
already exist by declaring its territory. This task is ini­
tially addressed by the forerunners of the discipline. This
first stage of development is usually a period during which
different conceptions of the field are put forth in the
literature. In the case where the new science evolves out
of a combination of two already existing fields, it would be
expected that the types of definitions proposed would be
affected by the orientation of the major field with which
the definer identifies himself.

Karpf (1932) discusses different definitions of
social psychology proposed by the early theorists in the
field. These definitions represent a great deal of varia-
tion in the notion of what social psychology is or was. The
range for the object of study extends from the perceptual
to the cultural: some examples are the psychological socio-
logy of Ellwood, Ross's psychic planes and currents as the
phenomena of social psychological interest, Thomas's concep-
tion of social psychology as the subjective side of culture,
McDougall's group psychology (based in the "native equip-
ment of man") and Mead's science of human nature and social
personality. A great deal of diversity appears in defini-
tional descriptions of the characteristics present during
this early period of development in social psychology. Such
a condition of diversity in definitions is a somewhat common
state of fields in their "coming into being" as a science;
the fact that social psychology in its early evolution evi-
denced this characteristic, is no cause for concluding that
the field is currently disorganized. As Roger Brown points
out, "biology did not begin with a good definition of life
nor linguistics with a good definition of linguistics."
(Brown, 1965:xxi). However, the process in the development
of a science dictates that the movement from this early
stage is in the direction of greater consensus and specifi-
city of field definition, thereby providing a clearer
demarcation of disciplinary boundaries. This would especially be relevant to disciplines with overlapping characteristics.

An examination of contemporary definitions used by social psychologists should shed some light on the issue of whether social psychology has made this transition. A sampling of current popular social psychology textbooks in the field is a valuable source for the examination of this issue. At first glance, one is impressed with the number of different descriptions of the appropriate subject matter for social psychology. Upon further study, however, the definitions seem to have some elements in common. Among these common elements are some reference to the individual, the social environment, and interaction. The type of emphasis given these elements differentiates the definitions from each other. The definitions used by social psychologists appear to fall into two roughly discriminable categories: the psychological and the sociological.

The psychological type of definition is characterized by a focus upon the individual and the resultant response to incoming social stimuli. The emphasis here is clearly upon the individual's status as a responder and mental processor of elements of the social situation. Roger Brown (1965) provides this type of definition in his text which was very popular in psychological social psychology in the late 1960's. He conceptualizes social psychology as a discipline concerned with "the mental process (or behavior) of persons
insofar as these are determined by past or present interaction with other persons." (Brown, 1965:xx). Perhaps the definition which has proven most popular in social psychology texts of the 70's is the one put forth by Gordon Allport in his previously cited article on the history of social psychology. He defines social psychology as "an attempt to understand and explain how the thought, feeling, and behavior of individuals are influenced by the actual, imagined, or implied presence of others." (Allport, 1968:3). Both definitions of the field have an internal focus, and emphasize intra-individual phenomena.

Behavioristic types of definitions also qualify as psychological, because the focus is still on the individual, even though the intra-psyche aspects are not dealt with specifically. The "black box" is still the individual black box. Jones and Gerard define social psychology as "...the scientific study of the behavior of individuals as a function of social stimuli." (Jones and Gerard, 1967:1). Hence, they retain S-R terminology, and the social realm becomes just another source of stimulation and not a dynamic product or process in and of itself. Sherif and Sherif (1969:8) propose a similar definition of social psychology as the "...scientific study of the experience and behavior of individuals in relation to social stimulus situations." This definition is behavioristic and psychological, yet it gives slightly more autonomy to the interactive situation by implying a relationship, and hence a mutual effect, between
the individual and the social situation. Thus the psychological type of definition is clearly tied in to the orientation of the parent field. This orientation is an individualistic approach. As Elms expressed it, "the focus is usually upon psychological processes within the individual (such as his feelings, perceptions, attitudes)...", "...the further a social science gets from what is going on within the individual human being, the more tenuous any inferences about human behavior must be." (Elms, 1972:6).

Textbook definitions of social psychology that are of the sociological type tend to treat the interpersonal situation as a process. In this category of definition, the dynamics of the social situation itself are emphasized. Schellenberg exemplifies this theme by designating social psychology as "...the study of interpersonal behavior." (Schellenberg, 1970:v). Deutsch and Krauss propose a simple definition of social psychology as the study of "...how people effect one another." (Deutsch and Krauss, 1965:1). The "how" of this definition implies the study of ongoing social behavior primarily from the standpoint of the observation of interpersonal events, and not cognitive processes per se. How the characteristics of a particular social situation define and shape resultant interaction is a central question asked by social psychologists of this persuasion. A final example of this definitional category is not from a social psychology textbook. It does illustrate however, the approach of sociological-type definitions. In a 1964
editorial policy statement, *Sociometry*, generally considered to be an interdisciplinary social psychology research journal, defined social psychology as "...the investigation of the processes and products of social interaction..." (*Sociometry*, 1974:vol.37). This definition has "bridging" qualities because the processes referred to include intrapersonal and interpersonal dynamics. The main emphasis is upon the interpersonal arena and its processual character.

Most contemporary definitions of social psychology put forth by social psychologists tend to be more oriented toward the psychological category. Sherif (1963) in a review of social psychology definitions found that only one fifth of the definitions reviewed defined stimulating conditions broadly enough to include "...other individuals, groups, (or) institutions..." (Sherif, 1963:33). This finding probably overestimates the predominance of the psychological definition of social psychology. However, it does point out that as far as current definitions go, the "social" in social psychology often takes a back seat.

It should be stressed once again that these two definition categories are not mutually exclusive, nor polar opposites in terms of their orientation toward social psychology. They tend to emphasize different aspects of the field of study, and this difference is illustrative of characteristics of the field with wider ramifications than merely its definition. The two categories of definitions represent key orientation distinctions of the two proposed
subdisciplines of social psychology: sociological social psychology and psychological social psychology. But before this main theme is elaborated, we return to the previous point concerning definitions of the field as an indicator of its stage of development.

The overview of current definitions of social psychology provides a variety of different views on the appropriate area of study for social psychologists. It is proposed that the definitions used by these practitioners in the field seem to fall into the two categories of sociological and psychological. Therefore the definitions existent in current social psychology are not a hodgepodge of individualized perceptions of the area, rather they seem to arrange themselves along certain discriminable lines of orientation which correspond with viewpoints coming out of the parent science. The dual category concept of social psychology definitions perhaps provides evidence of a less serious disciplinary rift than the earlier one, for example between McDougall's instinct-oriented group psychology and the "psychic planes and currents" of E. A. Ross. It would appear that some movement toward greater definition consensus has taken place in social psychology during the past sixty years. However, it is clear that this movement has not been sufficient to produce a unified viewpoint in the field.

In terms of more general statements made about social psychology that address themselves to the description of its
status as a discipline among the social sciences, it is most often viewed as not yet having attained its scientific credentials. Tedeschi and Bonoma refer to this characteristic of the discipline by saying that "the state of the art of social psychology is quite evidently in the pre-paradigm phase of development..." (Tedeschi and Bonoma, 1972:1). Gamson and Modigliani talk about social psychology along these same lines and state that "for better or worse, by Kuhn's standards at least, social psychology is an immature science." They say the reason for this scientific immaturity is that social psychologists have no shared visions of the phenomena they study (Gamson and Modigliani, 1974:vi). It can be said then that social psychology currently lacks the required consensual homogeneity of the Kuhnian paradigmatic notion of a science, and this lack of agreement over certain critical issues and aspects of the discipline stands in the way of its maturation.

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

It is proposed that the field of social psychology is in actuality a rubric under which two discriminably different disciplinary branches are subsumed: sociological social psychology and psychological social psychology. It is further maintained that these two co-disciplines are separable in terms of historical antecedents, philosophical assumptions, levels of analysis, units of analysis, theoretical and methodological approaches, research tools, conceptual frameworks, and causal assumptions (designation of
dependent and independent variables). These specific categories are described in greater detail in the methods section.

The dual-discipline approach to social psychology is not a new idea. Many social psychologists, especially during the 30's, 40's and 50's spoke of this division (Britt, 1937; Karpf, 1952). However, current published accounts of the field treat this duality as being of only historical interest and accept the premise that integration has taken place. Inkeles (1963) maintains that social psychology in sociology and psychology are today indistinguishable, and that the different historical developments of the two subfields are not relevant to their current status. Although the discussed historical separation is not a new conceptualization, its specific characteristics and their implications for the past and present development of social psychology have not been systematically outlined in the literature. Nowhere has there been a systematic analysis of the previously specified areas of disciplinary divergence which derive from basic orientation differences and various historical forces operating within the field. Therefore, the present research is an attempt to discuss and analyze these differences and present a broader overview of the developmental characteristics of social psychology. Thus far, no such systematization has taken place with regard to the field of social psychology in America. Previous attempts at historical treatments have either become out-of-date
Given the proposed dual approach to social psychology, it might be profitable to look briefly at some of the historical treatments of the discipline that have appeared in the literature in order to view better the history of the problem. The first descriptive account of the origins and development of social psychology was written by Fay Karpf and published in 1932. Karpf provides a fairly detailed picture of the roots of the discipline of social psychology. She has written the only existing history of social psychology in book form. Unfortunately, the account stops just at the point where the field comes into its own as an academic area. There has since appeared no more complete summary of social psychology.

Karpf begins by examining the European roots of the field in Germany and France in the nineteenth century. The social psychological thought emanating from both countries constitutes an emphasis upon the study of social life, and it is not until later developments in England that an individualistic theoretical shift occurs in social psychology. While it is true if one looks only at the theorists that
Karpf discusses from France and Germany, one might conclude that the influences coming out of the two countries were primarily social and sociological, it is difficult to ignore the fact that individualistically oriented viewpoints were also present here. Karpf cites Schäffle, Gumplowitz, Ratzenhofer, and Simmel as early social psychological thinkers of Germany, and Tarde, Durkheim, Levy-Bruhl, and Le Bon as representative of social psychological thought in France. Perhaps this is why Allport (1968) accuses most historical accounts of social psychological history of having a sociological bias. Maybe the confusion here arises out of Karpf's designations of social vs. individualistic theory. The types of theories which Karpf labels as individualistic in England are primarily in the instinct-oriented category, which in the view of the current author could perhaps be more accurately labeled as biological. Nevertheless, it would have been a fairer representation of the historical picture if Karpf had discussed the social and individualistic movements as parallel trends rather than designating one as more important than the other. Karpf states social psychology arose as a reaction to psychological individualism and as a result had a closer relationship to sociology (Karpf, 1932:3). Karpf does refer to the presence of parallel trends later by summing up the early period of social psychology in this way:

The development of social psychology, as we shall see, is thus intimately bound up during the early period with the development of sociology itself, though social psychological thought has spread out
from the first from both psychological and social sources. (Karpf, 1932:3).

Karpf's focus is upon tracing the roots of American social psychology. The main interest of the current research is also American social psychology, but the focus is upon trends of the twentieth century, specifically beginning in the 1920's and extending to the present social psychology of the 70's.

It is interesting to note the variety of individuals who have been given credit for social psychological fatherhood. Different authors have cited Gabriel Tarde (Mandall, 1960), Aristotle (Grossack and Gardner, 1970), Lazarus and Steinthal (Sprowls, 1927), and Hume (Bogardus, 1923) as disciplinary forefathers. These are just a few examples of the divergence in views. Two types of approaches among those used to describe the origins of a discipline are the "Great Man" and the "Zeitgeist" or spirit of the time. When a historian points to the theories of a particular person as the impetus for the development of a field of study, this constitutes a "Great Man" approach. If the historian instead discusses the origins of a field in terms of broader characteristics of the cultural-academic milieu present at the time, the "Zeitgeist" orientation is the one being taken. The Karpf (1932) history of social psychology makes use of a combination of these two approaches, although she seems to favor a "Zeitgeist" explanation overall.

The most popular contemporary treatment of the history of social psychology is the previously mentioned
chapter by Gordon Allport (1968). Allport discusses the difficulty of giving credit to any one individual for the initial development of the field. He points to Plato and Aristotle as the two individuals who first "...aroused the curiosity of western man concerning his own social nature." (Allport, 1968:5). Allport goes on to maintain that "...up to a century ago social psychology was largely a branch of political philosophy." He then suggests that social psychology is a substantial part of general psychology, although not identical with it, failing to mention where the critical metamorphosis of political philosophy into psychology took place. Close examination reveals that August Comte and his hierarchy of the sciences with psychology at the top may be the critical bridge. In an attempt to reinterpret Comte, Allport says that only Comte's death prevented the addition of psychology as the queen of the sciences of the famous hierarchy. Other social psychologists have picked up on this theme (Shaw and Costanza, 1970; Grossack and Gardner, 1970).

Although Allport does not agree, attempts to conceptualize social psychology as mainly a branch of psychology are fairly common in the literature. The facts are that social psychology exists as a major area of specialization for sociologists in departments across the U.S., and therefore constitutes an important subfield within this academic discipline. There are currently over twice as many psychologists in America as there are sociologists, hence sheer
numbers seem to be on the side of the psychological branch. This numerical difference has existed from the beginnings of the field in America and is one possible explanation for the most frequent allocation of importance to social psychology as a branch of general psychology. L. L. Bernard offers another interesting explanation for this psychological dominance of the field. Bernard believes that "...the psychologists have gained administrative control of social psychology in many universities mainly because social is an adjective and psychology is a noun." (Bernard, 1936:737). This could be one reason that C. A. Ellwood tried to popularize the term "psychological sociology" as a more descriptive label for the discipline of social psychology. The point being made here is that the field membership of the examining disciplinary discussant may effect the attribution of theoretical origins to the field, as well as the perception of its major disciplinary status as a subfield.

Most social psychological historians point to the twentieth century in the United States as the place and period where the birth of the field as a legitimate academic area of study took place. Karpf (1932) maintains that social psychology in this sense is American. Allport concurs with this when he states that:

While the roots of social psychology lie in the intellectual soil of the whole western tradition, its present flowering is recognized to be characteristically an American phenomenon. (Allport, 1968:2).

It is not unusual to date the beginning of a
a discipline from the time when the first textbook was published in the field. It is perhaps revealing in view of the subsequent joint developments of the two branches of social psychology, that two texts on social psychology were published in 1908, one by a psychologist and one by a sociologist. William McDougall, a psychologist, emphasized instincts as dispositional determinants of individual behavior. E. A. Ross, a sociologist, now labeled as a collective behavior theorist of the LeBon variety, studied the concepts of imitation and suggestion and stressed situational determinants of individual behavior. Both Karpf (1932) and Allport (1966) view the arrival of these two texts and viewpoints in the same year as a significant harbinger, symptomatic of future developments. From this point of view, the two branches of social psychology arose with very different orientations which continue to exist up to the present day, although not in the same or in as extreme a form.

The next important work to appear in social psychology is a textbook written by Floyd Allport in 1924. It is representative of the psychological branch of social psychology, maintaining that group concepts and variables are unnecessary to the explanation of the behavior of individuals in groups. Karpf refers to Allport's anti-sociological stance by designating him as the:

...first American social psychologist radically to challenge the widely accepted view that if social psychology is to be linked to one of the better established fields of investigation at all, it more naturally tends to associate itself
with sociology than with psychology. (Karpf, 1932:400).

Needless to say, the reaction of the sociological branch to Allport's book was unfavorable. Around the same period, J. B. Watson (1919) became a key figure in the behaviorist school (part of the psychological branch), which rejected internal cognitive theories in favor of an S-R behavior model. Kurt Lewin, a psychological field theorist in the 1930's, pioneered experimental social psychology through his studies of ad hoc groups in laboratory situations. Although his now famous study with Lippitt and White (1939) on the effect of group atmosphere upon behavior was sociological in focus, Lewin's field theory is basically psychological in the Gestalt tradition. For Lewin, the field is a psychological phenomenon, not primarily social. Milton Yinger (1965) adapts the field theory perspective to a more general sociological model. However, this is a much broader interpretation of Lewinian theory. Field theory also shows similarities in many respects to the later phenomenological approach in sociology. It is interesting to note that the Gestalt tradition in psychology with its introspective methodology and the phenomenological school in sociology with its participant observation method show similarities in their basic orientations.

In sociologically-influenced social psychology, G. H. Mead and C. H. Cooley, both heavily influenced by William James, represent an approach which Hollander (1971:61) labels "interactionism". This school made a lasting imprint
upon social psychological theory traditions. Mead (1934) developed the concept of role playing to apply to the progressive development of the socialized individual and placed great emphasis on the part played by social interaction in this process. Cooley (1902) contributed another aspect of the importance of the social situation as a determinant of behavior through his "looking glass self" concept which takes as its pivotal point the individual's imagination of how he appears to others. Although many of Mead and Cooley's concepts evidence an intra-cranial focus, the developmental dynamics of interactionist theory are clearly a function of the social interaction process. Interactionist theory attained great popularity in sociological social psychology in the 1930's, and has greatly influenced this branch of the discipline. Herbert Blumer (1962) later developed what he labels symbolic interaction theory, which is a further interpretation and extension of Meadian principles, with the addition of a methodological technique for studying the social arena. Role theory, also growing out of the interactionist tradition, constitutes another offshoot or extension of the Meadian framework that has maintained a legitimate theoretical existence from its appearance on the scene in the 1950's up to the present period of social psychology. Erving Goffman with his dramaturgical interpretation of role theory is perhaps the best known of the role theorists. The interactionist perspective gave impetus to a number of different related approaches that arose out of the
Mead and Cooley traditions in sociological social psychology. Out of the Mead and Cooley theories came two schools of symbolic interaction: the Iowa school and the Chicago school. These schools differ somewhat in the interpretation of the concept of self (Meltzer and Petras, 1972).

A second level of development in sociological social psychology is one which focuses upon the structural characteristics of the interaction process, and downplays individual interpretive functions. An influential historical figure in this more cultural analysis of interaction is George Simmel, a German philosopher whose ideas were not popularized in American sociological social psychology until the 1950's. Simmel's (1950) theories of the dynamics of the dyad and triad, types and functions of group conflict, and many other varied topics of social psychological importance represent this related but separate aspect of sociological social psychology. Robert Bales' (1968) Interaction Process Analysis technique for classifying verbal social interaction, and theory of transitions or stages through which groups evolve, also reflects this orientation in sociological social psychology. This tradition in social psychology, sometimes labeled micro sociology has interactionist aspects. However, it centers more upon the depiction of structural and conceptual characteristics of the interactive situation.

Thus it can be seen that the previously mentioned theoretical movements or schools of thought, and their development in social psychology constitute differing orientations growing out of the traditions and theories in
sociology and psychology. The theme of a dual social psychology with concomitant historical groundings has been mentioned by social psychologists since its beginnings. This disciplinary duality still continues to describe recognizable differences between sociological social psychology and psychological social psychology. E. L. Faris in the forward to Karpf's book says that schools "...are the growing pains of a science." (Faris, 1932:xvi). Social psychology is still experiencing these growing pains.

The task of the current research is to examine characteristics of this development of social psychology as a discipline from its beginnings as a systematic field of study in the 1920's to its current status in the 1970's. Rather than relying completely upon the sometimes selective perceptions of the qualitative historian for an objective picture of social psychology's development, trends in the discipline are viewed through the collective eyes of the time-bound observations of practitioners of social psychology who have published their findings in the journals of the field. Through the content analysis of research articles, it becomes possible to detect changes and differences in the important areas of theory use, conceptions of causality, levels of analysis, and methods. These are the variables which are examined in the current study.

The question arises whether the current author, a sociological social psychologist, will be able to render an objective account of the development of social psychology,
given that she also is a product of a particular viewpoint and academic training, and therefore subject to possible sources of bias. It is proposed that objectivity is primarily obtained through the use of content analysis as a methodological technique. The objectivity of this technique is supported by the results of the reliability check on a sample of articles in which the second judge is the product of psychological graduate training. Given that the reliability results (to be discussed in the following chapter) reached satisfactory levels, this is evidence for objective agreement in terms of the classificatory system applied to the research articles in the sample. Also, the current author is the product of both psychological (B.A. in psychology) and sociological (M.A. in sociology) academic training, and therefore is familiar with both fields. The interpretation of the study results is the final point where possible bias can be a problem. It is in this aspect of the description and interpretive analysis of the data that orientation preferences become most vulnerable to the bias charge. The only answer that can be provided here is that the current author attempts to stick to the findings, provide logical interpretations where applicable, and to the extent possible, provide an objective account of the historical trends in social psychology during the period under study.

It is proposed that a study of these orientational differences as historical trends is of value for a number of
reasons: (1) it provides a contribution from a philosophy of science perspective, because it furnishes information on the past and present scientific state of development of social psychology; (2) it is of value to the quantitative history of social psychology because it makes use of the technique of trend analysis; (3) it will help to systematize the implications and characteristics of different frameworks in social psychology, and finally; (4) through the recognition of the precise areas of difference in the subdisciplines, point toward the possible integration, or at least determine obstacles to the integration, of the field and its maturation as a unified science in its own right.
CHAPTER II

METHOD AND HYPOTHESES

In an article on the "Social role of the man of knowledge", Znaniecki (1940), proposes a typology of social role categories and subtypes which describes different orientations that the scientist may assume with respect to his or her perceived position in the activities of the scientific enterprise. An attempt is made by the current author to adopt Znaniecki's role of the "systematizer" or one who organizes existing knowledge in a field. The existing knowledge organized in the current research project is limited to a particular time period: 1920-1974; field: American social psychology; segment of the literature: samples of articles from three representative journals; classification system: content analysis, and focuses upon certain variables which are considered crucial to creating a representative impression of trends in the discipline.

The present research approaches the problem from the standpoint of the joint disciplinary development of social psychology in psychology and sociology. This dual development traces its historical roots and self perpetuation to the existence of a number of contributing factors: (1) social psychologists have traditionally been housed in separate departments in universities (with some exceptions), usually according to their parent discipline alliances and
concomitant graduate training, (2) they have at least historically published in different journals and as a result bounded their literature knowledge and use to that material appearing in these same publications, and (3) they have utilized different theoretical frameworks and different methods for studying social behavior either out of disciplinary tradition, real orientation differences, or most probably a combination of both.

By focussing on various aspects of these differences as they are represented in the orientations expressed in the published journal research over time, it is possible to study systematically their fluctuations. Many important questions about the evolution of social psychology can be addressed through the use of such a technique for the study of the history of a discipline. It is proposed that the use of the content analysis procedure not only helps to systematize discipline changes by subjecting them to categorization, but also makes possible a quantitative study of history. This type of historical study makes within-discipline and between-subdiscipline comparisons more objectively possible. This type of analysis has not been previously undertaken for the field of social psychology, and it is proposed that such a method of study is a productive avenue of approach to the task outlined here. This task is to examine some of the characteristics of the discipline over time. It is here maintained that by accomplishing this, a worthwhile and valuable contribution to the state of knowledge of the
field can be made.

**JOURNAL USE**

Kuhn (1970) recognized the importance of the technical literature of a discipline as a reflection of its characteristics in terms of a shared locus of attitudes toward "puzzle-solving". In his description of the characteristics of a scientific community, he states that its members "...have absorbed the same literature...", and that "...the boundaries of that standard literature mark the limits of a scientific subject matter..." (Kuhn, 1970:177). Hence, the characteristics of the published reports of a discipline can tell us much about the field itself. It is from an examination of this existing literature that one may view trends over time in styles of thinking in terms of developed and applied theoretical frameworks, methods for the study of field phenomena, causal orientations toward the types of events typically selected for explanation, and many other variables that constitute traits which serve to describe the particular field under study. It is logical that the contents of the academic journals for a field would then be a likely place from which to derive information about the state of the discipline. This is because academic journals have historically served as forums for the presentation of issues and research by those individuals who perceive themselves as members of the discipline to which the periodical addresses itself.

The present study involves an analysis of a sample of
published articles from three academic journals that have historically contained social psychological articles. Although analyzing articles from only three journals does create the possibility of some problems, for example representativeness, it is believed that such a limitation is necessary in view of the sheer size of the proposed task (see appendix ii for a discussion of this decision).

Three criteria were used in selecting the journals: (1) **longevity** - the journal should span the time period of interest, (2) **academic stature** - the journal must be a respected "main line" publication containing articles from the field, and (3) **representativeness** - the journal must contain a representative population of social psychological research articles for the disciplinary approaches under study. It is maintained that the journals which were selected best fit these required prerequisites for inclusion. Following is a list of the journals selected and a description of their characteristics and the author's rationale for selection.

**Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology.** The *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* (AB) is the main periodical representing trends in the psychological branch of social psychology. This journal originated under the title of the *Journal of Abnormal Psychology* under the editorship of Morton Prince in 1906. Prince was a Boston physician who became interested in mental phenomena. The important change of current interest came in 1921 when Floyd Allport assumed the major duties of editorship under the
title of associate editor. In this same year the journal was renamed the Journal of Abnormal Psychology and Social Psychology. This title was then shortened a few years later to the Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology. From this point on, the title for this journal will be abbreviated as AB in the current paper. In a joint editorial discussing the reasons for the inclusion of social psychological articles in this journal, Allport and Prince (1921) refer to the importance of the social environment upon the development of personality traits as the major determining factor in this decision. The stated journal policy was to retain a fifty-fifty split between abnormal psychology papers and social psychology papers. Later, the proportion of social psychology papers began to dominate the journal, and this was the main factor responsible for the journal splitting up into the Journal of Personality and Social Psychology and the Journal of Abnormal Psychology in 1965. This is substantiated in an editorial statement (Katz, 1964) at the time of the journal division. Therefore, sampling of social psychology articles from this period up to 1974 was done only from the Journal of Personality and Social Psychology (JPSP). Hereafter this will be treated as one article sample representing the psychological branch of social psychology. The Journal of Personality and Social Psychology became the main forum for social psychology articles in psychology at this time, therefore this is deemed a legitimate merging of samples.
Sampling for the study will begin with volume 16 in 1921 because this was the year social psychology articles became part of the journal. The total sample representing the psychological branch of social psychology will therefore include articles from AB from 1921-1964 plus articles from JPSP from 1965-1974. The decade of article overlap is 1960-69, and all journal volumes for these years constituted the sampling population.

AB does for the most part span the time period of interest in the current study: from the beginning of social psychology as a systematic discipline in approximately 1920, to the present decade. Therefore, the first of the three criteria for journal selection seems satisfactorily fulfilled. The academic stature of the journal is historically supported. Jerome Bruner and Gordon Allport (1940) polled a selected sample of members of the American Psychological Association in order to determine the "leading" journals in the field of psychology. Bruner and Allport submitted a list of fifty American psychological journals and asked them to rate these journals' "significance for, and devotion to, the advancement of psychology as a science." (Allport and Bruner, 1940:758). The *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* came in fifth in importance in the ratings. It would then seem that AB is of respectable academic stature in the field of psychology, and it therefore fulfills the second criteria for journal inclusion. The final criteria in the selection of the journal to represent the
psychological branch of social psychology is representativeness. It is unfortunate that there is not a poll to cite with reference to the field of social psychology within psychology. Because AB is the only journal in the top five places which contains social psychology articles as one of the main populations published from both in terms of journal title and editorial statements to this effect, it is proposed that this journal is the most likely choice to represent psychological social psychology.

Only social psychological articles from AB were included in the sample. The working definition for a social psychological article utilized in the selection was one that constituted the study of some aspect of the individual in the social environment. This definition would rule out the inclusion of articles of a pure abnormal psychology type, i.e. studies of mental abnormalities not specifically relating to the social realm. Both the editorial policy established and the journal title implication theoretically make this 50% of the articles. However, it is maintained that the actual proportion favors social psychology articles. This is because there is no clear dividing line between social psychology and abnormal psychology. Various editorial statements over the history of the journal indicate that the dividing line used was continually subject to redefinition in order to make the realm of abnormal psychology broader, and this produced much overlap. By 1950 the journal became swamped with a burgeoning number of social
psychology articles submitted for publication. At this point the reigning editor, J. Mcv. Hunt, found it necessary to redefine the area of abnormal psychology to include:

...manuscripts that contribute to our knowledge and theories of personal and social behavior as distinguished from discussions of clinical techniques, and of mental hygiene. (Hunt, 1950:4).

The reasons for this redefinition were twofold. Firstly, much of the traditional clinical-pathological type articles were going to the Journal of Consulting Psychology, and secondly, over twice as many social psychology articles as compared to abnormal psychology articles were being submitted to the journal by this time. Therefore, less than half of the initial article sample was discarded as abnormal psychology articles.

The criteria used to determine whether a given article fit into the sample were: article title, abstract, and, if it still was not clear from these two, a reading of the last paragraph of the article. Random samples from each decade under study were taken. Fifteen articles are taken for each ten year period, making a total of ninety articles representing psychological social psychology chosen for the content analysis. Book reviews, editorial statements, professional news items, and notes and comments were excluded from the sample. The six decades represented in the sample were for the years: 1921-29, 1930-39, 1940-49, 1950-59, 1960-69, 1970-74. The AB sampling begins in 1921 because this is the year that the journal title changes to include social psychology. Thus the sample is described as a
purposive, stratified, random sample. The sample is purposive because it includes only social psychology articles. The sample is stratified in terms of decade.

**American Journal of Sociology.** For articles to represent the sociological branch of social psychology, the American Journal of Sociology (AJS) constitutes the parent sampling population. AJS was founded in 1895 under the editorship of Albion Small. It was the first sociological journal published in the world. Obviously, the longevity criteria for journal selection is fulfilled by this long-lived journal of the field. AJS has historically been a forum for the presentation of the best in sociological thinking (Shanas, 1945:533). It is one of the top two journals in the field, and its academic stature accorded by the members of the field is unquestionable. It is proposed that this journal adequately fulfills the criteria for use as an indicator for trends in the sociological subfield of social psychology.

The sample of articles taken from the journal will be limited to social psychology research. Estimates of the proportion of social psychology articles appearing in the journal differ. Becker (1932), in a study of space apportioned to this category in AJS between 1895 and 1930 found the proportion varied between 6 and 8% of total journal space. However Becker makes use of a very limited definition of social psychology as the study of personality. A study by Shanas (1945) of the use of AJS space from 1895-1945
undoubtedly makes use of a broader definition of social psychology. She found that the amount of journal space allocated to social psychological articles during this time period seldom dropped below 10% and was usually the first or second most frequently appearing substantive area during the fifty year period studied.

Because of this discrepancy in the literature over the amount of space allocated to social psychology in AJS, it was necessary to do an additional check for comparative purposes, and to extend the time period to the present decade. In order to determine the article population characteristics in terms of the proportion of social psychological research articles for each decade of interest included in the study, a sample of one hundred articles was randomly selected from each ten year period from 1920, and then subsequently classified as social psychological or non-social psychological.

In order to make this categorical assignment, the article title, the abstract, and if further information was necessary, the last paragraph were examined. The criterion utilized for the designation of the article as social psychological was that the main problem addressed by the author must have focussed upon the study of individuals in the social environment. In other words, the social context of behavior must be the primary object of study in the article. Book reviews, editorial statements, news items, notes and comments were excluded from the sample. Also articles that were purely methodological in scope were excluded. The
resulting proportions of social psychological research articles for each decade to be included in the analysis are shown below in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1 Percent Social Psychology Articles in AJS by Decade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1920-29</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930-39</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940-49</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-59</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-69</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-74</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Shanas (1945) study and the current results are not directly comparable because Shanas is estimating the allocation of total journal space, and includes the categories of dissertations, sociological "shop talk", special bibliographies, and a miscellaneous category. The above percentages are only for the proportion of research articles in this category. This difference would serve to make the Shanas percentages lower. The three periods that can be compared in this manner are 1920-29, 1930-39, and 1940-49.

Averaging the percentages found by Shanas (she uses five year periods) and comparing the first half of the 1940-49 decade, the corresponding percentages are 10.7, 19.1, and 16.2. These numbers obtained are considerably lower than those found in the present results. Since Shanas does not state what definition for social psychological articles was used,
this cannot be illuminated via a difference of definition explanation. In order to check the reliability of the article classification technique used for this designation, thirty of the sample articles (five from each decade of the selected articles), were scored by another coder trained in social psychology. The percent agreement for the two coders was 97%.

Although the precise magnitude of an acceptable level of intercoder reliability is still a debated question (Holsti, 1968), it is apparent from the high agreement figure, that the criteria for article inclusion are satisfactory. These precautions were taken with regard to the sample selection of articles to be used to represent trends in social psychology in sociology because there is no sociological journal which exclusively publishes social psychological research articles. The categorization of the one hundred article samples per decade not only produced a good estimate of the relative proportion of social psychological articles for each decade of the journal under study, it also provided the sampling population for the fifteen social psychological articles per decade from AJS to be content analyzed for the current study. The population of social psychology articles used for the sociological social psychology trend analysis constitutes, as for the AB articles, a purposive, stratified, random sample.

Sociometry. The final journal from which article samples for content analysis were drawn is Sociometry. This
journal was founded by J. L. Moreno in 1937, therefore the longevity criteria is not satisfactorily fulfilled. The first time period of interest for the current study begins in 1920. However, it is maintained that the other benefits accrued from the choice of this journal outweigh this time limitation.

It was believed necessary to include an additional journal for the sample which would represent an interdisciplinary approach to social psychology. Sociometry is a self-avowed interdisciplinary journal which has historically attempted to maintain this mediational position through accepting and publishing research from both psychology and sociology on social psychological topics. This journal has also recruited members of both fields for its editorial staff in order to maintain a balance in this respect. Editorial statements over the years have consistently emphasized this interdisciplinary theme. A criticism which has been raised concerning the representativeness of the journal has been the accusation that it has existed solely as a vehicle for the glorification of the approach of J. L. Moreno, the journal originator, and his sociometry theory. This is not a fair assessment of the contents of the journal for a number of reasons. The primary one is that although it does appear that Moreno had some influence upon journal content in the first three years of its publication, this is a relatively minor effect which disappears at an early point in Sociometry's history with an editor change. For this reason, and
also because the first full decade correspondent with the other two journals in the sample begins in 1940, this will be the first decade (1940-49) from which articles will be taken.

George Lundberg took over journal editorship in 1940, and in a subsequent editorial statement he reiterates Sociometry's interdisciplinary perspective. With respect to this journal objective he states that:

We propose...to supply an outlet for new "interdepartmental" ventures in the objective description and measurement of hitherto relatively unexplored phenomena. (Lundberg, 1941:12).

Lundberg also talks about the real need in the field for such an interdisciplinary journal. He says that:

The frustrating effect of too rigid departmentalization of academic fields, themselves largely the result of the accidents of university administration, has been noted by many scholars. (Lundberg, 1941:12).

Lundberg additionally points out with respect to these traditional arbitrary divisions that "...this state of affairs frequently prevents investigation of problems of obvious significance..." merely because of doubts as to where the study "belongs" (Lundberg, 1941:12). It is therefore proposed that Sociometry is an adequate choice for a journal to reflect the interdisciplinary approach to social psychology. With regard to the academic stature of Sociometry, it is a respectable journal, although in terms of circulation figures, not one of the most prominent ones. It is perhaps because of its interdisciplinary nature that it must attempt to seek
popularity in two fields, and as a result receives the complete allegiance of neither. Still, it is a recognized publication source for interdisciplinary research, and therefore fulfills the criteria of academic legitimacy.

It will be interesting to see how the content analysis for the variables of interest in the present study will compare with Sociometry. It will also be revealing to see whether the journal will consistently fall in an intermediate position between the two fields or will be more similar to one or the other of the branches of social psychology with respect to some of the concepts under examination. The analysis of the stratified random sample of Sociometry articles for the four decades should provide the answers to these questions.

Therefore, it is from the analysis of social psychological research published in the above three journals that the empirical basis for subsequent statements about trends in the development of social psychology will be made. Samples of fifteen articles from each period of study covering six decades of AB and AJS, and four decades of Sociometry will be content analyzed. This will yield a total of 240 articles in the total sample.

THE DEFINITION OF RESEARCH

As has been previously mentioned, the sample of studies from the journals used in the current study must constitute social psychological research articles. This may seem like a simple enough discrimination to make at first
glance; however, upon further examination, the characteristics of the dividing line between research and non-research become more difficult to pinpoint. A look at definitions of research contained in a few social science dictionaries may provide some illumination. Fairchild (1944) defines social research as:

The application to any social situation of exact procedures for the purpose of solving a problem, or testing an hypothesis, or discovering new phenomena or new relations among phenomena. (Fairchild, 1944:291).

This definition seems to conform to contemporary standards for social science research, as does the one by Hoult (1969), which defines research as:

The method or the result of careful and systematic experimentation, examination, or inquiry, particularly where the purpose is to add to the existing body of knowledge or to test theory. (Hoult, 1969:272).

A third definition of research to be examined is the one by Theodorson and Theodorson (1969). It is the most general one. They view research as:

...a systematic and objective attempt to study a problem for the purpose of deriving general principles. (Theodorson and Theodorson, 1969:347).

They further state that:

All honest attempts to study a problem systematically or to add to man's knowledge of a problem may be regarded as research. (Theodorson and Theodorson, 1969:347).

Extracting the main elements from all three definitions, it appears that the primary consideration in determining research is that it be a systematic approach to a problem. If,
for example, a person were concerned with the negative way in which people reacted to him and decided to change personalities each day for a set period to see what responses were evoked from others, he could, according to this definition, be said to be doing research. That would make social researchers much more numerous than is reflected in faculty and research institute membership rolls. On the other hand, if one increases the rigor of the definition by interpreting the term "systematic" to mean using the scientific method with its traditional hypothesis-test-generalization process, then it becomes too limiting. This requirement would force one to discard many of the early articles in social psychology, all descriptive studies, any articles making use of alternative methodologies such as participant observation, symbolic interaction, ethnomethodology, and any other studies utilizing types of post-hoc hypothesis research techniques. This would not be a desirable solution to the definition problem either. One way out of this dilemma between choosing a too general definition of research vs. one that is too rigid would be to omit from analysis primarily metatheoretical, state-of-the-discipline commentaries, and concentrate on articles with "data". A datum, broadly defined, is any fact or piece of information used in solving a problem. The term data must include both qualitative and quantitative data, or else important research traditions are slighted. The research article population is then defined as composed of articles which represent systematic attempts to study
social phenomena through the use of factual support. This definition would rule out purely methodological papers because the focus in this type of article is upon techniques of study and not social phenomena. This is a satisfactory criteria for inclusion of articles in the sample, because it enables one to retain a larger range of articles without eliminating information that reveals important historical traditions, and it also allows for changes in the definition of research over time. This was the research definition that was used to select articles for inclusion in the sample for the current research.

CONTENT ANALYSIS PROCEDURES

Content analysis is "...a multipurpose research method developed specifically for investigating a broad spectrum of problems in which the content of communication serves as the basis of inference." (Holsti, 1968:597). This research technique is chiefly a twentieth century phenomenon, with the major proportion of such studies falling in the post 1950 period in the social sciences (Holsti, 1968:607). This is the method that will be used in the current study to analyze disciplinary trends in social psychology. The content of research articles can be viewed as communication statements between the members of a discipline. It can be seen that an analysis of such a communication form would reveal the nature of the field itself. Sociologists and anthropologists are the most frequent users of content analysis methods, but only a handful of such studies specifically
address themselves to the issue of disciplinary trends. The most popular focus for these existent studies has been the analysis of literature citations, which is also called reference analysis (Tannenbaum and Greenberg, 1961; Shulman, 1972). Other studies have limited the focus to only one aspect of article analysis, such as article titles to determine shifts in the popularity of various substantive areas within a field (Becker, 1930; Becker, 1932; Shanas, 1945). In fact Holsti (1968), who wrote the most systematic description of content analysis research currently available, cites only one article dealing with the study of discipline trends using research articles which actually involves the analysis of qualitative and quantitative variables from within the body of the articles themselves. Studies of this sort make the collection of more valuable and complete information possible, and this is superior to a mere categorization of some more superficial characteristic of the article. This latter method may yield a larger amount of data in less time, but it does not really provide an overall picture of the field studied. For this reason, a more comprehensive analysis of research articles is undertaken in the current study. This project involves categorizing research articles in social psychology according to forty-four different variables, which are subsumed under four major areas of interest in the study: use of theory, causality, method, and citations. These major areas are significant aspects of the character of a discipline, and they provide the
discriminations necessary to the present focus of study in terms of the development of the sociological and the psychological branches of social psychology. The following section in this chapter describes these categories used in the content analysis procedure, along with the corresponding hypotheses for disciplinary trends.

Categories and Hypotheses. The various categories for the content analysis technique used in the present research are discussed in terms of their importance to the trend analysis, the key elements used for classification, and the predictions of their appearance over time and between journal populations.

Theory Use. It is proposed that types of theories developed and used in social psychology differ in the sociological and the psychological branch. Although there is obviously overlap, the popularity of various frameworks relates not only to the professional identity of the originator, but also to the basic orientation of the parent discipline itself. The frameworks that these theories or approaches fall under can be described by five types of theories typically used, or that have been used, over time in social psychological research: instinct-based theories, reinforcement theories, interactionist theories, perceptual theories, and cultural theories. The present system used in the analysis is one developed from a classification scheme proposed by Deutsch and Krauss for theories in social psychology. With regard to this theoretical breakdown and its
importance in the description of field orientations, Deutsch and Krauss state that:

In part, these special orientations reflect differing conceptions of the nature of man, and, in part, they direct attention to different aspects of the varied subject matter of social psychology. (Deutsch and Krauss, 1965:3).

These theoretical frameworks outlined by Deutsch and Krauss are: Gestalt, Field, reinforcement, psychoanalytic, and role theory. In the current system, Field and Gestalt theories were combined because of their similar historical roots and large overlap in orientation. The category "instinct" theory subsumes psychoanalytic theories, and is more descriptive as a framework used in social psychology. The Deutsch and Krauss designation of the category "role theory" is much more accurately labeled as interactionism, because this theoretical perspective needs to be broadened to include a greater number of similarly oriented theories. Furthermore, role theory is really a type of interactionist theory which attained popularity later on in social psychology. An additional category was added when it became necessary to find a place for structural or societal type theories used in social psychology. This category is labeled cultural theory, and includes anthropological, sociological, and subcultural theories.

Each article in the sample was categorized according to the theoretical framework that provided the main theoretical influence for the article perspective. Alternatives to the framework categorization were: no theory - if the article was merely
the presentation of descriptive information with no theoretical perspective applied; original theory— if the theory was original to the author and did not fall within any of the existent frameworks; theory critique— if the article only discusses or compares theories and does not attempt to test or support a single theory; microtheory— if the article involves testing a hypothesis that is not part of a larger framework (Deutsch and Krauss (1965) call this a "theory fragment"); and theoretical synthesis— if the article shows the use of a combination of previously existent theories into a new one which, however, is not original. Following is a discussion of each major framework along with a brief description of the theories included under each.

Instinct theories view social behavior as the product of innate, species-specific mechanisms which usually are perceived as being relatively unmodifiable by environmental factors. The most well-known of the instinct theories is Freudian psychoanalytic theory, and it is suggested that this will be the most used of the instinct theories. Other Freudian-type theories which would fall into this category are Jung's analytical psychology, and Adler's individual psychology. It is hypothesized that instinct theories will show popularity in early psychological social psychology, but will become much less important by the 1940's. During its period of popularity, instinct theory became merely a labelling exercise for habits. This category of theory was never very popular in the sociological social psychology
because its very propositions were anathema to this perspective where the social environment is perceived as the major shaper of behavior. Since the interdisciplinary Sociometry sample does not begin until the 1940-49 decade, it is doubtful whether instinct theory will make an appearance in the articles in this publication.

The reinforcement theory framework is currently a very popular approach in psychology. Learning theorists however, have only relatively recently become concerned with the social psychological aspects of this process (Deutsch and Krauss, 1965:77). It is therefore hypothesized that this category will show a greater frequency in occurrence after the mid-century mark in psychological social psychology. Since this framework is of psychological origin, the increase in use should be first in this branch, and later in the sociological branch. Sociological social psychologists showed great interest during the late 1960's in exchange theory, one of the subcategories of reinforcement theory, which is an adaptation of the principles of reinforcement theory applied to social interaction. Homans (1964), among others, has written of the promise of this approach for the analysis of all social behavior. It would seem that this type of learning theory should show a rise in use in the sociological branch during the 1960's. The trends in reinforcement theory for the interdisciplinary journal would fall most probably somewhere in between, i.e. appearing later than the AB sample and earlier than the AJS sample.
The interactionist framework has a long tradition in sociological social psychology dating from the 1900's and the theoretical contributions of James and Dewey. This approach has been the major contribution of this branch to theories of social psychology. It is therefore hypothesized that this framework will show much greater popularity in the AJS article sample. The 1930's was the period when the Mead-Cooley interactionist theory began to be a significant movement within sociology. This was the time when Mead's lectures were published by his students, and the Iowa school became prominent. It will be around this time that the increase in its use should occur. This framework has never really been integrated into the social psychology of the psychological branch, and it is proposed that this class of theory will not be a significant part of theory use in the AB article sample. It is difficult to predict how the interactionist framework will fare in the interdisciplinary sample. Interactionism is an interdisciplinary theory, in that it attempts to integrate psychological and social factors into a scheme which deals with the relationship of social meanings to thinking and behaving. In fact, Mead labels himself a "social behaviorist". However it is also true that the concept of self is more sociological in its origin, use, and implications. The corresponding term with very different origins, usage, and implications in psychology is the concept of the ego. If the interactionist approach is truly interdisciplinary, it will be one of the
predominant frameworks utilized in articles from this journal (*Sociometry*).

Perceptual theories have theoretical origins in the Gestalt tradition in nineteenth-century Germany. Lewin's Field theory also has German origins and contains many similarities with Gestalt psychology. From the Gestalt orientation grew the many cognitive theories, particularly attitudinal ones, which have been an important part of the research from the psychological branch of social psychology since the 1950's. Heider's Balance theory, a forerunner of later more complicated attitude dynamics models, was influential in placing the focus of social action explanation upon the internal workings of a consistency attainment and tension reduction force. It is argued here that most, if not all later theories are elaborations or slight revisions of the assumptions of a balance model (as examples, dissonance theories and attribution theories). This category of theory has increased in popularity in the psychological branch, and is beginning to filter into sociological social psychology more recently. It is hypothesized that this framework will be a dominant perspective used in the AB articles of contemporary (since 1960) origin. *Sociometry* articles in terms of theory use should also indicate this increase in use although less so than AB and more so than AJS articles.

The category of cultural theory constitutes a sociological perspective in its purest form as applied to social
psychology. This framework makes use of structural variables to explain social phenomena. Under this rubric fall anthropological, sociological, and subcultural theories. This approach subsumes perhaps a more varied combination of theories, however its historical origins also reach back to Germany and France. Various aspects of the theories of Durkheim, Marx, Lebon, and later on Parsons and Merton would appear under this theoretical banner, in terms of social psychological research approaches utilizing these theorists' perspectives. It is obvious that this framework should show its greatest frequency in the sociological branch of social psychology. It is doubtful whether such theories will be used at all in the psychological branch of social psychology. It is also expected that the cultural theory category will not show up significantly in the Sociometry article sample, because it does not constitute an interdisciplinary framework. In its usual form it is not a theoretical "bridging" possibility in terms of narrowing the gap between sociological social psychology and psychological social psychology.

In terms of overall trends in theory use among the three journal samples, it is hypothesized that the differences will decrease. If any argument for an increasing interdisciplinary movement is to be made, evidence such as this should be discernable in the results.

The vast majority of theories that have been used by social psychologists contain some underlying orientation or perspective toward the nature of human nature. Gamson and
Modigliani (1974) call these "images of man" and state that these images are usually implicit in the theories, yet are important components in the reflection of assumptions upon which these theories are based (Gamson and Modigliani, 1974: 1). This mode of article classification is designed to categorize these perspectives used by social psychologists, and to determine the extent to which these images have appeared over time in the branches of social psychology. Indicators of the image used in the article would be the type of theory or theories used by the researcher, the philosophical tone of the writer in terms of the way in which the material is presented and analyzed, and the general implied view of the motivating force for social behavior. Gamson and Modigliana (1974) have proposed four types of images that describe these orientations toward the nature of man: man the animal, man the profit seeker, man the symbol interpreter, and man the noble. An additional image was added to these four which has a legitimate existence as an alternative approach to human nature: man the cultural product. It is true that these images are often not diametrically opposed and can have some overlap. However, they are all discernably different conceptions, and they characterize an aspect of theory which is broader than just the labeled frameworks applied to social psychological research. Following is a brief description of the characteristics of each image and its projected use.

Man the animal as an image would apply to all
biologically-based views of human nature. This includes instinct theories as well as reinforcement theories. This image implies that the main trait determining human action is homo sapien's status as an animal. It is proposed that this image will show some use in the psychological branch, especially in the early periods of the sample.

The image projected by the label "man the profit seeker" is one of a human being motivated by the pleasure-pain paradigm. This approach or avoidance of positive and negative reinforcements is not based in simple animal drive responses. It is rather a more social conception of the hedonistic principle in which profits are translatable into social rewards. Certain types of reinforcement theories, as well as social exchange theories fall into this category. It is hypothesized that this image of man will be more prominent in psychological social psychology, but will also be an image used in the sociological sample of social psychological research.

The image of man the symbol interpreter is described by a focus upon man as an active participant in the interpretation of his environment. The approach is one in which the search for social meanings and their cognitive interpretation is a major factor guiding human social action. The main category of theories that fall under this type of image are those of the interactionist framework. Some of the cognitive theories in which the interpretive function is tied into the social arena would also apply to this image.
Balance theory has aspects of the symbolic interpretation of the social environment, as do some of the other consistency models (for example Osgood and Tannenbaum, 1955). It is hypothesized that this will be the dominant image utilized in the sociological social psychology sample. Because of its tie-in with cognitive theories, it is also proposed that this will be an important image for the psychological branch. Sociometry should also reflect this image use as a predominant approach. It is very "social psychological", because the social and psychological aspects of man are theoretically linked in a dynamic system representing this duality.

The image of man the noble entails a theoretical perception of a rational actor, often motivated by prosocial forces and seems to be based on the assumption that the individual is in control of his own actions. This provides a humanistic perspective on the nature of man. For this image, the individual is guided by prosocial tendencies, which can override the pleasure-pain principle of human action. The example that Gamson and Modigliani (1974) use to illustrate this approach is Abraham Maslow's self-actualization theory, which is based upon a conception of man that underscores positive traits such as creativity, spontaneity, and the desire to know. This outlook will not be a frequently used image in the articles under analysis. One reason is that there are not many theories with these types of assumptions about human nature in social psychology.

The image of man as a cultural product involves a
structural-sociological approach, where these factors operate directly upon the individual, unfiltered by interpersonal variables. A good example of the use of this image is one of the articles in the sample entitled "The effects of war upon the intelligence of youth" (De Groot, 1948), where the cultural condition is directly responsible for effecting the individual characteristic of I.Q. It is hypothesized that this will appear as an important image within the sociological branch, more so of the first few decades than those later on. This is because the symbol interpreter image took over in popularity in sociological social psychology when symbolic interaction theory became a significant framework in this subfield. It is further hypothesized that the cultural image will be little used, if at all, in psychological social psychology. The AB sample should reflect this. It is maintained that the interdisciplinary journal will not show much use of this perspective either.

Overall trends in the use of the various proposed images of man should show less discrepancy between the three journal samples and their corresponding branches over time. This would be in keeping with a movement toward somewhat greater homogeneity in the field of social psychology.

The final area to be studied which is classified under the theory use heading is that of substantive area. The purpose of obtaining such information is to see the distribution of subject areas that are most commonly studied in social psychology, in order to determine differences
between the samples of articles from the three journals used. It is hypothesized that such a difference exists. An examination of chapter headings used by psychological vs. sociological social psychology textbooks leads one to conclude that the areas of study in social psychology differ between the disciplines. For example, chapters on attitudes, personality, learning, and motivation are much more likely to appear in psychological social psychology texts than in sociological ones. Conversely, a sociological social psychology text is more apt to include chapters on the self concept, collective behavior, and culture and personality than a psychological one. These substantive areas are tied in to the theories used, because the perspectives many times dictate what are considered appropriate labels for topics of study. In this sense, the topics addressed reflect the approach. For example, leadership might be covered in social psychology texts in psychology as a personality trait, whereas a sociological text might treat leadership in terms of a group characteristic. The same general concepts can therefore be categorized by discipline into different substantive areas. The classifications for the twenty-one substantive areas were collected from those most frequently occurring in a sample of contemporary texts. They are listed in the content analysis appendix. In cases where the article falls into more than one substantive area, it is classified according to the main problem addressed in the introductory section of the article.
This variable of substantive area in the content analysis will be treated more descriptively, because specific predictions are difficult to make for the entire range of topics, time periods, and journals under study. In terms of more general statements about the distribution of substantive areas covered in the research topics addressed in social psychology, it can be said that more of the group-type categories (collective behavior, group dynamics, inter-group relations) will be characteristic of the AJS articles, while AB will be more likely to contain articles dealing with individual characteristics (personality, motivation, social perception, attitudes).

Causality. The issue of causality is of importance to all sciences because it functions as the core concept in describing how the scientist perceives the variables in his field of study, and consequently how these variables become arranged into the types of causal schemes that disciplines typically use. This is of especial importance to sociology and psychology as social sciences, because they are related disciplines which hold allegiance to different causal conceptions of the social environment and man's place in it. This has even greater relevance to social psychology, because it exists as a subfield of each discipline which very often studies the same phenomena, but makes use of very different variable schemes to describe them. It is hypothesized that the types of causal models and variables used are different for the two disciplinary branches of social
psychology, and these differences are reflective of the perspectives of the parent fields. The major focus of the causality issue as applied to the present research will be upon the use and types of independent variables utilized in social psychology. An independent variable will be defined as one:

...whose occurrence or change results in the occurrence or change in another variable (the dependent variable). (Theodorson and Theodorson, 1969:457).

The types of variables viewed as having independent properties have great import in social psychology because of a contemporary debate, particularly in sociology, over the problem of reduction (Deutsch, 1964; Homans, 1964; Brodbeck, 1968; Blain, 1971). Reductionism is "...the view that all explanations of social behavior are reducible to psychological or physiological explanations." (Theodorson and Theodorson, 1969:338). The reductionist perspective seems almost to deny the legitimacy of analysis at anything other than the individual level. This view obviously allocates causal pre-eminence to individual level analysis, which would put the study of social phenomena almost entirely in the hands of psychologists. Of course, this is a serious bone of contention for sociologists and social psychologists, because their task would become one of merely providing principles to link the social-structural to the more causally important individual level. In terms of the causality hierarchy this would make them as well as their field of study less crucial to the basic understanding of
human behavior. The reduction issue serves to illustrate exactly how important conceptions of causality are with respect to the scientific tasks taken on by a given discipline and their relation to the overall study of social behavior.

It is proposed that psychological social psychologists will be more likely to adopt the individual as an independent variable, while sociological social psychologists will show a greater tendency to attribute this variable label to the dynamics of the group situation. The content analysis results should show that the distribution of types of independent variables used in the sample articles from the journals selected varies along these lines. It is proposed that the Sociometry article sample will show a predominance of articles with independent variables of the interpersonal and group category. The AB sample will show a dominance of the individual as the independent variable, while AJS articles will be more likely to make use of group and societal-level variables as independent. The findings for this should provide crucial evidence for differentiating sociological from psychological social psychology.

In terms of the overall types of causal schemes used in social psychology, the content analysis includes the identification of the type of model used in the article, for example simple independent--dependent, multiple dependent, single intervening, etc. The purpose of including such a classification is to determine whether more complicated causal models became more popular over time along with the methods of statistical analysis, and whether there are
differences in model use among the three journal samples.

The concept of levels of analysis as applied to the current research is used to refer to the categories describing different types of implied causal-theoretical connecting links made by the social psychological researcher. These connections, whether manifestly stated or implied within the body of the article, relate the conceptual units under examination in terms of the level of the mode of explanation (the causally implied independent variable), and its effect upon the object of explanation (the dependent variable). The present analysis makes use of three levels to describe conceptual loci which are used by social psychologists for the explanation of social behavior: the societal, the interpersonal, and the individual. The societal level includes the structural and processual characteristics of society. The interpersonal level constitutes the interactional and situational context within which individuals act toward each other. The individual level refers to the organism as a thinking and behaving unit. Needless to say, these levels are in actuality distinctly separable only in terms of the present superimposed lines of division drawn. These categories of level relationships serve to describe real conceptual differences between the subfields as well as succinctly illustrate an important theoretical characteristic of a research article. Following is a list of the proposed levels of analysis used in the present content analysis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode of Explanation</th>
<th>Object of Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. societal----------societal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. societal----------interpersonal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. societal----------individual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. interpersonal----------societal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. interpersonal----------interpersonal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. interpersonal----------individual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. individual----------societal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. individual----------interpersonal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. individual----------individual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The concept of levels of analysis as applied to the current research content analysis relates to the previously discussed reduction issue because it is this general type of causal perception that describes the different causal approaches and consequently the reduction position of the branches of social psychology.

It is hypothesized that the first three categories will be most frequently occurring in the articles from the AJS sample. Sociometry articles will make use of levels three through six, and AB will show a predominance of levels seven through nine. Level one is theoretically a "pure" sociology perspective, and level nine would be pure psychology in terms of causal conceptions. It will be interesting to see how these journal samples change or remain stable over time. If the integration of sociological social psychology and psychological social psychology is in process, then the distributions should move toward a more genuinely
interdisciplinary approach.

**Methods of Data Analysis.** The types of methods selected by the researcher for doing social psychological research are linked to different disciplinary approaches. Statistical techniques for data analysis also function as indicators of differing orientations toward social psychology as well as traditions within the parent discipline itself. The presently discussed content analysis section is designed to categorize systematically these different methods of analysis used in the sample articles in order to determine their appearance across time for the three journals, describe their developmental characteristics in terms of time-bound traditions, and provide between-journal comparisons. The technique for classification of these methods is a modification of one developed by Riley (1963) for categorizing sociological research designs. Alterations and additions were made in the Riley system in order to make the model more appropriate to social psychological precision and add necessary information. The method categories are discussed in order of their appearance in the content analysis.

The classification system used for the article type category is a slightly revised form of one designed and tested by Goodman (1972). This system makes use of four categories "...to place each paper on a scale ranging from post hoc to purposive selection and recording of data, from subjective to objective material." (Goodman, 1972:61-62). Following is a description of the four categories for
article type used for the current research.

The subjective category includes papers reporting observations of a general nature based on the personal experience of the author. Data consists of anecdotal illustration, casual references to experience in practice and incomplete case descriptions used as examples of a principle. The author uses observations to support or illustrate statements, rather than drawing conclusions directly from the incidents described. The case study is a developmentally higher form of research and the focus is usually upon a case(s) or instance(s) of a particular phenomenon. The empirical data reported usually consists of a full description and more complete information on which one could better judge the validity of the generalizations made. Next in the developmental sequence of article type is the sample paper which is based on observations of a specified sample or series of cases chosen especially in order to derive statements of fact. Characteristics of the sample are specified and representativeness considered important for generalizability. The final category is labeled controlled, and includes papers in which observations are based on a controlled study of a sample. Relevant variables are defined and controlled. Methods used by the researcher can be either experimental, involving the manipulation of variables, or differential using comparison of samples. If the article falls between, or makes use of techniques falling into two categories, it should be coded for the higher one.
The reliability of this system of article classification which Goodman (1972) used to apply to categorize articles in marriage counseling research is calculated using comparison with two coders for a sample of the total articles. The obtained percent agreements are 83% and 75%. The reliability obtained for the current study for a sample of articles compares with the Goodman (1972) results. The percent agreement is 80%. The percent resulting if the two Goodman (1972) estimates were averaged would be 79%.

Goodman states that:

The history of the natural sciences displays a general developmental pattern which starts with description and classification of phenomena and then proceeds in the direction of experimental control. Scientific sophistication is commonly evaluated in terms of how closely research approaches the use of techniques such as precise formulation of hypotheses, careful control of variables, systematic selection of observations, quantification and statistical analysis of data, and deliberate effort to replicate findings. The same trends may be identified for many branches of the social sciences. Indeed, it is widely agreed that one indication of the level of development within a field is the extent to which that field has developed a rigorous and appropriate research methodology. (Goodman, 1972:6).

It is proposed that if classification according to this system constitutes one of scientific sophistication, then, because psychology is generally viewed as higher up than sociology in the "hard" science hierarchy, psychological social psychology should show this tendency through the article type category results. The Sociometry sample should show trends midway between the two branches then, if they equally contribute to determining the nature of the
total field. The overall trend for the article type category should be from the type 1 or subjective paper to the type 4 or controlled, in terms of change over time in the total sample.

The nature of the research case pertains to the description of the unit being studied by the researcher. There are four main categories of units studied: the individual, the group, society, and inter-societal. In order to classify the article according to these criteria, it is necessary to determine exactly what unit of analysis in the social realm is the object of study for the researcher. The group category in this section is further divided into interactive or aggregative. Interaction groups are classified as either natural or artificial (ad hoc). Aggregative groups are classified into nine categories: racial, ethnic, political, economic, religious, occupational, classroom, activity-centered, and cultural.

The classification of the research case type should be revealing in terms of the types of units of study characterizing sociological and psychological social psychology. It is proposed that the unit selected in the former branch more likely will be the group or society, whereas the latter subdiscipline should be more apt to use the individual as the unit. It is hypothesized that the articles from the interdisciplinary journal will reflect a tendency to deal with the group as a
unit of study, because the interdisciplinary approach to social psychology would theoretically constitute a interpersonal focus.

The number of cases included in the analysis for each article is included in order to check for disciplinary differences. It is hypothesized that sociological social psychologists will use a larger sample size because of the sociological research tradition of focusing upon larger conceptual units, which logically contain a greater number of individuals. Also, methodological traditions have characteristically placed greater emphasis on representativeness, and its relationship to sample size is one aspect of this concern.

The basis for sample selection is the next variable described in the content analysis discussion. The sociological emphasis upon external validity previously mentioned affects the selection requirements for sample taking. Again, representativeness has historically been considered much more of a crucial criterion for research in sociology and consequently should also be characteristic of sociological social psychology. Therefore the representational sample category should be more frequently occurring in this branch than in psychological social psychology. The trend in sociological social psychology should be toward a greater concern with generalizability of findings. Consequently, more articles with this type of sampling technique will occur over time. The analytical sample, also called the
purposive sample, is usually based upon the selection of a particular sample for some specified theoretical reason. It is proposed that this type of case selection will be more characteristic of the earlier articles in the field as a whole, rather than specifically reflective of different disciplinary orientations. The availability sample is typically composed of university undergraduates, usually sophomores in an introductory course. This sample is in no sense random, and the chief concern of the researcher who makes use of this type of sampling is more with internal validity than the generalizability of the study results. Psychologists have traditionally used this subject pool for experimentation. The interdisciplinary article sample probably will be more likely to indicate this type of case selection than the AJS sample. The accidental sample is a non-probability sample in which the researcher has little or no idea of the population parameters. This type of sample has been more of a contemporary phenomena because it is closely tied with modern naturalistic or field experiments. An example of the accidental sample would be a study where the population supplying the data for the research would be individuals leaving a particular store on a Friday afternoon, or who make two dollar bets at the racetrack. One can make some educated guesses about the characteristics of individuals who would typically be at these sites for data collection, but little factually supportive evidence is usually supplied.
In terms of overall trends for the journal samples, it is hypothesized that the most popular type of case selection for AJS will be the representational sample, and, for AB and Sociometry, it will be the availability sample.

The treatment of time within the research frame reflects the different temporal perspectives of social psychology in sociology and psychology. Psychological social psychology would be more likely to carry out research in a static context. In other words, the data and the generalizations which it is based upon are taken at one point in time. In contrast to this, the dynamic study is more concerned with changes over time in the research phenomena under study. The processual aspects of the study of social situations evolving over time is incorporated into the research design or at least is discussed with reference to the findings in an attempt to integrate temporal changes into the analysis and discussion. It is maintained that the static research design is more often used in the psychological branch, while sociological social psychologists are more likely to utilize dynamic research models. The interdisciplinary sample should probably fall at some intermediate point in this time scheme.

The type of control attained by the researcher falls into two categories: control over extraneous variables, and control over independent variables. Extraneous variables are those variables which are not pertinent to the hypothesis under study, but which might possibly alter the results.
Control over extraneous variables, according to its degree (systematic, unsystematic, no control) can be attained through the process of randomization of subjects or units to experimental research conditions, or through control of the variables in the environmental situation in terms of selecting a laboratory setting or any other site where the researcher can obtain fixed conditions. Statistical control over extraneous variables is usually done post facto, and involves the use of mathematical techniques, such as partial correlation to hold certain conditions constant which might have affected the findings. A third method for obtaining systematic control over extraneous variables is theoretical. Through the systematic discussion of the extraneous variables which might have affected the results, the researcher can rule out or compensate for such variables.

Control over independent variables, when it is systematically applied, can be done through two methods: experimental manipulation of the independent variable, or categorical assignment in order to select certain post facto variables as independent. The former technique is most characteristic of psychology. Most experimental studies in this field use this method in order to vary the designated independent variable (holding other conditions constant), and then measure any changes resulting from this variance. On the other hand, sociologists often handle independent variables after data collection by assigning them to categories, in order to separate certain variables conceptualized
as containing the independent property. These techniques for attaining control are not necessarily arrangeable into a hierarchy of scientific development. They indicate preferences in establishing control, and show different areas of concern to researchers. The nature of the data that researchers from the two fields work with has some effect upon the type of control possible or desirable. For example, a psychological social psychologist is more likely to be dealing with the laboratory experiment and randomization, and experimental manipulation of independent variables is most suited to this mode of study. The sociological social psychologist is more likely to deal with cross-sectional data from questionnaire responses, and therefore can choose to use statistical techniques and categorical assignment to establish the desired control factor.

The category sources of data, has relevance to the current research, because this is a possible differentiator of the two branches of social psychology. Within the sources of data category there are four classifications: new data, old data, hypothetical data, and some combination of these categories. The new data category constitutes data collected by the researcher for the specific purpose of the study. Old data can be of three types: archival, data banks, or case histories. Archival data usually involves library research and collection. The category data banks refers to information gleaned from data storage collections for general use, and case histories are usually classic cases in the
literature. The hypothetical data category is the type usually used to illustrate a point or theory and will be more frequently used in earlier social psychology. It is hypothesized that the new data category will generally be the dominant category in contemporary social psychology. It is further specified that sociological social psychology will be more likely to make use of data banks. The use of case histories will be more characteristic of earlier psychological social psychology, and should disappear as a technique for data collection by the 1940's.

The previous variable of sources of data applies to one aspect of data gathering. The more specific methods for the collection of research data relates to how the data is collected rather than where it comes from. Under this rubric are three categories of interest: observation techniques in terms of the role of the researcher in data gathering, types of self-report measures used, and the setting within which the data collection took place. Junker (1952) proposes four roles that the researcher can take with respect to the social situation he is attempting to examine: the complete observer, the observer as participant, the participant as observer, and the complete participant. These categories have to do with the degree of involvement characteristic of the researcher. It is proposed that the most dominant role taken by the researcher will be the complete observer. There will be a slightly greater tendency for psychological social psychologists to employ this technique
than sociological social psychologists. Participant obser-
vation, and methods developed in sociology for data gathering
has a following within the discipline and especially among
social psychologists who describe themselves as symbolic in-
teractionists. However, this will not be the significant
category (observer as participant, participant as observer,
and complete participant) for the field.

Self report measures fall into five main headings:
interview, questionnaire, indicator, projective test, and
apparatus. The interview as a self report technique will be
a more common method used in earlier social psychology, but
will retain its popularity in the sociological branch much
later than in the other journals. The questionnaire has
been popular in both psychological and sociological social
psychology. It is adaptable to both the experimental study
as well as cross-sectional research. The indicator or in-
strument test, which is more specific a form of the ques-
tionnaire and usually tests only one characteristic, will be
more frequently occurring in psychological social psycholo-

The projective test has historically been more popu-
lar in psychology and, therefore will show up as a technique
more significantly in psychological social psychology. The
apparatus category is still a self report technique, but it
does not require active participation by the subject, and
therefore can be less obtrusive. Machines that measure
heart beat, electrical conductivity of the skin, or arousal
fall into this category. In terms of overall disciplinary
differences, it is proposed that the most popular technique used in the psychological branch will be the indicator, followed by the apparatus. In sociological social psychology the most frequent category will be the questionnaire, followed by the interview. It will be interesting to see where the Sociometry article sample falls in terms of this variable. The most popular technique used in this sample will probably be the indicator.

The research setting includes six sub-categories: laboratory, classroom, field, arm chair, institution, and clinical. The laboratory category can include laboratory-type situations where the environment is controlled in some significant manner. Field or naturalistic settings constitute the least obtrusive research settings. The arm chair category, while not an actual site for data collection, was included to describe more predominantly theoretical articles. The institution category includes penal, mental, military, and religious institutions as sites of study.

It is hypothesized that the most popular research settings for psychological social psychology will be the laboratory and the clinical settings. The methodological traditions in this field would make this prediction logical. The most popular categories for the sociological branch will be the classroom and the institutional atmosphere. In terms of overall trends for social psychology as a field, it is hypothesized that the arm chair will show some popularity in early social psychology (20's and 30's), but will be much
less frequently occurring later on. It is further hypothesized that the field category will be most popular in early social psychology, leave the disciplinary scene and then not reappear until the late sixties and early seventies. This is because the naturalistic study has recently received some support from social psychologists along with the increasing concern with the effects of observation upon the social situation observed. Therefore in order to cope with the effects of the observer, social psychologists of both extractions have been more amenable to this type of situation because of its unobtrusiveness characteristic.

The techniques used by various social psychologists for data analysis have differed between branches as well as over time for the total sample. It is difficult to specifically outline hypotheses with regard to this category, because such analyses of comparative use of data analysis are rare. It is important to examine this variable because it is historically important to the development of social psychology and the problem of the researcher's selection of such analysis techniques. The articles are classified here with respect to the major technique used to test the main hypotheses proposed by the researcher. Two main categories for data analysis are verbal description techniques for reporting data vs. the use of statistical analysis. Studies using verbal description can be either systematic or unsystematic. The subcategories for the techniques of statistical analysis used in the content analysis are based on
distinctions made by Loether and McTavish (1974). Statistical techniques can use primarily either descriptive statistics or inferential statistics. Descriptive statistics include summary measures such as percent or measures of central tendency, and correlational techniques which are divided into simple correlation measures and complex correlation. See the appropriate section of the content analysis appendix for a summary of these subtypes of correlation measures. The inferential techniques include analysis of variance, chi square, and the t-test. It is hypothesized that an overall trend in methods for handling data results will be described by a general transition from descriptive studies to statistical techniques. It is further hypothesized that sociological social psychology will be more likely to show the use of chi square, while the t-test is a psychological statistic. The most popular inferential technique in contemporary social psychology will be analysis of variance, with correlational techniques a close second for sociological social psychology and psychological social psychology. There should also be a general trend within statistical technique usage from descriptive statistics to inferential.

**Citation Analysis.** The final section of the content analysis system used for the current research project involves an examination of reference use and article authorship. The references cited by researchers from the different branches of social psychology will differ in terms of the
types of journals used, the proportion of books in the total literature cited, and the total number of such citations in the reference section of the article. It is proposed that the AJS sample will show a slight tendency toward a greater use of books, a greater general use of references, and a tendency to cite sociological journals. Sociologists tend to deal with broader and more diffuse theoretical issues and are more likely to bring in historical material in their research. This would contribute to the predicted greater reference use in sociological social psychology. The psychological social psychology sample from AB will generally show a greater use of journals, more specifically those in psychology, less use of books, and a smaller average number of citations per article. It is hypothesized that interdisciplinary journals will be more likely to be cited in the Sociometry journal, followed by AJS. AB will contain the smallest proportion of literature citations from interdisciplinary journals. The overall trend in social psychology will be from books to journal citations. This category of analysis is important in the determination of interdisciplinary influences in the branches of social psychology. It is obvious that the general tendency within a field is one of familiarity with, and hence citation of, primarily references from one's own field of study. However, social psychology is an interdisciplinary science and therefore should evidence influences from the adjacent field. It is proposed that as far as interdisciplinary influences in
literature citation are concerned, if adjacent field citations occur, they will more likely do so in sociological social psychology. The Sociometry article sample will show a slightly greater tendency to cite journal articles from the psychological branch, rather than the sociological.

The disciplinary affiliations of the authors of social psychology articles is included in the citation analysis section to determine whether there is any "crossing over" between sociological social psychologists and psychological social psychologists. This variable was categorized according to the departmental membership of the author of the article. It is maintained that in cases where this does happen, it will be more likely that a psychologist will publish in AJS than the reverse case (a sociologist publishing in AB). The reason for this is the implicit "hard science" hierarchy in which psychology supersedes sociology. The authors from the two disciplines should be equally distributed in the Sociometry sample, if the journal is truly interdisciplinary. The senior author affiliation category will also measure the proportion of articles submitted by individuals outside the academic arena: research institutes, government organizations, or industry. It will also be interesting to see whether any interdisciplinary authorship (a psychologist and a sociologist as joint authors) is present. The location of the author was also included in the analysis. The purpose of including this was to examine the spatial distribution of social psychological research as a whole
over time, as well as to determine differences between journal sample populations. For example, it is a general belief among sociological social psychologists that many important contributions in social psychology came from the Midwest in the thirties and forties from the Chicago and Iowa schools of symbolic interaction. The findings should determine the validity of this belief. It will be interesting to see which areas of the country contributed most significantly to social psychological research.

One additional measure is taken of the number of pages per article. This obviously is not a crucial variable in the study of a discipline. However this author was curious to find out if the accusation of psychologists that sociologists are "wordier" than psychologists had any factual basis. The implicit assumption behind it is that an overemphasis on theoretical discussion to the detriment of "hard data" collection is a characteristic of sociological researcher and their publications.

The current description of the content analysis categories used in the present research is necessary to the discussion of each related hypothesis proposed for this study of social psychology. For this reason, the theoretical and methodological discussions are integrated into a single chapter. Each content analysis variable is tied to an aspect of the theoretical perspective for the research, and consequently, it is necessary that they be jointly discussed.
Reliability. An inter-observer reliability check utilizing a random sample of thirty-five articles from the overall sample was undertaken. The second scorer was a graduate student trained in psychology. Selecting a judge with psychological disciplinary training served as an additional check for possible "disciplinary bias" by the present researcher.

The percent agreement scores for each individual variable of interest in the content analysis are listed in Table 2.2. All but six variables from the original content analysis format were retained. The variables dropped from the analysis because of low reliability scores were: type systematic control over independent variables, theoretical framework alternatives, type interactionist theory, type perceptual theory, and type complex causal model. Where relevant, these variables will be mentioned with a notation of their low reliability levels.

The overall reliability score obtained was 80.7. Given the conceptual complexity of the material, and the different disciplinary backgrounds of the judges, this was viewed as an acceptable level.
Table 2.2 Inter Observer Reliability Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>% Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit Studied</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type Group Studied</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type Interacting Group</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type Natural Group</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type Aggregative Group</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Cases</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Selection</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Over Extraneous Variables</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Over Independent Variables</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources of Data</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type Old Data</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation Method</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Report Method</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Setting</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type Descriptive Method</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type Statistical Method</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type Descriptive Statistics</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type Summary Measure</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type Correlation Measure</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type Simple Correlation</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type Complex Correlation</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type Inferential Statistic</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method of Handling Group Properties</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical Framework</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type Instinct Theory</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type Reinforcement Theory</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantive Area</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image of Man</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type Causal Model</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variable Label</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable Label</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Independent Variables</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Dependent Variables</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Intervening Variables</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Variable Type</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Analysis</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total References</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Journals</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociological Journals</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Journals</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary Journals</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Books</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article Type</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

overall reliability = 80.7
CHAPTER III

THEORY USE

The current chapter on theory use includes a discussion of the major theoretical frameworks used in social psychology during the period of interest, the images of man portrayed in the articles, and the substantive areas most frequently addressed by social psychologist researchers. These three areas represent different aspects of theory use in terms of the theories themselves, the images they imply, and the topics in social psychology to which they are applied.

MAJOR THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS

The five major theoretical frameworks selected for inclusion in the content analysis were chosen to demonstrate the influence of varied perspectives for the different journal categories over time. It has been hypothesized that their use will differ according to the influences emanating from the parent disciplines, and that the interdisciplinary approach of articles in Sociometry should in most cases (with previously specified exceptions) show trends intermediate to both sociological social psychology and psychological social psychology.

The categories of theory included do seem to represent the major trends. The results show that an average of 88% of the articles from AJS fall into one of the five
frameworks, 82% of the articles from AB and 65% of the articles from Sociometry. The combined data for all three journal categories shows that an average of 80% of the total articles in the sample fall into one of the five frameworks.

The lower score for Sociometry articles is due to a slightly greater tendency for articles to fall into the categories of no theory, original theory, or micro theory. A probable explanation for this tendency is one which centers around the influence of the journal's founder, J. L. Moreno. His theoretical contribution to social psychology is in the area of sociometry, a theory as well as a technique for studying social interaction (see Moreno, 1945, for a description of sociometric theory by its creator). Sociometry theory and technique did seem to have some early effect on the journal contents. However, its influence as a separate perspective dropped out by the 1940's. This is because the later adopters of sociometry either used it purely as a methodological technique devoid of theory—hence the slight increase in "no theory" articles, or incorporated it into one of the other theoretical frameworks, most likely the perceptual or interactionist theories.

A brief note here about Moreno's sociometric theory is relevant. This theory shows influences from three of the major theoretical perspectives in social psychology: the Gestalt school in terms of the importance of the conceptualization of the "whole" of social interaction; interactionism in terms of the focus upon the dynamics of the
social process; and behaviorism in terms of the external ob-
servation and interpretation of interaction. Yet sociome-
tric theory does not clearly qualify as a theoretical syn-
thesis because Moreno contributed an original interpretation
of social interaction and its dynamics. He made the struc-
tural study of social relations possible by outlining a
technique for its systematic description. He proposed the
concept of "tele" to describe the force or forces operating
upon the interactants in a social group (this does have some
distinct philosophical leanings in the direction of Lewinian
field theory). But most importantly, Moreno created the
possibility of the marriage of theory and methodology into a
consistent approach for the study of social behavior. While
it is true that Moreno's sociometry does not show the full-
ness of a comprehensive theory of social behavior that some
of the other perspectives attempt to approach, it is a "pure"
social psychological theory. Sociometric theory focusses
almost exclusively on the interpersonal level in terms of
both explanatory independent variables and objects of expla-
nation (Moreno, 1947).

Returning to the appearance of various theory frame-
works in social psychology, Figure 3.1 depicts the trends
in frameworks by the three journal categories. The results
are presented in terms of the percent of the articles for
the particular journal and decade that fell into each of the
five theoretical frameworks. The first graph represents the
use of the instinct theory frameworks during the six decades
Figure 3.1 Trends in the Use of the Five Major Theoretical Frameworks in Per Cent of Journal Sample Per Decade
under study for the **American Journal of Sociology** (AJS), the **Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology** (AB), and **Sociometry** (Sociom.). It can be seen that instinct theory remains rather unimportant as a perspective for AJS and Sociometry articles. For the psychological branch of the discipline, instinct theory begins a steep decline from relative popularity in the 1920's, levels off between 1940 and 1969, and drops out of sight entirely for the 1970-74 period. The first two decades of the twentieth century are generally recognized as a time during which instinct type theories—most importantly Freudian, experienced great popularity. The proliferation of different labels for new instincts at this time reached such proportions that nearly every type of behavior was seen as the product of some new instinct. E. A. Ross, for example, discusses the instincts for pugnacity, gregariousness, and construction (of buildings) in his *Social Psychology* (1908). It must have finally become obvious that merely giving a name to certain classes of behaviors perceived as instinct-motivated added no additional explanatory information to its understanding.

The Freudian psychoanalytic framework was the major instinct framework used by the authors of articles in this tradition. In the 1920-29 period, six of the eight articles using instinct theory took this approach to the phenomena under study. For the next five periods from which data was taken, the psychoanalytic perspective with one exception
(one article in 1965) was the instinct theory used. Although the Freudian framework in social psychology may appear to be somewhat short-lived as an important theory perspective in social psychology, the influence of Freudian conceptualizations is actually more far-reaching. Concepts such as the unconscious, ego defense mechanisms, id impulses, and the superego all are familiar to social psychologists. Many later theorists took Freudian concepts and applied or reinterpreted them into later frameworks or micro theories. Humanistic psychology arose out of the Freudian framework and such theorists as Abraham Maslow, Erik Erikson, and Erich Fromm built their theories upon a Freudian foundation. The incorporation of the frustration-aggression hypothesis into motivational psychology, and Freudian defense mechanisms into certain perceptual and attitudinal theories, are additional examples of the pervasive Freudian influence in social psychology.

Reinforcement theory appears to have become more important in psychological social psychology as Freudian theory decreased in popularity. The graph in Figure 3.1 shows that reinforcement theory begins a steady rise in popularity in AB beginning in 1940, and continues at the same rate through the 1970-74 period. For AJS, this framework does not show any significant appearance in any of the decades studied. Much has been made of the promise of exchange theory for taking the precepts of psychological learning theory and making them appropriate to social levels of analysis (Homans,
1964; Thibaut and Kelley, 1959; Blau, 1964). The distribution of types of reinforcement theory used in articles in the sample shows that only in Sociometry during the 1960-69 decade does exchange theory appear at all. The sixties is the period when this theory was being discussed in sociology and social psychology, and it does represent the type of reinforcement theory of both articles in the sample from Sociometry during that decade. It is clear that in this case we are dealing with too small a number of articles to establish any conclusions. It is interesting that the findings for the sample of Sociometry articles correlate with the appearance of exchange theorists on the disciplinary scene in the social sciences. Skinnerian learning theory as a type of reinforcement perspective shows a clear rise to importance in AB between 1950 and 1959. During this time all the articles which use the reinforcement perspective are Skinnerian in approach. For the following period, 1960-69, only one of the five articles categorized as reinforcement-oriented falls into the Skinnerian framework, and none of the articles occurring between 1970 and 1974 uses Skinnerian learning theory. What plausibly occurs here is that, while the popularity of reinforcement theory in psychological social psychology is on the rise, no one of the major theories dominates. Instead we have the condition where there are a number of microtheories of learning, all based on general reinforcement principles, but with greater specificity and methodological rigor. Also, the tendency to cite or give
theoretical credit only to the most contemporary theoretical mentors is a relatively recent policy of current reporters of social science research. This practice functions to give the appearance of originality and newness to theoretical contributions, while effectively erasing the influence credit for the authors of the original idea. This does not mean, of course, that there are no new ideas, just reinterpretations or additions to old ones, for there are many novel ideas constantly being introduced into the field. It does, however, illustrate the point that mainstream theoretical frameworks may sometimes appear to vanish completely from the scene when the real situation is one of a narrowness of theoretical scope in the researcher's review of the literature.

The interactionist perspective has historically been conceived as most important in influencing sociological social psychology. The results for the interactionist framework are shown in Figure 3.2. The trend for the AJS articles using interactionist theory seems to be one of a small increase in appearance which reaches a peak in the 1950's, and then begins a steady decline up to the 1970-74 period. For the AB sample articles, interactionist theory remains at a fairly stable but somewhat low level over time with a small upward climb for the 1970-74 period. The interactionist perspective in the Sociometry article sample shows a dominance of the theoretical market in the 1940-49 period. During this time, seventy-five per cent of the total number of Sociometry
articles using the major frameworks were interactionist in approach. From this level, the per cent declines to a low of 33% in the 1960's, and then turns upward again from 1970-74. Interactionist theory is the most used framework for the interdisciplinary journal, and appears to have been an important influence upon the research perspectives. It also appears that overall interactionism does constitute a significant theoretical perspective for social psychology as a whole. This is true most importantly in the sociological journal and the interdisciplinary one, but also for the psychological one.

As far as the types of interactionist theory and their distribution over time for the three journals, it should be pointed out that the obtained reliability was very low. The agreement level for the interactionist theory categories was only 55%. Any discussion of these particular findings should be done with this in mind. The use of the various subcategories of interactionist theory show no clear differences. The mainlain Meadian approach is the most popular for the AJS and AB articles, while Parsons-Bales structural functionalism is the one which has been most used in Sociometry articles. The rest of the articles using the interactionist framework seem to be relatively equally distributed, with role theory showing a slight edge over the others.

Perceptual theory with its foundations in the Gestalt psychology of nineteenth century Germany is the most
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important theoretical perspective in psychological social psychology in the 1940's. The Sociometry articles seem to make use of this framework somewhat more than those in AJS. Articles from the AB journal category using a perceptual-type framework after reaching their high in the 1940's, decline and level off by the 1970-74 period. Similar to the case of the interactionist perspective in sociological social psychology, perceptual theory still plays a role in psychological social psychology. It is interesting to note that all three journals meet at the same point for the 1970-74 decade, perhaps denoting the equal degree of acceptance of the perceptual approach by all three branches, or more provocatively, evidence for a greater homogeneity in the discipline of social psychology itself. This point is further discussed later on in this section.

The final theoretical framework examined is of sociological origin, so it is not surprising that it is the dominant framework utilized in the sociological branch of social psychology. Cultural theory, as can be seen from an examination of the graph illustrating the trends for this category of theory, has shown rather consistent popularity with the sociological branch. Sociologically oriented theories representing structural approaches to the explanation of interpersonal phenomena form a logical link with the parent discipline. The trend for AJS articles indicates that this framework increased in relative importance up to the 1960's and then showed a modest decrease in use (from
Figure 3.3
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57% to 47%) for the last period under study. The trends for AB and Sociometry articles in this category are more similar, although cultural theory is used more in Sociometry articles as a whole. For AB, cultural theory is more popular in the early two decades of the sample, and then nearly disappears. Cultural theory does play an important part in theory use in AB.

Viewing the overall results for the distribution of theoretical framework use over the six decades for the three journal categories, some statements can be made about the differences and similarities of patterns of theory. As far as selecting dominant trends for each journal category, there are some discernable differences between the sociological and psychological branches of social psychology. For the AB articles it can be said the psychological social psychology went through three phases in theory popularity. The first period is the instinct period which lasts from 1920 to 1940. This phase is followed by the rise to popularity of perceptual theory during the 1940's. The last phase in psychological social psychology theory use is the reinforcement theory. Reinforcement theory increased in appearance in the articles in the AB sample from the 1940's to the present period of social psychology.

The two most popular theoretical frameworks for the AJS articles representing the sociological branch of social psychology are the interactionist and cultural theories. The 1950's is the decade during which the interactionist
framework evidences its greatest popularity. However, the cultural theory category is the main one of influence in sociological social psychology for all six periods of study.

Sociometry articles show trends over time that are intermediate to the psychological and sociological branches, with the exception of interactionist theory which is more predominant here than in the other two journal categories. This provides some evidence that the journal does represent its professed interdisciplinary perspective, and incorporates trends in both subfields equally.

With regard to the issue of the direction of past and present trends in social psychology as a whole, some movement toward a greater homogeneity of perspective is discernable in the findings. Two theoretical frameworks for which this does not hold are the reinforcement and the cultural theory perspectives. Although the lines on the graphs representing these trends are not moving in opposite directions, which would be an indication of no future convergence, they are not rapidly approaching each other. For the instinct, interactionist, and perceptual theoretical frameworks, the trends are more similar in the last period of study. Instinct theories have virtually disappeared from the scene for all three journal results. It is interesting to view the overall trends in relation to each other for the perceptual and interactionist perspectives. These two categories of theories seem to be bridging approaches to the study of interpersonal dynamics, one sociological in origin,
one psychological. These two frameworks provide key evidence for a future merging of theory in the two branches of social psychology. Perhaps the development of theoretical combinations which take central variables and assumptions of both perspectives will occur in the future. This is a real possibility because interactionism contains perceptual elements, and perceptual theory can be amenable to certain interactionist conceptions.

IMAGE OF MAN

The images of man (man the animal, man the noble, man the profit seeker, man the cultural product, and man the symbol interpreter) reflected in the articles present an interesting picture of discrepant views of the nature of human organism. Figure 3.4 depicts the two least popular conceptions of this image: man the animal, and man the noble. These constitute the two most opposing images of human nature in the categories used. As predicted, man the animal shows some early popularity in the AB sample correspondent with the instinct theory findings for the same journal. Figure 3.4 shows the distributions of image in percent of the total article sample for each journal for a given decade. After its drop from a high of 60% in the 1920-30 decade, the image of man as animal fades from the scene, showing only a small increase in appearance in the sixties. The three journal samples look virtually the same after 1950. It seems that this image of man has not been an important one reflected in the orientations of authors of articles since
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this time in social psychology. Man the noble as an article image remains at a low usage level throughout the time frame of the current study. Slight upward trends for the 1970-74 period are discernable for AB and AJS, but all three journals show much similarity in general distribution format. Man the noble and man the animal present quite different perspectives on human nature as perceived by social psychologists. Neither is a predominant image used in social psychology. Perhaps this is because the social scientist realizes that man is basically not totally animal nor god-like, and image orientations which take this into account are hence more palatable to the social psychologist. These two images can be better viewed as human action potentials, rather than as predispositional givens.

The next two images, man the profit seeker and man the cultural product, are shown in trend form in Figure 3.5. They reveal different assumptions about what forces guide human behavior. For the profit seeker image, it is the desire to accrue rewards and avoid losses. These rewards can be in many forms, for example positive self regard, or a feeling of altruism, and not just in terms of more concrete exchanges such as monetary or other goods and services that are objectively calculable. The use of this image shows the greatest overall popularity in the AB sample beginning with the 50's period. The AB sample contains a sharp upward trend to the present period and one would predict that this would continue to gain in the future. The Sociometry sample
Figure 3.5  Trends in the Use of the Images of Man the Profit Seeker and Man the Cultural Product
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shows a similar upward trend from the 1940's to the 1960's, and then drops sharply for the 1970-74 period. For the AJS article sample, the profit seeker image never is very frequently occurring over the years of the sampling.

Man the cultural product as an article image was most consistently occurring in AJS article up until the 1970's. During this time the cultural image as an orientation drops to the levels of the other two journals. This image depicts man as significantly affected by the cultural context in which he has been socialized. Therefore the characteristics of the culture become reflected in the individuals that compose it. It is obvious that this is a more sociological interpretation of social behavior than any of the other images, and therefore it would show the greatest occurrence in the AJS sample. This image shows little popularity over time for the AB article sample, and the Sociometry sample for the most part falls in a median position. The exception to this is the 1960-69 decade when the Sociometry sample drops to the AB level. The most interesting overall trend for this image is the fact that the lines for the 1970-74 period for all three journals come close to meeting each other. With regard to this image at least, it appears that a consensus is being reached here in social psychology, even if this consensus does seem to be that the cultural image is not appropriate as a social psychological view of the determining factor in human social behavior.

Figure 3.6 contains the findings
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for the image of man the symbol interpreter. For all three journals in the current study, this seems to constitute the most popular perspective. One reason for this is that the perceptual theories and the interactionist theories both make use of this perspective on social behavior. As previously mentioned, these two frameworks share certain commonalities and one of these is an emphasis on this aspect of man's social nature. Man as an interpreter of the world around him involves an assumption of individual internal dynamics as shapers of social behavior. The popularity of the symbol interpreter image peaks in the 1940's for the AB sample and in the 1950's for AJS. For the Sociometry article sample, the percentage hovers around 50% for the decades under study for this journal. The trends for Sociometry are very similar for this image, and by the contemporary period, almost identical. The AB use of this image slopes radically downward from its 1940's high point, and it looks as if this image may in the future become nonexistent for this journal. Comparing this finding to that depicted in the profit seeker image graph, one can conclude that this is replacing the symbol interpreter image in psychology, although these two interpretations do not seem diametrically opposed. Man as a profit seeker, it would seem, must also incorporate an internal interpretation function as part of the image. Otherwise the profit seeker perspective becomes one of pure hedonism and almost reflexive.

In terms of overall statements of the social
psychological picture of image use over time in the branches of social psychology, it appears that the two last discussed images are currently the more important ones in social psychology. Man the profit seeker is the choice for psychological social psychologists, while man the symbol interpreter seems to be favored by the sociological and interdisciplinary samples. For the other three images (cultural, animal, and noble), the trends have become much more homogeneous for social psychology as a whole. Perhaps in the future these two images of profit seeker and symbol interpreter will be reconciled or replaced by a new one that somehow combines assumptions from both.

SUBSTANTIVE AREA

The six most frequently occurring substantive area categories are calculated in terms of journal totals across all time periods combined for each of the three journals in the sample. Below the results are listed with their frequencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AJS</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>AB</th>
<th>f</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>attitudes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>personality</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personality</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>motivation</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group dynamics</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>attitudes</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>socialization</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>social learning</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intergroup relations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>social perception</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collective behavior</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>self</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The main unexpected finding for the substantive area results is that attitudes as an area for the AJS sample is in first place, and personality second; the prediction was that culture and personality would be among the top categories for AJS. The rest of the findings for substantive areas for AJS and AB are in keeping with expected areas of importance for the branches. Group dynamics, socialization, and collective behavior are generally considered to be important topical areas in sociological social psychology, and are standard chapter headings for texts in the field. The AB substantive area findings are very much in accordance with those mentioned as primary areas for psychological social psychology (with the exception of self), and reflect the individualistic approach of the subfield. One would expect that the topics addressed most frequently in the interdisciplinary sample would be group related, and this is borne out by the results. By far the two most popular areas for the Sociometry articles are group dynamics and interpersonal level of interaction. Personality and attitudes are topics that
appear in the top six categories of all three journals sampled. Personality as an area of study in social psychology can be approached using all three orientations. It can be viewed as an individual trait, as a social characteristic that reflects cultural personality typologies, and as an interpersonal product affected by group settings. Therefore its broad scope as a substantive area of study makes it amenable to multiple interpretations and orientational differences. Attitudes can also be the product of an individual, social or cultural variables.

The findings for theoretical frameworks, images of man, and substantive areas used in social psychology provide some evidence for an increasing similarity between the three branches. This does not, however, constitute a case for the immediate possibility of a unification of the discipline. It is also apparent that some important differences still serve to differentiate the social psychologies with regard to this area. For example, the rise of reinforcement theory and the image of man the profit seeker in psychological social psychology have no counterparts in the other branches. While there is some overlap in topics addressed by social psychology researchers, the order of importance for these areas is different. The link between theory, image, and substantive area is a logical one, because theories which imply certain conceptions of man are applied to the explanation of areas deemed appropriate as social psychological research topics. These are interlinked with each other, and
contribute the overall disciplinary perspective of each brand of social psychology.
CHAPTER IV.

CAUSALITY

The previously described causality variable, relates to the nature of the discipline of social psychology. It is of importance to the discrimination of the various approaches to the field currently under examination. Three aspects of causality are of interest in the analysis of the causal character of the articles: the models used, specifically whether a simple (independent—dependent) or complex model is used to conceptualize the variables under study; the types of variables, chiefly independent, that are selected for study; and the levels of analysis which describe the modes of explanation and objects of explanation for the articles (see appendix i for a description of the criteria for these categories). These are viewed as important characteristics of articles, because differences in these aspects of causality serve to compare the orientations of the three journals under study, and reflect dispositional differences between subdisciplines.

VARIABLE USE

Models. The simple and the complex causal models, when utilized by researchers to study various social phenomena, show the degree of complexity that the scientist is attempting to incorporate into the design. While this rough categorization of articles is not in itself a discrimination
capable of yielding the major definitive information about the crucial dividing lines between psychological social psychology and sociological social psychology, it does provide a type of comparison that illustrates one aspect of causal model selection. In terms of discipline-related tendencies to use simple versus complex causal conceptions over time, the findings for the three journals are not very different. For the overall totals by journal, the AB sample articles show the greatest use of the complex model. For this journal, 60% of the models used are simple, and 40% are complex. The comparative percentages for AJS are 74% and 25%, and for Sociometry, 65% and 35%. The Gamma for the degree of association between the type of causal model and the journal category is not significant (.23). There are no consistent within-journal trends over time in terms of, for example, an increasing use of the complex model, with the possible exception of the Sociometry sample. The Gamma for the degree of association between decade and causal model in Sociometry is not significant (.13), therefore there is no evidence of a trend toward a greater complexity of causal models in social psychological research. The decision by the researcher to treat the object of study as either a complex or a simple causal model reflects the scope or type of focus of the particular research, rather than evidence of scientific development.

Society, Group and Individual. As previously stated, the independent variable selected by the researcher
for study is a key aspect of causality, because it is this variable that is the source of the types of effects or changes which result from the independent variable. Therefore, the initiating function that the independent variable fulfills, makes its causal status preeminent. The types of independent variables used in the articles from the three journals are categorized into three classes or variable units: society, group, and individual. These categories describe the types of units perceived as independent variables for a given study. For this classification, all causal schemes (both simple and complex) are included in the analysis. If the causal model describing the article contains more than one independent variable, the one listed first is selected. These findings provide a depiction of the types of independent variables selected by the researchers as "causes". Table 4.1 contains the data for all three journals from the 1940-49 period to the most recent one (1970-74). The Gamma for the degree of association between the level of independent variable and journal category is significant beyond the .01 level. The hypothesis that the level of the independent variable varies with the sub-discipline is supported.

A discussion of a study by Lambert (1963) is relevant with respect to these findings on the use of the independent variable. Lambert applies content analysis to all articles from the Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology (AB) for the years 1952 and 1960. He compares causal
Table 4.1 Association between Level of Independent Variable and Journal Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>individual</th>
<th>group</th>
<th>society</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociometry</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ N = 167 \]

\[ G = .65 \]

\[ p \geq .01 \]
schemes for these two years in order to determine the trends in the discipline of psychological social psychology (although he does not label it as such). His overall findings indicate that there is not a complete consensus in the field as to what specifically constitute independent and dependent variables. However, the trend is overwhelmingly in the direction of individual characteristics as independent variables. This study concurs with the variable patterns found in the psychological branch for the current research during these years. Table 4.2 contains the independent variable use results over time for all three journals. In the current AB article sample from the same two decades covered by the Lambert data (1950-59 and 1960-69), there is a substantial increase in the use of the individual as the independent variable. Although for all other decades in the sample for this journal, the individual is the category of independent variable used most frequently, the trends for the use of this category for the previous three decades constitute a pattern of decreasing use from 1920 to 1960. Perhaps if Lambert had not limited his sampling to these two years, he would have been presented with a more complete picture of trends in variable use over time in social psychology. If Lambert is attempting to represent his findings as a continuous trend toward a greater use of individual independent variables by generalizing from only two sampling years, this is not a complete account of the disciplinary picture.
Table 4.2  Distribution of Independent Variables Used by Journals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Independent Variable Type</th>
<th>20-29</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50-59</th>
<th>60-69</th>
<th>70-74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AJS</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Society</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociometry</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Society</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Society</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The real question here concerns the drop in the use of the individual as the independent variable in psychological social psychology in the 1950's. Historical discussions of social psychology often mention that the national experience of World War II stimulated social psychological research interest in the group approach. This constitutes a social-structural explanation of shifting disciplinary orientations which ties cultural conditions to academic field characteristics. It is revealing to compare the variable use patterns for this same period in the AJS sample. From the 1940's to the 1950's, the group as an independent variable rises abruptly from characterizing 7% of the sample in the 1940 decade, to 57% in the 1950's. There also is a corresponding increase in the group category for the Sociometry sample. For the 1940-49 period in Sociometry, 33% of the articles make use of individual variables as independent, while in the period from 1950-59, the figure is 67%.

It appears that this change of focus in terms of causal orientation characterizes the discipline as a whole, and not just one branch of it. Sorokin (1960), writing about the field of sociology, indicates that small group research is a dominant trend in the fifties. This corresponds with the present findings for sociological social psychology. Lambert labels this area microsociology and indicates that this branch has begun to play an increasingly influential role in social psychological research.

With regard to the data collected on the average
numbers of independent, dependent, and intervening variables used in the article causal schemes, the differences between the journals are unsystematic. Overall, it can be said that the modal causal model for the social psychology research analyzed in this study contains one independent and one dependent variable. The simple causal model is the most frequently used device to depict causal relationships in social psychology research articles. Very few of the two hundred and forty articles analyzed use a causal scheme that involves any intervening variables. The AB journal sample shows the largest number of studies with intervening variables (a high of four articles in the 1920-29 period).

In order to further look at trends in variable use, it is productive to examine another aspect of the causality question for social psychological research orientations: the level of analysis.

LEVEL OF ANALYSIS

It has been stated previously that the main orientation differences between the two social psychologies center around the issue of primary causality in the explanation of phenomena of social psychological relevance. It is logical that sociologists in social psychology would view societal level concepts as being of central causal relevance, while psychologists in social psychology would view individual level concepts as the major causal determinants. This issue is of key importance because, regardless of any consensus concerning the proper object(s) of study for the discipline,
the clear differentiation along causal lines functions to perpetuate disciplinary divisions. Figure 4.1 depicts the nine levels of analysis categories. Table 4.3 shows the distributions of the levels data collapsed into three categories by mode of explanation. The percentages of articles falling into the three categories of levels shows this division to be stable over the span of the decades studied. The main mode of explanation for the social psychological articles in the AJS sample is a societal level concept, for the AB articles it is a psychological level one, and for the Sociometry articles it is an interpersonal level concept. It is interesting to note the change over time in the distribution of the first and third level categories for the Sociometry articles. While the bulk of articles for the entire period of study for this journal remains in the interpersonal category, the other articles go from a secondary predominance of societal level explanations in the 1940-49 period, to an increasing proportion of articles utilizing a psychological mode of explanation.

The Gamma for the degree of association between the level of analysis categories (shown in Table 4.3), and journal is significant beyond the .01 level (G = .74). These results indicate that the independent variable as the mode of explanation is an important differentiator of the branches of social psychology. The findings parallel the previously discussed independent variable use patterns.

If the levels of analysis categories are rearranged
Figure 4.1 Levels of Analysis Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode of Explanation</th>
<th>Object of Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>societal</td>
<td>societal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>societal</td>
<td>interpersonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>societal</td>
<td>individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interpersonal</td>
<td>societal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interpersonal</td>
<td>interpersonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interpersonal</td>
<td>individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individual</td>
<td>societal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individual</td>
<td>interpersonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individual</td>
<td>individual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 Level of Analysis Trends for Social Psychological Articles in Percent by Journal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>20-29</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50-59</th>
<th>60-69</th>
<th>70-74</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AJS</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociometry</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
according to the object of explanation, there is more between-discipline agreement concerning what categories of variables are appropriate for social psychological study. The vast majority of articles for all three journals are in the interpersonal and individual categories as objects of explanation. The total percentages of articles falling into these two categories is 89% for AJS, 98% for AB, and 91% for Sociometry. It appears that the more important characteristics of subdisciplinary differences in conceptions of causality are the types of variables that are perceived as major determinants of social psychological phenomena. Social psychologists of different disciplinary affiliations may be studying the same things, however the units they choose to explain these phenomena differ. It is these causal orientations that make for disciplinary divergencies, and consequently disagreements over, not necessarily what is being explained, but how it is to be best explained. These differences in causal conceptions are traceable to parent discipline orientations, and should be discernable in other aspects which form the character of the subdisciplines.
CHAPTER V.

METHODS OF DATA ANALYSIS

The types of methods used to analyze a given social variable are products of the discipline tradition and the orientation differences of the discipline toward the objects of study. For example, a psychological social psychologist reared in the tradition of the laboratory experiment would be more likely to choose certain methods for collecting data, such as observational techniques, while his sociological counterpart might select the questionnaire as a more preferred technique. Out of this selection process of the researcher certain patterns emerge that describe discipline-specific modes of doing research in social psychology. These patterns of data collection and analysis differentiate the social psychology branches of interest in the current research. This chapter will be concerned with different aspects of the methods of social psychological research and how they can be conceptualized as indicators of disciplinary orientations.

ARTICLE TYPE

As previously outlined in the section which describes the content analysis procedures, the article type category is a slightly revised form of a system developed and tested by Goodman (1972). This system uses four categories for the classification of research articles: (1) Subjective, (2) Case
Study, (3) Sample, and (4) Controlled. Classifying each article into one of these categories involves applying a combination of three dimensions describing scales of article characteristics ranging from naturalistic to controlled observational research, post hoc to purposive selection and recording of data, and subjective to objective research material.

The hypothesis is that the general trend over time for social psychology research articles would be from a predominance of type 1 or subjective articles to a predominance of type 4 or controlled research articles. Looking at the raw data averages for the time periods under study shown in Table 5.1, the overall trends are in keeping with this prediction. The average number of subjective articles starts from a high of 8.5 out of 15 articles per decade for the first period (1920-29) and decreases regularly to a low of 1 in the most recent period of the sample (1970-74). Conversely, the controlled article category averages show a consistent upward trend from the 1920-29 period to the high figure of 11.6 articles per 15 in the 1970-74 period.

The results for the case study and sample categories show a tendency in both cases for a steady, but less extreme decrease in use over time. The major change in the distribution of article types is one away from subjective-type research and toward more controlled designs. This corresponds with a generally recognized trend toward the greater dominance of the positivistic orientation in scientific research.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article Type</th>
<th>20-29</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50-59</th>
<th>60-69</th>
<th>70-74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjective</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlled</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Inclusion of Sociometry articles begins in 1940.
(Goodman, 1972:6). This type of research orientation change is one with traceable philosophical roots in Western scientific ideology which functions as the major directing force for an evolving discipline. The findings relevant to this issue of article classification clearly support a trend toward a greater acceptance, and consequently, a greater degree of consensus about the type of research (the controlled design) in keeping with the spirit of this scientific tradition.

In order to better look at the trends in article type distribution for each journal category, the findings are presented graphically in Figure 5.1, according to article type. For the subjective category, the general trends by journal are in keeping with those previously discussed for the combined data. However, it is interesting to note the sharp drop in the proportion of subjective articles for the AB category for the 1940-49 period. Between this period and the earlier decade, the proportion of articles goes from 8 per 15 to zero, and stays at that level up to the most recent period of study. For the AJS articles, the decrease in this category of articles is much more gradual, but it also approaches zero in the 1970-74 period. The fluctuations in the number of Sociometry articles are small and show no clear consistent trend over time, although one must take into account that the time span under study for Sociometry articles is smaller, and the number of articles falling into the category remains small.
Figure 5.1  Trends in Article Type Distributions for the Three Journal Categories: American Journal of Sociology, Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, and Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, and Sociometry
Figure 5.1 (cont.)
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The graph of the case study category shows that the proportion of this type of article stays fairly constant over time for AJS, decreases slowly over time for the AB articles, and also decreases over time for the Sociometry articles, but at a faster rate. The case study approach to research is never really a predominant method or research mode, and it may drop out of sight entirely in social psychology.

The sample article category indicates different trends over time for different journals. Articles in this category for AB show a constant figure until the 1950-59 decade, when they decrease to zero by the final decade. Sample articles in Sociometry indicate a sharp decrease from the first period in which data was taken up to the 1970-74 period, when the number also drops to zero. The AJS data shows a small drop from 1930-39, with an increase up to the 1960-69 period, remaining constant for the last period. It is generally believed that sociologists have traditionally placed more emphasis than psychologists upon sampling techniques to better insure representativeness and generalizability of results. It appears from this data that this division between an emphasis on external validity factors by sociologists versus an emphasis on internal validity by psychologists does not appear until the 1960's. It may be inferred from the current study that this is a difference of relatively recent origin. In the last period, fully one third of the social psychological articles from AJS fall
into the sample category, while for both AB and *Sociometry*, none of the articles fall into this category during the same time period.

The individual journal trends for the number of controlled articles depict some interesting differences. The curves for AB and *Sociometry* are very similar, the only difference is that the sharp increase in controlled articles occurs a decade earlier (1940-49) for AB than it does for *Sociometry* (1950-59). This becomes the only category used in AB during the last period and it characterizes thirteen of the fifteen articles for *Sociometry* during that time span. Although the use of the controlled design in AJS stays at a relatively low level up to 1960, there is a noticeable increase in the most recent period, and one could make the prediction that this would continue increasing and approach the levels of the AB and *Sociometry* journals.

It is worthy of note that for both the subjective article results, and those of the controlled articles, the overall trends look to be somewhat similar for all three journals. The sharp drop in subjective article use occurs first in AB, followed a decade later by *Sociometry* and AJS. The sharp increase in controlled article usage also occurs first in AB (1940-49), and it is followed by a similar increase in *Sociometry* ten years later (1950-59), and in AJS twenty years later (1970-74). This leads one to the conclusion that, at least for these two categories of article types, the trends in social psychological research first
appear in the psychological branch. It may be that the emphasis upon more controlled research is merely a function of influences operating within the disciplines which are in turn effected by some overall social science orientation changes. However, this could also be a product of differing research priorities relating to theory and the types of phenomena selected for study in the two areas. In keeping with this interpretation would be the above mentioned observation that the alternative emphases of internal versus external validity affect the type of research as well as the methods for doing it. It is not entirely clear, from the content analysis variable discussed in this section, that sociological social psychologists attach greater priority to sampling techniques at the possible expense of degree of control. This would be one interpretation of the apparent lag behind psychological social psychologists in the control category. It should be somewhat revealing to compare findings for the basis for sample selection in a later section of this paper.

UNIT STUDIED

The unit studied, also called the unit of analysis, refers to that actual object of study in the research. This is distinguishable from the conceptualized unit of study in terms of its research "reality". In other words, if the researcher states that he is studying the group and then proceeds to test individual attitudes or other traits, the actual unit studied is the individual, while the
conceptualized unit of study is the group. Conceptual variables are here examined in the variable use section previously discussed, since the hypothesized variable relationships in a given study are often different from their research translation. It has been found that the conceptualized variable units, as they appear in the causal hypotheses, differ in certain ways by subdiscipline. These differences will be magnified as they become translated into research units studied because they represent a combination of methodological factors operating to narrow the research focus.

As can be seen in Figure 5.2, the research results for the unit studied are in keeping with the previously hypothesized predictions for the journal categories. Because the number of studies making use of the intersocietal unit of study is only a total of 4 out of 240 articles, it is not included in the graphically depicted results. The three units of study shown are the individual, the group, and society. For the AJS articles, it can be seen that the most frequently occurring unit of study is the group. In two of the decades under study, 1920-29 and 1940-49, the group unit does not show this predominance. However since the 1940's, the group as a unit of study is the one used in over 70% of the article population. The unpredicted result for this journal is the finding that the individual as a unit of study is more common than the societal unit in every period except the first decade studied (1920-29). In this period, the societal unit is the most frequent, but the trend over
Figure 5.2 Trends in Units Studied in AJS, AB and Sociometry Journal Articles
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time shows a steady drop to its disappearance in the 1960's. The overall picture of AJS shows the group unit rising to a secure prominence.

Up until the 1960's, the dominant unit of study by far for the AB sample is the individual. This is consistent with the proposed focus for the psychological branch of social psychology. However, it is interesting to note that the group unit indicates a rise in appearance from the 1940's and surpasses the individual in the final period studied (1970-74). This would lead one to conclude that the two branches are becoming more similar as far as the unit of study is concerned. The societal unit never even comes into play as a research choice in the articles for this journal. It is clear that even though the societal level may be a part of the conceptualized hypothesis for a particular study, its operationalization always constitutes a reduction to individual or group data. The overall AB journal data indicate that the dominance of the individual unit of study ends in the 1970's, and the groups unit is the contemporary choice of psychological social psychologists.

The Sociometry article data shows the predicted popularity of the group unit of study. The results for this journal are very similar to those for AJS. The second most frequently occurring unit is the individual, followed by the society. The societal unit of study is also not very prominent in this journal, in fact it disappears from the sample after the first decade studied (1940-49).
Comparison of the overall results for the three journals shows that while the individual versus the group are characteristic units of study for the psychological and sociological branches over time, the group category is the contemporary one of importance. Furthermore, there appears to be a trend toward an increasing degree of consensus within the discipline about what is the most appropriate unit of study for social psychological research. The evidence from the unit of study is the most convincing indication so far that the trend in the field is toward convergence.

SAMPLE SIZE

The sample size data is presented in Table 5.2. Because the number of cases per article shows such extreme variation (for example in AB during the 1930's the range was from 58,696 to 1 case) an average score would not be representative. This is because the mean as a measure of central tendency is significantly effected by extreme scores. Instead, the median is selected as a better indicator of sample size central tendencies for the journal data. It has been previously proposed that the sociological branch would exhibit the largest sample size scores. As can be seen from an examination of the results for this variable, the trends are not clearly different for the three journals. Therefore this hypothesis is not supported by the findings for this measure. One might also predict that with the development of the discipline and the greater rigor of research efforts along these lines, the sample size would increase with time.
This is also not clearly supported by the results, although if only the first sample decade and last for each journal are examined the movement is in this direction. The trend, however, is not consistent over time for any of the three journals.

An additional finding not previously dealt with in the hypothesis section is considered interesting and important enough to include in the present discussion. Table 5.3 shows the results for the percentage of articles for each journal by decade for which the number of cases used is unspecified. The reporting by researchers of this variable should be a necessary aspect of scientific writing. Concomitant with the development of a discipline there should be evidence of an increasing number of articles which provide this information. Table 5.3 generally supports this contention. The AJS journal data shows a general decline in the percentage of articles with unspecified sample sizes from the 1920's to the 1960's. In the last period sampled, the percentage goes from 27 to 47, and constitutes a reverse in the trend. This is because of the large proportion of theoretical articles characteristic of this period. For the AB article data there are no articles with the case number unspecified after 1939, and the percentages of articles falling into this category overall are significantly smaller than those for the AJS sample. The Sociometry results show a clear decline in articles with unspecified sample size information, and are more similar to the AB data trends. It
Table 5.2 Median Number of Cases per Article by Journal and by Decade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>20-29</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50-59</th>
<th>60-69</th>
<th>70-74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AJS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociometry</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3 Percentage of Articles with Number of Cases Unspecified per Journal by Decade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>20-29</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50-59</th>
<th>60-69</th>
<th>70-74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AJS</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociometry</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
would appear that the reporting of sample size is then of more concern to the psychological and interdisciplinary journal authors than the sociological. Perhaps this is merely a matter of disciplinary writing and research reporting styles, however it would seem that this information is a necessary part of the full description of scientific research. Nevertheless, it can be pretty safely predicted that articles with unspecified case numbers will disappear from the literature in the near future in social psychology.

**BASIS FOR SAMPLE SELECTION**

The sample selection data is presented graphically in Figure 5.3. The first hypothesis regarding the predicted sampling type results is that the representative sample would be more characteristic of the sociological social psychology articles. This is substantiated by the findings for the use of this sampling technique. As can be seen from the graphs, the representative sample occurs more frequently in AJS than in AB or Sociometry. The reason given previously for this prediction was that the discipline of sociology is typically more concerned with generalizability of findings and hence, would tend to select representative sampling as a technique preferred by researchers with this disciplinary orientation. The representative sample data for the AJS articles shows a steady rise in popularity over time, and is the method most frequently chosen for the 1970-74 period. A safe prediction would be that this technique will retain its predominance in sociological social psychology in the future.
Figure 5.3  Types of Sample Selection for AJS, AB, and Sociometry by Decade
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also. The representative sample as it appears in the AB journal peaks in the 1930's, and then declines in use. This type of sample never is the most popular choice for psychological social psychology researchers during any time period studied. The Sociometry results for this technique of sampling show an increase in occurrence generally most similar to the form of the AJS data, however it is never the primary choice for this journal.

It has been predicted that the analytical, or purposive sample (one based on selection for some specified theoretical reason), would appear as an important technique for the discipline as a whole in the earlier periods studied, and then decline in prominence over time. The overall findings substantiate this hypothesis for all three journals. The analytical sample is the primary sampling choice for AB, AJS, and Sociometry, up until the 1950's for AB, and the 1960's for AJS and Sociometry. The graph lines, however, indicate a general decline in the use of the analytical sample over time for the three journals. It appears that this sampling method will continue to decrease in usage by researchers in the field.

The hypothesis that the availability sample would show the greatest frequency of occurrence in the psychological branch is also supported by the data shown in Figure 5.3. The use of this type of sample is characterized by a steady rise to prominence in AB over time. This is also true of the Sociometry findings. For the AJS data, the availability
sample never becomes a technique used to any extent by social psychologists of this persuasion. It is proposed that there are two major reasons for this lack of use of the availability sample in sociological social psychology. The previously mentioned primary explanation is that this sampling method limits the generalizability of the results. If the subject pool is too homogeneous, the information gained from the research theoretically applies only to similar categories of subjects, and therefore, becomes specific to other groups or population strata with these same characteristics. This is a sampling concern to sociologists, and serves to make this a less attractive choice as a technique. Psychologists, however, weight internal validity factors more heavily, and therefore are more concerned with the random assignment of homogeneous individuals to experimental conditions. Thus, the generalizability limitations are not as detrimental a characteristic of this type of sample for psychological social psychologists as they are for sociological social psychologists. A second reason for the availability sample being prominent in the psychological branch and nonsignificant in the sociological is a historical one. Psychologists have more recently had the use of subject pools for research purposes which are usually integrated into undergraduate course requirements by the department. Sociologists generally have not made use of this possibility as a part of the major curriculum, and therefore they do not have the use of such subject pools for research subjects.
It is true that the research orientation of the discipline of sociology as a whole is not toward the laboratory experiment as the method of choice, however the subject pool concept could easily be applied to most sociological studies. This is perhaps a less important explanation of sampling differences, nevertheless, these types of methodological traditions become supported over time by the professional socialization process in academic departments and, therefore firmly entrenched in the discipline-specific character of the research process.

It has been predicted that the accidental sample (a non-probability sample in which the researcher has little idea of the population parameters) would become more frequently occurring over time because of the greater respectability of the natural or field study as a contemporary method. It should be pointed out here that, although all field studies do not make use of accidental samples, and accidental samples can occur in non-field research designs, the overlap is sufficiently large to warrant the assumption of parallel trends in appearance. The findings with respect to the hypothesis for this sample type are not clearly supportive. As it can be seen, this sample type rarely appears in the results at all. The accidental sample is not used in AJS in any of the articles from that journal. It only appears once in the 1940's period in the AB data. For the last sample period of the Sociometry data, the accidental sample composes 20% of the articles for those years, however, it would be risky to
predict that this unitary appearance constitutes a stable future trend in the interdisciplinary branch. The literature which is supportive of the naturalistic or field study is of recent origin in the field (1960's), however, and only future studies will tell whether this movement will become a legitimate and discipline supported trend.

In terms of overall statements about the types of sampling techniques associated with the three journal categories, it can be said that the patterns for the sociological and psychological branch are distinctive. For AJS, the representative sample is the one becoming of major import in the subdiscipline. For AB, it is the availability sample that has become the major technique of choice for psychological social psychologists. The Sociometry sample choice pattern seems to show trends midway between the other two, with both the availability and the representative sample retaining significant positions in the interdisciplinary branch.

TIME

The static and the dynamic study represent two types of temporal perspectives with regard to research. It has been predicted that the dynamic study would be a more frequently occurring form of research in the sociological branch, while the static design would characterize the main approach in psychological social psychology. The results shown in Figure 5.4 support these contentions, however they appear in a less radically differentiated form than expected.
Figure 5.4 Proportions of Static and Dynamic Studies Over Time for AJS, AB, and Sociometry Articles.
The three journals show surprisingly similar linear relationships with regard to trends in the use of these two types of research formats over time. The overall picture for the discipline of social psychology is away from the dynamic study and toward a greater use of the static design. One aspect of the large increase in static studies is the increasing popularity of the laboratory experiment. Although this design usually involves before and after measures of the independent variable, this does not constitute the study of changes over time, but merely constitutes a test for changes resulting from the manipulation of the independent variable. Another reason for this change is the greater degree of specialization characteristic of social psychologists of the contemporary periods. In an AB editorial statement, M. Brewster Smith (1961) comments upon the overspecialized character of the discipline and says that this has functioned to narrow the focus as well as the time perspective of current research (Smith, 1961,463). One consequence of a narrowing research focus (which goes hand-in-hand with an increasing degree of specialization), would be the failure to adequately incorporate the processual aspects of social phenomena into the study design. This practice ultimately promotes the static depiction of only segments of the social arena under study. This would be analogous to examining only one frame of a movie film. The hope is that, if enough research is done on these single frames, the eventual result will be the accurate representation of a process.
This seems to be the type of trade-off that modern social psychological researchers are making with regard to the incorporation of dynamic process variables into study designs. It is really more of a rejection than a compromise. This aspect of the changing face of social psychology research is discussed further in the final chapter.

CONTROL

There are two types of control relevant to the current research: control over extraneous variables, and control over independent variables. These two categories of control are broken down further to include experimental, statistical, and theoretical control over extraneous variables, and experimental manipulation, categorical assignment, and theoretical control over independent variables. As previously stated in the section on the reliability of the content analysis system used in the current study, the subcategories of control are excluded from discussion because of their low reliability levels. However, the degree of control, which is divided into a three part scale in both the independent variable and the extraneous variable control categories is retained in the analysis. These two main categories of control will presently be discussed separately.

Control Over Extraneous Variables. Each article is characterized as either containing systematic, unsystematic or no control over extraneous variables. These three categories constitute a scale which describes the degree of control for a given article. It is logical that, as a science
develops, its research should evidence a greater degree of control over extraneous variables. The results of the statistical test for this hypothesis are contained in Table 5.4. Gamma, a test association between two ordinal variables, was deemed the appropriate measure for this data set. The value of Gamma obtained was +.49, and the z transformation shows that this score is significant beyond the .01 level. So there is an increase in this type of control for social psychology over time. To test the hypothesis that the journals sampled arrange themselves according to degree of control with AB the highest, followed by Sociometry and then AJS, a Gamma was calculated. As can be seen from an examination of Table 5.5, the result for the measure of association between journal category and degree of control over extraneous variables are also highly significant. Because of the missing cells for the Sociometry journal, the data used for these calculations makes use of only the last four decades in the sample. The raw data trends are consistent with the direction of the data for these decades, therefore it is safe to generalize these results to the overall sample period.

Control Over Independent Variables. With regard to the measurement of the degree of control over independent variables, the articles are categorized according to a scale like that used for control over extraneous variables. The categories are: systematic, unsystematic, and no control. The first hypothesis tested for this variable is that the degree of control over independent variables increases for
Table 5.4 Association Between Degree of Control Over Extraneous Variables and Decade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>3 low</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1 high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G = .64

p ≥ .01

N = 180
### Table 5.5 Association Between Journal Category and Degree of Control Over Extraneous Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>3 (low)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1 (high)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AJS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociometry</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ N = 180 \]

\[ G = .49 \]

\[ p \geq .01 \]
the discipline as a whole over time. Again, the data analyzed begins with the 1940's because of the Sociometry missing cells. The results are shown in Table 5.6, and the resultant Gamma score is significant beyond the .01 level. It is clear that there is a greater degree of control over time for social psychological research as a whole.

The next question to be considered is whether there are differences among journals in the degree of control over independent variables, as there are for control over extraneous variables. It has been previously stated that the branches differ in the technique selected for control (experimental manipulation versus categorical assignment) and not necessarily in terms of the degree. The results for this test of association between degree of control and journal category are depicted in Table 5.7. The Gamma is not significant. It can therefore be said that the journals do not significantly differ in the degree of control over independent variables.

To summarize the findings for the control variable, it can be stated that both degree of control over extraneous variables and degree of control over independent variables become more rigorous over the time periods included in the sample. Thus, the development of social psychology as a disciplinary area has been accompanied by changes in the rigor of research control. In their degree of control over extraneous variables, the three branches represented arrange themselves into a hierarchy with psychological social
Table 5.6 Association Between Degree of Control Over Independent Variables and Decade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>3 low</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1 high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 180

G = .59

p > .01
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psychology at the top, and sociological social psychology at the bottom. The explanation for this difference in the journal samples most likely resides in the greater use of the experimental laboratory situation and its corresponding control possibilities. Therefore the related methodological characteristics of some of the variations of the other aspects of methods used within the subdisciplines may be affecting the type and magnitude of the control over variables classified as extraneous. Examples of this type of variable would be the temperature at the time the data was collected and its possible effect on the subjects, the time of day during which the data collection took place, or any other environmental variable which might have affected the results, and which is irrelevant to the hypothesis being tested. It is evident that this type of control is more easily achieved in data collection situations more characteristic of the psychological branch. The findings for the second type of control measured, however, do not show this hierarchical relationship between journal category and control over independent variables. Sociologists pay greater attention to this type of control and make use of statistical techniques to do so. Such techniques for independent variable control as, for instance, path analysis, partial correlation, and factor analysis, allow the researcher to separate out independent variables under study, and thereby establish control over this aspect of internal validity. Psychologists are more likely to make use of control groups to satisfy internal
validity criteria. While the various methods used to attain this type of control may differ, the results in terms of degree of control obtained may not. It should be kept in mind, however, that the classification system for measuring these within-technique differences is not sufficiently reliable to include in the current discussion of results. Therefore, definitive statements about differences in discipline-specific methods of control over independent variables cannot be confidently made.

SOURCES OF DATA

The type of data that a researcher uses to carry out his study is representative of overall discipline trends, as well as subdiscipline traditions. Data sources for the articles in the sample are classified as either making use of old, new, a combination of old and new, or hypothetical data. The usage of these different data sources over time by journal category is shown in Figures 5.5 and 5.6. The first figure depicts the use of old data across time. It is clear that the heaviest use of data of this type is in the early years of the discipline. From the 1920's on, there is a decline in old data use which continues to the present, with the exception of the upturn in the last decade period (1970-74) for AJS. The main criteria for inclusion into this category is that the data be collected by someone other than the researcher for some purpose other than the particular article in which it has been incorporated. One exception is the case where a researcher reanalyzes his own data which has been
Figure 5.5 Trends in the Use of Old and New Data in Journal Articles
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published elsewhere; this would also be classified as constituting the use of old data. The use of published case histories, data banks, and any type of archival data, such as historical information, would fall into the old data category. Returning to the discussion of the old data use findings, the sudden upturn in the percent of articles using old data in AJS occurs in the archival data subcategory. Most of these articles are summaries, interpretations, or reviews of a particular research area, for example, collective behavior or labeling theory applications. So it appears that the first half of the 1970's might be characterized by a type of stock-taking in sociological social psychology research. Perhaps this research evaluation movement is characteristic of the discipline of sociology as a whole. The theme for the 1976 annual convention of the American Sociological Association was: "Sociology for Whom?", and this slogan would support the notion that the field is reflecting upon itself. Perhaps then, this overrepresentation of old data articles in the 1970's is an indicator of this concern with disciplinary self evaluation. AB and Sociometry show no such increase in old data use for this period, in fact, both are described by a decrease in the use of this data category over the time periods of the study.

The next graph in Figure 5.5 shows the trends in the use of new data over time for the three journals. The overall trend is one of increasing use over time. Again, the exception is the AJS data for the 1970-74 period of the
sample. The decline is traceable to the previously discussed increase in the use of old data. It is worthy of note that for each journal, in the course of the years spanned by the study, there is a sharp increase in the use of new data, but this occurs at different time periods. The AB journal data shows such an increase in the 1940's, when the percentage of articles using this type of data rises from 33% to 80%. The jump for the Sociometry data occurs ten years later in the 1950's, and goes up from 33% to 73% at this time. The sharp increase in AJS comes about in the 1950's also, but continues its climb into the 1960's at the same rate. It is clear that the discipline of social psychology experiences a change in the type of data selected for research during the 1940's and 1950's. This could be due to factors such as a change in the attitudes of social psychologists toward the types of data believed to be most appropriate for research, the evolution of new methodological and statistical tools, or simply a field movement in keeping with increasing scientific development. The probable case is one which combines all three elements and produces a change in the total character of a discipline.

Figure 5.6 includes graphs of data use by journal, for the combination of old and new data, and hypothetical data. The first graph shows that the combination of old and new data is, overall, not a popular one in social psychology. The only period for which this category reaches any sufficient proportion is in AJS in the 1940's. It can be
Figure 5.6 Trends in the Use of a Combination of Old and New Data and Hypothetical Data in Journal Articles
concluded from the previous data selection category discussions that this is a transitory period in data use for this journal from old to new data. It is logical that more articles during this time would combine these two types of data. This is not true for the other two journals. The use of this combination category never constitutes an important data alternative for AB and Sociometry during any of the time periods in the sample.

It has been hypothesized that the use of hypothetical data would be more characteristic of earlier social psychology. The results for this category shown in the second graph in Figure 5.6 support this contention. This type of data which chiefly makes use of illustrative examples to demonstrate a point, support a hypothesis, or confirm a theory, is more appropriate for developing theoretical formulations which exemplify an evolving discipline. One might even question whether this constitutes research. However, hypothetical examples are a type of data, although of a different sort than is usually demanded by the empirical tradition in scientific research. There is a place for this type of data to be used (and it is perhaps just as valuable a mode of explanation for particular types of articles), however, it appears that the days of the academically sanctioned use of hypothetical explanations are short-lived, and associated with scientific immaturity, although this need not necessarily have been the case. For comparative purposes, it would be informative to see whether this type of data use
pattern also characterizes the beginning stages of other related disciplines.

In terms of overall trends in the selection of research data types, it can be said of the discipline as a whole, that the movement is away from the use of old data and hypothetical data, and toward a greater use of the new data category. These trends reflect stages in the scientific development of the discipline of social psychology. They are indicative of an increasing empirical orientation toward research, as well as of the specialization of research interests. With regard to the relationship of specialization in a field to the types of data selected for research, the connection can be found in the effect of choosing an area. By selecting a specialty area, a field practitioner is further dividing up the field into more particularized substantive areas. With this decision comes the necessity of selecting more specialized data appropriate to the problem. The outcome would be an increase in the need for particular types of data specific to the area involved. This produces the need for the collection of new, and consequently, more specialized data.

DATA GATHERING

The present data gathering section is concerned with different research styles in the collection of data and their relationship to field orientation. Three variables from the content analysis are discussed here: observational styles, self report measures, and research settings. A
comparison of preferences in the selection of these three aspects of research data collection produces additional information about the branches of social psychology under study.

**Observational Styles.** If the researcher chooses to select a data collection technique which requires the presence of an observer, the relationship of the researcher or observer to the subjects he is studying can be classified into four types of roles which describe this relationship. Junker (1952) labels these roles as the complete observer, the observer as participant, the participant as observer, and the complete participant. These observer roles arrange themselves according to social distance from the situation studied, or degree of participation of the observer in the social aspects of the research setting. The percentage of articles which make use of one of these observation styles over the total period of the sample is 67% for AJS, 67% for AB, and 62% for Sociometry. It appears that the frequency with which this type of data is collected does not differ appreciably among the three journals. It has been previously hypothesized that the dominant role taken by social psychologists would be the complete observer. The selection of this role is very much in keeping with the scientifically oriented "nonintervention" policy that pervades much of the research in this tradition. The results show that 78% of the articles in Sociometry are in the complete observer category.
It has been hypothesized that there would be a greater tendency in the sociological social psychology articles to take on observer roles which require a greater degree of participation by the observer, i.e., the roles of observer as participant, participant as observer, and the complete observer. The results do not support this prediction. Table 5.8 shows the results. The Gamma for the association between journal and degree of observer participation is -.004. There is virtually no difference in the degree of participation for AJS and AB across time periods. The most unexpected finding was that so few articles from the sociological social psychology branch made use of the various forms of the participant observation technique. This observation technique is theoretically related to symbolic interactionist theory and methods, which is a popular approach in this branch of social psychology.

The overall results for the observational technique findings indicate that the complete observer is the research role choice for social psychologists, and that participant observation as a methodology has not been much used in the discipline.

**Self Report Measures.** The data collection techniques that are classified as being self report measures are: the interview, the questionnaire, the indicator or instrument test, the projective test, and the experimental apparatus. The percentages of articles using some type of self report measure are 45% for AJS, 77% for AB, and 73% for Sociometry.

It has been hypothesized that the interview as a self
Table 5.8  Association Between Degree of Participation by Research Observer and Journal Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>1 (low)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4 (high)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJS</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 119

G = -.004
report technique would be the most frequently occurring one in the AJS sample. This is born out in the results. The AJS sample shows 51% of the articles using the interview as a self report measure, in comparison with 19% in AB, and 23% in Sociometry. The interview is the most popular self report technique over time for the sociological branch. It was also hypothesized that the questionnaire would be an important self report measure in both psychological and sociological social psychology because of its adaptability to both the experimental and cross-sectional research designs. The questionnaire accounts for 49% of the AJS self report measures, 36% of the AB, and 59% of those in Sociometry. Overall, it is the most popular self report measure for social psychology. It has been further predicted that the indicator or instrument test, a more specific form of the questionnaire, would be more frequently occurring in psychological social psychology. This is obviously the case, because no articles in AJS over the time span studied make use of the instrument test, while this type of measure accounts for 32% of the AB self report measures. Nine percent of the self report measures in the Sociometry article sample use the indicator, or instrument test. However, it has been hypothesized that the indicator would be the most popular technique used in AB articles, and this is not the case. As pointed out previously, the questionnaire is the most popular technique used in psychological social psychology. It has been additionally hypothesized that the apparatus would
be a frequently occurring self report measure for the psychological branch. Although it is more frequently occurring in the AB sample than in either AJS or Sociometry (both contain no articles using this type of measure), its use accounts for only 9% of the total sample of self report measures for this journal. The projective test as a self report measure does not occur at all in AJS and Sociometry. It is only used in three studies in AB, and constitutes 4% of all self report measures for that journal. The use of self report measures in the Sociometry sample seems to reflect a mediating position between the two other journals, as would be required of a truly interdisciplinary journal. The most popular measure in this category for this journal is the questionnaire, with 59% of the articles using this technique. The interview is the second most popular self report measure in Sociometry, accounting for 23% of such measures, followed by the indicator with 9%, and the apparatus also with 9%.

In terms of overall trends in the use of self report measures in social psychology, the questionnaire appears to be the most popular technique. The second most used self report measure for the total sample is the interview. The self report technique which shows the most differential use by subfield is the indicator or instrument. It is used in 32% of the articles from AB, but only in 9% of the articles from Sociometry, and none of those in AJS. This could be only a matter of the refinement of questionnaire data into
scale-type instruments which yield one overall score. However, it is far more likely that it is a matter of research focus. In other words, psychological social psychologists might be more interested in dealing with what they perceive as unitary, one-dimensional traits which are more easily reducible to this type of single factor measure, while sociological social psychologists might orient themselves more toward the integration of multidimensional combinations of characteristics which are not so easily reduced to a single representative score.

**Research Setting.** It has been hypothesized that the site of data collection will vary by the branch of social psychology from which it originated. The research settings used in the categorization of this variable are: laboratory, classroom, field, arm chair, institution, and clinical settings. These represent what are the most typical places in which social psychological research is most likely to take place.

For the research setting findings, it is important to look at trends across time, because the merged data by journal can be misleading due to extreme changes in setting use over time. Table 5.9 shows the overall distributions in percentages of articles which fall into the six research settings for each journal over the time range of the study. The most popular setting in sociological social psychology is the arm chair. This is the second most frequent research setting for psychological social psychology, but is is only forth in importance in the interdisciplinary journal. The
Table 5.9 Research Setting Distributions by Journal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>AJS</th>
<th>Sociometry</th>
<th>AB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>laboratory</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classroom</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>field</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arm chair</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>institution</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clinical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
explanation for this discrepancy in the use of the arm chair setting is partly a historical one. The arm chair paper is much more characteristic of early social psychology in the 1920's and 1930's. The Sociometry sample does not begin until the 1940's, therefore this setting is much less frequently occurring by this time. It has been predicted that the laboratory would be an important setting in psychological social psychology. The overall proportion of articles with laboratory settings in the AB journal is 53%. Laboratory experiments in this branch are a contemporary phenomenon, and the large increase in the use of this setting occurs in the last twenty years. A better picture of the development over time in the use of these research settings is provided by the graphs (see Figures 5.7, 5.8, and 5.9).

The laboratory setting, shown in the top graph in Figure 5.7 increases in use over the total period for all three journal categories. The sharpest rise in the use of this site is in the AB sample, where its frequency goes from 8% in the 1920's to 93% in the 1960's and 1970's. By this time, the laboratory setting in the psychological branch reaches almost a total dominance. The laboratory setting does not appear in the AJS sample until the 1960's, and even then it does not constitute one of the major ones used in this branch. In terms of this research setting, the Sociometry data is again representative of a median position between the other two social psychology branches. The use of the laboratory setting increases steadily across time to a
Figure 5.7 Journal Trends in the Use of the Laboratory and the Classroom as Research Settings
position of prominence in the journal. For the last time period (1970-74), the laboratory setting is used in 40% of the articles in Sociometry.

The use of the classroom setting in AJS articles shows no consistent trend over time. It has historically been only of minimal importance as a research setting for this journal. The use of this setting in the AB sample articles peaks in the 1940's, and 1950's, and then drops out of sight for the two remaining time periods. The use of the classroom in the Sociometry sample constitutes a more significant proportion of the settings used in articles. The overall percentage of articles making use of this research setting is 24%, however, there seems to be no consistent trend over time in this journal either.

Figure 5.8 shows the research setting distributions for the field and arm chair. It has been previously predicted that the field category would be popular in early social psychology, disappear from the scene, and then not reappear until the 1960's. The results show a slightly different picture of trends in the use of the field setting. In the AB and AJS articles, this setting increases from virtually no use in the 1920's through the 1940's. After this time, the AB use pattern shows a large drop, never again attaining its previous level. The AJS sample reaches a high in the 1950's, and shows a small drop for the remaining two periods. The use of the field setting in Sociometry generally increases over the time periods studied. The current findings do not
Figure 5.8 Journal Trends in the Use of the Field and the Arm Chair as Research Settings
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indicate that, for social psychology as a whole, the field study is increasing in popularity. The field, however, still constitutes a significant proportion of the research settings used in both AJS and Sociometry, and it is the second most frequent category for both of these periodicals.

It has been predicted that the arm chair setting would occur most frequently in early social psychology. This is supported by the findings for this setting. The arm chair setting shows a consistent decrease in use over time, with the exception of the last time period in AJS. It has been previously mentioned that AJS during this time could be characterized as being affected by a self evaluation trend in the discipline of sociology. More theoretical articles are found in this period, hence the arm chair setting also occurs more frequently. It is predicted that the frequency of this setting will decrease.

Both the institutional and clinical settings are shown in Figure 5.9. Neither constitutes a significant research setting for any of the three journals. It has been previously hypothesized that the institutional setting would be an important one in sociological social psychology, and that the clinical setting would be important in psychological social psychology. It can be seen from the graphed results that neither prediction is supported.

The overall trend in the use of various research settings in social psychology can be described as being one away from the arm chair and toward more structured settings.
Figure 5.9 Journal Trends in the Use of the Institutional and Clinical Research Settings
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The laboratory setting and its sharp rise to dominance to psychological social psychology stands in sharp contrast to the more free-flowing character of the field setting and its popularity in sociological social psychology. The interdisciplinary journal shows an incorporation of both settings into its research articles. Perhaps in the future the disciplines will make use of each for particular types of problems.

**DATA ANALYSIS TECHNIQUES**

The techniques used in social psychology over time for the analysis of research data reveals changes both in the development of the discipline, and trends in the separate branches of social psychology. The method used to analyze the data presented in the research article is initially classified as either making use of verbal description or statistics. It has been hypothesized that the trend for social psychology would be toward an increasing use of statistics in data analysis. The results of the Gamma calculated for the correlation between time and method, is shown in Table 5.10. The time data contains the merged raw scores only for the AJR and AB journals, because these two extend over the entire fifty year period of interest. The Gamma is significant beyond the .01 level. The trend from the verbal description of research data toward a greater reliance on statistical techniques over time in social psychology is supported by the findings. The Sociometry data also reflects this greater use of statistical methods, however,
Table 5.10 Correlation between Time Period and Method for AJS and AB Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME PERIOD</th>
<th>20-29</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50-59</th>
<th>60-69</th>
<th>70-74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Description</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistical</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ G = .59 \]

\[ p \geq .01 \]
this data is not included because it does not begin until the 1940's when the greatest increase in the use of statistics occurred.

It also appears that the journals differ in their transition rates from verbal description to statistical analysis. To test this difference, a Gamma is calculated using a journal scale with AJS at the lowest rank and AB at the highest to determine the degree of relationship between journal category and method. The data for all three journals included in the analysis begins in the 1940-49 period, because this is the first period from which the Sociometry sample is drawn. The results are shown in Table 5.11. There is a significant correlation between journal and method. The changeover from the use of description in data analysis to the use of statistical techniques is occurring at a faster rate in the interdisciplinary and psychological branches than it is in the sociological.

**Verbal Description.** The articles which make use of verbal description for presenting the data results are classified as either systematic or unsystematic. Figure 5.10 shows the increasing proportions of articles classified as using systematic verbal description over time and for all three journals. Conversely, the proportion of articles in the unsystematic category has decreased over time.

**Statistical.** Statistical techniques for data analysis are classified into two categories: descriptive statistics and inferential statistics. Of those articles using
Table 5.11 Correlation Between Journal Category and Method (1940-74)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Verbal Description</th>
<th>Statistical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AJS</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociometry</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 180

\[ G = +.72 \]

\[ p \geq .01 \]
Figure 5.10 Percentages of Articles in AJS, AB, and Sociometry Using Systematic Verbal Description
statistical analyses, the percentages of descriptive versus inferential statistics across time for the three journals are shown in Table 5.12. The combined time data for each journal indicate that the articles in AB show the greatest use of inferential statistics, and AJS articles the least. The trends over time for all three journals are in the hypothesized direction, i.e., toward a greater use of inferential statistics.

The descriptive statistics category is further broken down into summary and correlational measures. Summary statistics include the use of measures of central tendency, percent, standard deviation, tabular analysis, and ratios. Correlational techniques include simple (rho and Person's r), and complex (multiple, partial, path analysis, factor analysis and regression) correlational measures. The results for the articles using descriptive statistics of both the summary and correlational type are presented in Table 5.13. The favored descriptive statistic for the sociological journal is the summary measure. For the psychological journal, it is the correlational. The interdisciplinary branch data reflects an intermediate position between the other two journals with regard to the two types of descriptive statistics. The trends over time for all three journals, however, are toward an increasing use of correlational measures and a decreasing use of summary statistics.

**Inferential.** The three most common inferential statistics in social psychology are analysis of variance, chi
Table 5.12 Use of Descriptive and Inferential Statistics Over Time by Journal Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Descriptive</th>
<th>Inferential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AJS</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociometry</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.13 Use of Types of Descriptive Statistics by Journal Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>20-29</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50-59</th>
<th>60-69</th>
<th>70-74</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AJS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>summary</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>correlation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sociometry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>summary</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>correlation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>summary</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>correlation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
square, and the t-test. No inferential statistic is used in any article in the overall sample until the 1940-49 period. These techniques of statistical analysis were not developed until the 1930's. Chi square is the most frequently occurring inferential statistic in AJS, and analysis of variance is the most frequently occurring inferential statistic in AB and Sociometry. The proportions of articles using these three types of inferential statistics are shown in Table 5.14.

The overall trends in the use of various techniques for the analysis of research data indicate that statistical analysis dominates contemporary social psychology, that inferential statistics are being used more frequently, and that analysis of variance is the most popular inferential statistic in social psychology.
Table 5.14 Use of Types of Inferential Statistics by Journal Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>20-29</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50-59</th>
<th>60-69</th>
<th>70-74</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AJS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi Square</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-test</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociometry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi Square</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-test</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi Square</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-test</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER VI.

CITATION ANALYSIS

The analysis of literature citations has been a popular method of content analysis research. The focus of the current use and analysis of such citations is upon the characteristics of literature use and their relationship to branches of social psychology.

REFERENCES

It has been hypothesized that the sociological branch uses more references than either the psychological or the interdisciplinary branches. There are two characteristics of sociological research which would serve to contribute to this hypothesized greater use of references in sociological social psychology. Firstly, sociologists have traditionally been concerned with more diffuse theoretical issues than psychologists. This would expand the spectrum of possible reference citations from which the sociologists draw. Secondly, the sociologist participates to a greater extent in "historical stage-setting" in terms of the literature review component of research writing, and this would also tend to produce an increase in the number of references cited. The results for total reference use are shown in Figure 6.1. The general trend is in keeping with this hypothesis. The average number of references cited per journal article per decade is greatest for AJS, with the exception of one decade:
Figure 6.1 Average Number of References Used Per Journal Article for AJS, AB, and Sociometry by Time Period
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1940-49. The Gamma for the degree of association between journal category and ranking by decade for total references for the last four periods is +.79, which is significant at the .05 level.

**Journal Use.** The prediction that the greatest proportional use of journals would be in AB, and the smallest in AJS, is also supported by the results. The Gamma value of +1.00 for the degree of relationship between journal category and the proportion of journal references to total references used is significant beyond the .01 level.

It has been hypothesized that sociologists would be more likely to cite sociological journals as references, and psychologists more likely to cite sociological journals as references, and psychologists more likely to cite psychological journals. This within-discipline literature citation bias is a function of the professional socialization process. During the academic training period, the future practitioner is familiarized with his own field's publication sites, and this sets the boundaries of the perceived pool of relevant research available. Additionally, professional training includes the adoption of a field-specific ideology which creates an orientation bias toward a belief in the superior quality and appropriateness of one's own field offerings in contrast to the literature from related fields. It has been additionally predicted that sociologists would be more likely to cite psychological journals than psychologists would be to cite sociological journals. The reasons behind the
prediction of a greater frequency of cross-disciplinary journal citation in sociological social psychology are two-fold. It is proposed that sociologists are more attuned to the relationships between the social and behavioral sciences, and hence, more likely to look to these related fields for possible literature contributions. Secondly, the perceived "hard science-soft science" hierarchy dictates the borrowing from the related higher status discipline as a result of the disciplinary striving for upward mobility in the hierarchy. The proportional use of psychology and sociology journals is depicted through the use of bar graphs in Figure 6.2. The proposed prediction of differential use of journal citations is supported by the data. It is apparent that disciplinary journal "cross-overs" occur much more frequently in AJS than in AB. The most equitable use of sociology and psychology journals occurs in Sociometry. This makes it come close to fulfilling its interdisciplinary claims with regard to the journal use variable. There is no evidence of a trend toward a greater proportion of cross-disciplinary journal citation, in fact, the reverse trend seems to be in operation. For the AJS and AB article citations of journals, there seems to be a greater use of within-discipline journal literature with time. The conclusions from the journal reference data point to the existence of an increasing tendency for social psychologists to make use of research from the author's own field. This would seem to be antithetical to the prediction of a future merging of the disciplinary
Figure 6.2 Proportional Use of Sociological vs. Psychological Journal References over Time by Journal Category
branches.

The cases of reference citation of the two interdisciplinary journals (Human Relations and Sociometry), are too few in number to make any definitive trend statements about their use by researchers publishing in AJS and AB. The data presented in Table 6.1 shows that the total use of interdisciplinary journals in AB for all six decades is only 13 cases, and 18 for AJS. Since the journals classified as interdisciplinary are so few, the frequency in Sociometry of interdisciplinary journal citations is probably due more to the tendency to cite from the journal in which the article is published, and is thus not clear cut evidence of interdisciplinary literature use.

Books. The predictions that the proportional use of books in literature citations would decrease over time, and that the greatest use of books as references would be in AJS, and the lowest proportional book use in AB, are supported by the data presented in Figure 6.3. The reliance on books in article citations for the Sociometry journal is closer to the AJS pattern than it is to the AB proportions.

AUTHORSHIP

As can be seen from the raw data presented in Table 6.2, there is a definite trend for all three journals toward multiple authorship over time. The Gamma for the degree of association between year (decade period), and number of authors per article is +.45, which is significant at the .01 level. One possibility for explaining this increase in
Table 6.1 Interdisciplinary Journal Use in Literature Citations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>20-29</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50-59</th>
<th>60-69</th>
<th>70-74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AJS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociometry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6.3 Percentage of Books in Total Literature Cited by Journal Category over Time
Table 6.2 Number of Article Authors by Journal over Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>20-29</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50-59</th>
<th>60-69</th>
<th>70-74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AJS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. authors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. authors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. authors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
multiple authorship is the change in the number of research articles submitted per year. This has increased steadily in both psychology and in sociology. The result of this is that the acceptance rate of journal articles has gone down, because the journals can afford to be much more selective about what they publish. If joint research efforts can produce a higher quality product, and consequently increase the possibility of publication, then this could motivate individuals to do more co-operative research. Therefore, the increase in multiple authorship could be an outgrowth of these changes in the size of the population of submitted articles, and publication rates, in terms of indirectly fostering more joint research projects of higher caliber, and therefore providing a greater possibility of publication.

It is appropriate at this juncture to consider whether this trend toward multiple authorship, most typically joint authorship, is an interdisciplinary one which has fostered co-operative research between psychologists and sociologists. The results show no increase in the interdisciplinary authorship of research articles. In fact, out of the total sample population of 240 articles, there were only three cases of interdisciplinary authorship involving a psychologist and a sociologist; none in AJS, two in AB, and one in Sociometry. It appears that the multiple authorship trend is predominantly a within-discipline research phenomenon. The author or senior author (if more than one), of a social psychological research article is more likely to be affiliated with a
sociology department if publishing in AJS (68%), and a psychology department if publishing in AB (53%). There is a more nearly equal representation of psychologists and sociologists in the Sociometry journal, where 31% of the first-listed authors in the sample are from sociology departments, and 36% from psychology departments. Sociologist first authors in AB, and psychologist first authors in AJS, only constitute 7% of the total for each journal. The second most frequently occurring senior author affiliation for all three journals is an organizational one. Twelve percent of the first authors in AJS, 20% in AB, and 10% in Sociometry are associated with some type of organization (includes religious, military, and government).

ECOLOGICAL DISTRIBUTION OF RESEARCH

Geographical location data are taken only for the senior, or single author of the article. Figure 6.4 shows areas of the United States as they are represented proportionally by research submissions over time for the three journals (see appendix i for a definition of these areas). Articles submitted from individuals outside the United States are included only in the totals because they constitute only 11% of total article submissions. Nine articles from the AJS sample, twelve articles from AB, and five articles from Sociometry have first authors from outside the continental United States. Table 6.3 contains the proportional geographical distributions for the journal totals, including the foreign contributions. The major source of
Figure 6.4 Geographical Distributions of Research Over Time in Three Journal Categories
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Table 6.3 Geographical Distributions of Articles by Journal Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>Midwest</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>Foreign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AJS</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
social psychological research article submissions for AJS is the Midwest, for AB, the East, and for Sociometry, the Midwest. The dominance of the East in the AB sample decreases steadily from its high in the 1920's. The Midwest is an important area in the 1950's for all three journals. From this time on, it decreases as an area of research submissions for AB and AJS, but stays the same for Sociometry. The 1950's were the heyday of the Chicago and Iowa schools of symbolic interaction, and this could be a factor contributing to the prominence of this area in social psychology during this period. The western United States has become more important as a research source in AB and Sociometry, but no corresponding trend is evident in the AJS sample. The southern U.S. is never a very important contributor of social psychological research during any time period in the sample.

The variable of article length reveals no major difference between sociological social psychologists and psychological social psychologists. The data is contained in Table 6.4. There is a slight tendency toward a decrease in the average number of pages per article over time for the AB data. The longest articles appear in Sociometry, which contains close to an equal number of sociologist and psychologist contributors. The large increase in the average article length in AJS between the 1960's and the 1970-74 period is largely explainable by the increase in theoretical papers during the 1970's. Therefore, although sociologists are at
present wordier than psychologists, this is not seen to be the case through the decades.
Table 6.4  Average Number of Pages Per Article for AJJS, AB, and Sociometry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Decade 20-29</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50-59</th>
<th>60-69</th>
<th>70-74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AJS</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociometry</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSIONS

The results presented in the present trend analysis of social psychology do not provide complete support for either the existence of social psychology as a unified field of science, or a dual discipline with completely separate branch characteristics in sociology and psychology. There are areas of substantial overlap, as well as areas in which distinct differences are evident. The actual picture presented is one of a field in transition, with historically-based differences which chiefly stem from parent discipline characteristics. These developments show some movement over time toward a greater homogeneity of approach. Nevertheless, there are still areas in which differences exist that may function as barriers to the possibility of an ultimate unification of the field.

CONVERGENCE OR DIVERGENCE

The focus of the current research is upon four main areas of orientation comparison: theory, causality, method, and literature use. The evidence with regard to theory use shows that over the total time period the five theoretical frameworks evidence differential popularity by field. Two cases in point are instinct and reinforcement theories in psychological social psychology, and cultural and interactionist theories in sociological social psychology. In
terms of overlap, there are currently two theories which seem to exhibit some cross-disciplinary appeal. The perceptual and interactionist frameworks evidence some similarities in theoretical character, as well as an increasing acceptability in the field as a whole.

The use of images of man in social psychology also shows differential use by journal. The image of man that shows the greatest overall popularity is man as a symbol interpreter. This image incorporates the major assumptions of both the perceptual and interactionist approaches, and therefore holds promise as a unifying social psychological perspective. Man the profit seeker is the currently dominant image in psychological social psychology articles. This is because of the recent increase in popularity of reinforcement theory in this branch. Man the cultural product has been an important image used in sociological social psychology, but has been decreasing in use since the 1960's. The image of man the symbol interpreter has shown consistent popularity in the Sociometry journal articles, and demonstrates that this image is interdisciplinary in focus.

Two substantive areas appear in the top six positions in terms of use in all three journal samples. Attitudes and personality are research areas which show cross-disciplinary use. This suggests that there is some agreement among social psychologists concerning appropriate objects of study for the discipline.

The causal orientations which describe the approaches
of psychological social psychology, sociological social psy-
chology, and interdisciplinary social psychology reflect
differential perceptions of factors affecting the social
sphere. The findings indicate that the disagreement among
social psychologists is not as great over what objects con-
stitute appropriate phenomena of study for social psycholo-
gists, but rather the key causal variables which effect
these social objects. The causal character of subdiscipli-
nary research is traceable to differences in the orientations
of the parent sciences of psychology and sociology. The use
of categories of independent variables by journal demon-
strates this thesis. For the psychological branch, the inde-
pendent variable is the individual; for the sociological, it
is the society; and for the interdisciplinary view presented,
it is the group. These causal conception differences become
translated into corresponding models which reflect the le-
vels of analysis utilized by the social psychologists. In
fact, in terms of the levels of the framework developed for
the current study, the modes of explanation and the objects
of explanation used in the three social psychology journals
show applications consistent with the independent variable
use data. These two sets of findings indicate that this is
a crucial aspect of subdisciplinary differences which has
relevance to the integration possibilities of the field.

The major trend in the discipline with regard to the
use of research methods, has been toward the development of
greater methodological rigor, as defined by the scientific
tradition. This can be seen in the movement away from the subjective study, and toward a more controlled study. Researchers have become more rigorous in reporting the characteristics of the sample used. The amount of control over extraneous variables, and independent variables has increased steadily since 1920 in social psychology. The trend in data analysis has been from the verbal description of results to the application of various techniques of statistical analysis, chiefly inferential statistics. The use of hypothetical data, and what has been classified as old data, has been replaced by the collection of new data for the specific purpose of the particular research project. The static research design has become dominant in preference to the dynamic model which incorporates change over time, and processual aspects of individual research has become much more specialized, and as a consequence, the scope has narrowed.

The reference use findings indicate that cross-discipline citations are still a relatively rare occurrence in the sociological and psychological subdisciplines. The trend toward multiple authorship has not been accompanied by an increase in interdisciplinary co-operation in research efforts by psychologists and sociologists in social psychology.

The findings for the Sociometry data were included in order to provide an interdisciplinary comparison standard for sociological and psychological social psychology. The trends depicted in the research from this journal show that its interdisciplinary claims are well substantiated. The
results for this journal sample generally reflect a mediational position between the two subdisciplines of social psychology.

FUTURE TRENDS

The examination of historical trends in social psychology as reflected in the character of research articles in selected journals yields information about social psychology as it has been and currently is. The question then arises whether there is a "real" social psychology, and if so, to what extent does it correlate with the disciplinary picture presented by the findings? Assuming the existence of a "real" social psychology, and determining the degree of discrepancy between what has been, what is, and what should or will be requires that one view the discipline as being in a state of developmental transition into a full-fledged academic area.

If one accepts the Kuhnian paradigmatic notion of science, even in its looser interpretation (Kuhn, 1970) as a community of scholars with attitudinal agreement about appropriate ways of doing research, it is clear that the consensus required is not present among social psychologists. With regard to the amount of agreement necessary to constitute the existence of a paradigm, and hence a science, Ben-David (1966) provides an interesting theoretical interpretation that has greater relevance to social psychology. He states that it is necessary for the new discipline "to have at least minimal consensus on the boundaries of the subject
matter upon which its practitioners will focus their attention, and on an acceptable range of research methods" (Ben-David, 1966:457). The findings for the current research indicate that this minimal consensus currently exists in social psychology. Why then has it not become a recognized field in its own right, rather than merely an area of specialization? Ben-David makes a distinction between "role-hybridization" and "idea-hybridization" as applied to the development of a new interdisciplinary science from existing academic parents. Idea hybridization involves "...the combination of ideas taken from different fields into a new intellectual synthesis" (Ben-David, 1966:460). Role-hybridization occurs where the methods of a "higher status" science are applied to the subject matter of another discipline. Examples are the development of psychology from physiology and philosophy, and the development of biochemistry from chemistry and biology. He says that the existence of idea-hybridization "does not attempt to bring about a new academic or professional role, nor does it generally give rise to a coherent and sustained movement with a permanent tradition." (Ben-David, 1966:460). He further points out that "...the ideas necessary for the creation of a new discipline are usually available over a relatively prolonged period of time, and in several places." These ideas function as only the potential beginnings for a new science. Further growth of a developing science necessitates the presence of certain structural conditions as facilitators. One of these
precipitating structural conditions is the development of an academic role describing the practitioners in a field. In the case of social psychology, this role-hybridization has not occurred. Social psychologists are either psychologists or sociologists first, and only secondly do they use the term social psychologist to describe their specialization area. Applying Ben-David's role vs. idea-hybridization dichotomy to social psychology, it can be seen that the actual condition of the field has been a product of a combination of the two processes. The idea synthesis notion is clearly descriptive of what has occurred historically in social psychology, and the case can be made that more borrowing in terms of contemporary methods has occurred from psychology than sociology. However, the evolution of a separate role of "social psychologist" has not come about for the field.

Addressing the issue of the structural prerequisites to the growth into maturity of a discipline, Ben-David states that:

...such growth occurs where and when persons become interested in the new idea, not only as intellectual content, but also as a potential means of establishing a new intellectual identity and particularly a new occupational role... (Ben-David, 1966:452).

In order for a new occupational identity to be established, it would have to be accompanied by the development of departments of social psychology in colleges and universities as structural representatives of this new role. These departments would also have to exist in order to train new members with this occupational identity in order to create a new profession of "pure" social psychologists, unfettered by
parent disciplinary allegiances. What few departments of social psychology that do exist in the United States produce individuals ready to declare themselves sociologists or psychologists in order to make themselves saleable in the academic marketplace.

Given that these structural prerequisites are met, the problem still remains concerning the extent to which idea-hybridization has taken place in social psychology. This requires a return to the still unanswered question of the existence of a "real" social psychology, and the degree to which it differs from the current character of the discipline. It is the view of the current author that, in order for social psychology to exist as a unified area, it must carve out its rightful place from the areas of overlap between sociology and psychology. These boundaries have never been precisely defined enough to constitute a clear dividing line which designates where psychology ends and sociology begins. It is maintained that this is because there is a separate level of analysis existent, which describes an area concerned with the study of group or interpersonal phenomena. From this level, arise both the independent and dependent variables of interest to social psychologists. The results for the actual unit selected for study in all three journals, which represent different social psychology orientations, indicate that the dominant unit in contemporary social psychology is the group. The differences in approach are reflected in the conceptualized independent variables, which
are treated as effectors of this group unit. For sociological social psychologists, it is societal-level phenomena, and for psychological social psychologists, it is individual characteristics. It is only for Sociometry, the interdisciplinary journal, that both the mode of explanation and the object of explanation are group variables. It is proposed that this interdisciplinary perspective represents the character of the "real" social psychology, which must of necessity concern itself primarily with this level of analysis. For this reason, it is maintained that the main barrier to the fruition of a true synthesis of ideas between sociology and psychology into a new field is one which revolves around the issue of causality. Unless there is more agreement about the level of social behavior from which the major effectors, or independent variables derive, there will continue to be a lack of unification. It is proposed that this type of causal consensus exists in psychology and sociology to a large extent. This is not to say that these two fields are homogeneous, unified, sciences with little disagreement among their practitioners. The questions sociologists disagree about with regard to causal determinants, are a matter of which structural, or individual variables among many, are important. This is why there are multiple sociological and psychological theories co-existing within the fields.

In view of the previously discussed prerequisites for role-hybridization, and idea hybridization, the future of the discipline of social psychology is still in question.
In terms of the likelihood for these changes to take place, it is most fitting to conclude with a quote from A. L. Kroeber, a sociologist writing on "The possibility of a social psychology" in the year 1918.

...there is no evident reason...why a science that shall formulate social processes in terms of social factors is impossible.
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Appendix I

CONTENT ANALYSIS SCORING MANUAL

I. Theory Use

A. Major Theoretical Frameworks
-These categories are developed from a classification scheme used by Deutsch and Krauss (1965). The proper classification is according to the framework of primary influence cited in the body of the article. If multiple frameworks or subcategories are utilized, cite them in order of importance.

1. Instinct-Based Theories
   a. Psychoanalytic (Freud)
      (1). analytical psychology (Jung)
      (2). individual psychology (Adler)
      (3). other Neo-Freudians
   b. other instinct theories (list theorist and theory).

2. Reinforcement Theory
   a. behaviorism (Watson)
   b. associationism (Pavlov, Thorndike, Skinner)
   c. exchange theory (Blau, Homans, Thibaut and Kelley)
   d. other reinforcement theories (list theorist and theory)

3. Interactionism (James, Dewey, Baldwin, Mead, Cooley)
   a. self theory (Kuhn)
   b. role theory (Turner, Goode)
   c. dramaturgical (Goffman)
   d. phenomenology (Berger, Scheler, Luckman)
   e. ethnomethodology (Garfinkel)
   f. symbolic interaction (Blumer)
   g. reference group theory (Shibutani)
   h. structural-functional model (Parsons and Bales)
   i. other interactionist models (list theorist and theory)

4. Perceptual
   a. Gestalt (Wertheimer, Kohler)
   b. field (Lewin)
   c. Gestalt-influenced cognitive theory
      (1). balance (Heider)
      (2). dissonance (Festinger)
      (3). other (list theorist and theory)
   d. cognitive development (Piaget)
   e. other perceptual models (list theorist and theory)
5. Cultural Theory
   a. anthropological theory
   b. subcultural theory
   c. sociological theory
6. Other (list theorist and theory)

B. Framework Alternatives
1. No theory discernable in article
   -This category is appropriate if the article is merely the presentation of descriptive data with no theoretical integration.
2. original theory
   -If the theory doesn't fall into any of the major framework categories, and is original to the article author, place it in this category.
3. critique of existing theory
   -If the article merely discusses or compares theories and is not a test of a single theory. State the theories compared.
4. micro-theory
   -If the article involves testing a hypothesis that is not part of any larger theoretical framework.
5. theoretical synthesis
   -If the article combines two or more theories into a new one.

II. Image of Man
-This section is designed to provide a system for classifying articles according to the implicit or underlying assumptions about the nature of man present in the article. Clues for categorizing may be contained in the types of theory or theories utilized and/or cited by the researcher, the way in which the content of the article treats man and social behavior, or simply the philosophical tone in terms of which the material is presented. The major categorical breakdowns are suggested by Gamson and Modigliani (1974) in their discussion of views of human nature in social psychology. Additional categories or subcategories can be added as new views are determined.

A. Man the Animal
   -This category applies to instinct-based conceptions of human behavior, most characteristically Freudian-type theory.
B. Man the Profit Seeker
   -This category includes views of man oriented toward reinforcement, profit-reward, and/or social hedonism.
C. Man the Symbol-Interpreter
   -This classification rubric would include symbolic interaction theories, role theory, and also cognition based approaches to human behavior, and social action.

D. Man the Noble
   -This category would be composed mainly of humanistic conceptions of man which imply or assume that man is ruled by more positive forces or aspects of this character such as responsibility for actions, altruism, prosociality, etc. and consequently able to supercede, overcome, or rise above the pleasure-pain paradigm, and take control of his own fate.

E. Man the Cultural Product
   -This image is based on the premise that cultural characteristics determine human behavior, values, attitudes, and personality.

F. Other Images of Man
   -Specify image name and describe.

G. No Image of Man

III. Substantive Areas
   -These are categories collected from a sample of current social psychology textbooks. Select according to the category of the main problem addressed by the author of the article.

1. attitudes
2. communication
3. collective behavior
4. group dynamics
5. intergroup relations
6. interpersonal attraction
7. language and culture
8. leadership
9. organizations
10. personality
11. role
12. self
13. social influence
14. socialization
15. social learning
16. motivation
17. social perception
18. other
19. mass media
20. environmental psychology
21. culture and personality
IV. Causality

This category label is designed to address the causal inferences that the researcher is implying through his specified or implied use of independent and dependent variables in the study. Do for the main hypothesis under study only. Look to the abstract, paper title and order of presentation of hypotheses to determine the main one.

A. Simple Causal Models (X→→Y)

1. Independent Variable

"an independent variable...is one whose occurrence or change results in the occurrence or change in another variable (the dependent variable). In terms of the cause-effect scheme, the independent variable is the cause." (Theodorson and Theodorson, 1969:457). State the variable label.

a. type variable

-What type of variable is the researcher using for explanatory purposes (the causal concept)? This classification should be based on the stated variable designation and not the method or level of operationalization. List the variable title and then categorize according to the following criteria.

(1). individual characteristics
(2). group characteristics
(a). structural
(b). process
(3). societal characteristics
(a). structural
(b). process
(4). some combination of the above
(5). objects

b. variable specificity

(1). specified
- operationalized or specific theoretically
(2). implied

2. Dependent Variable

"a dependent variable occurs or changes in a regular, determinable pattern related to the occurrence of or changes in another variable or variables. In terms of the cause-effect schema, the dependent variable is the effect." (Theodorson and Theodorson, 1969:457). Classify as in above criteria for independent variable.
B. Additional Variable Schemes -other than the simple $X \rightarrow Y$ causal model:

List category number and define variables as in A above:

$X_i = \text{independent variables}$

$Y_i = \text{dependent variables}$

$i_i = \text{intervening variables}$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>diagramatic representation</th>
<th>category label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. $X_1 \rightarrow Y$</td>
<td>multiple independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. $X \rightarrow Y_1 \rightarrow Y_2$</td>
<td>multiple dependent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. $X \rightarrow i \rightarrow Y$</td>
<td>single intervening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. $X \rightarrow i_1 \rightarrow i_2 \rightarrow Y$</td>
<td>multiple intervening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. $X_1 \rightarrow Y_1 \rightarrow Y_2$</td>
<td>multiple independent, multiple dependent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. $X_1 \rightarrow i \rightarrow Y \rightarrow X_2$</td>
<td>multiple independent, single intervening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. $X \rightarrow i \rightarrow Y_1 \rightarrow Y_2$</td>
<td>single intervening, multiple dependent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. $X \rightarrow i_1 \rightarrow i_2 \rightarrow Y_1 \rightarrow Y_2$</td>
<td>multiple intervening, multiple dependent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. $X \rightarrow i_1 \rightarrow i_2 \rightarrow Y$</td>
<td>multiple intervening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. $X_1 \rightarrow i \rightarrow Y_1 \rightarrow Y_2$</td>
<td>multiple independent, single intervening, multiple dependent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagramatic Representation</td>
<td>Category Label</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. X&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt; i&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt; i&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt; Y&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt; X&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>multiple independent, multiple intervening, multiple dependent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. X &lt;circle&gt; Y</td>
<td>two-way causation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. systems model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. other variable schemes- diagram on back of coding sheet and define variables accordingly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. no causal scheme specified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. Level of Analysis - The concept of levels of analysis as applied to the discussed research will be used to refer to the categories describing different types of implied theoretical connecting links made by the social psychological researcher. These connections, whether manifestly stated or implied within the body of the article, relate the conceptual units under examination in terms of the level of the mode of explanation (causally implied independent variable) and its effect upon the object of explanation (the dependent variable). The presently proposed analysis will make use of three levels to describe conceptual loci which are used by social psychologists for the explanation of social behavior: the societal, the interpersonal, and the individual. The societal level includes the structural and processual characteristics of society. The interpersonal level constitutes the interactional-situational context within which individuals act toward each other. The individual level refers to the organism as a thinking and behaving unit. Needless to say, these levels are in actuality distinctly separable only in terms of the above superimposed lines of division drawn by the present author. Classify in level of analysis category by listing the number. Do for main line theoretical links in article.

A. mode of explanation object of explanation

1. societal----------------------societal
2. societal----------------------interpersonal
3. societal----------------------individual
4. interpersonal------------------societal
5. interpersonal------------------interpersonal
6. interpersonal------------------individual
7. individual---------------------societal
8. individual---------------------interpersonal
9. individual---------------------individual

B. Levels Concept Not Applicable
VI. Article Type

This is a slightly revised form of an empirical system of classification designed and tested by Goodman (1972) which makes use of four categories "to place each paper on a scale ranging from naturalistic to controlled observation, from post hoc to purposive selection and recording of data, from subjective to objective material." If the author uses two types of data, code for the highest category.

1. Subjective
   -Papers reporting observations of a general nature based on personal experience of the author are included in this category. Empirical data consists of anecdotal illustrations, casual references to experience in practice and incomplete case descriptions used as examples of a principle. Here the author uses observations to support or illustrate statements rather than drawing conclusions directly from the incidents described.

2. Case Study
   -These are papers based on a case(s) or instance(s) of a particular phenomenon under study. The empirical data reported consists of the full description and more complete information on which the reader could better judge the validity of the generalizations which are made.

3. Sample
   -These are papers based on observations of a specified sample or series of cases, chosen especially in order to derive statements of fact. Characteristics of the sample are specified and representativeness considered important for generalizability.

4. Controlled
   -This category contains papers in which observations are based on a controlled study of a sample. Relevant variables are defined and controlled. The method used by the researcher could be either experimental, involving the manipulation of variables, or differential, using a comparison of samples.
VII. Method

- The technique for classification used is a modification of one developed by Riley (1963) for categorizing sociological research designs. Alterations have been made in order to make the model more appropriate to social psychological research, or in some cases to increase categorical precision.

A. Nature of the Research Case

- What unit is actually being studied?
  1. individual
  2. group

- State the group size and number of groups studied.
  a. interacting
     (1). artificial (ad hoc)
     (2). natural
        (a). friendship-peer
        (b). family
        (c). occupational
        (d). classroom
        (e). racial
        (f). activity-centered
        (g). cultural
        (h). unspecified
  b. aggregative

- Membership is defined by one or more common characteristics.
  (1). racial
  (2). ethnic
  (3). political
  (4). economic
  (5). religious
  (6). occupational (includes students)
  (7). demographic
  (8). other

3. society
4. inter-societal
5. some combination

B. Number of Cases

1. specified
   - State number of cases
2. unspecified

C. Basis for Selection of Cases

1. representational (sampling)
2. analytical (purposive)
   - Sample is selected for some specified theoretical reason.
3. availability
   - Sample is chosen because of easy access.
   For example from undergraduate college population
4. accidental
   -This is a non-probability sample in which the researcher has little idea of the characteristics of the parent population or sample.

5. other

D. Time
1. static
   -This design is taken or focused upon one point in time and no attempts are made to integrate temporal aspects into the research.

2. dynamic
   -This design incorporates changes with time into the design.

E. Control by the Researcher
1. over extraneous variables
   a. systematic
      (1). experimental
         -Control established through laboratory setting, etc.
      (2). statistical
      (3). theoretical control
   b. unsystematic control
   c. no control

2. over independent variables
   a. systematic
      (1). experimental manipulation
      (2). categorical assignment
      (3). theoretical
   b. unsystematic control
   c. no control

F. Sources of Data
1. new data
   -Data collected by the researcher for the specific purpose of the study.

2. old data
   a. archival
   b. data banks
   c. case histories

3. combination of old and new data

4. hypothetical data
   -Data is used to illustrate a point or theory.

5. unspecified

G. Method of Gathering Data
   -If more than one type is used, check all applicable.
1. observation type (observer categories by Junker (1952)
   a. complete observer
   b. observer as participant
   c. participant as observer
   d. complete participant
   e. unspecified
2. self report
   a. interview
   b. questionnaire
   c. indicator or instrument
   d. projective test
   e. apparatus
   f. other
   g. unspecified

3. setting
   a. laboratory (controlled environment)
   b. classroom
   c. field (naturalistic observation)
   d. arm chair
   e. institution (penal, mental, military, educational, religious, medical)
   f. clinic
   g. unspecified
   h. other

H. Method of Handling Data Results
   - Classify according to technique used to test main hypothesis.
   1. verbal description
      a. systematic
      b. unsystematic
   2. statistical analysis
      - The classification system is based on Loether and McTavish (1974)
      a. descriptive techniques
         (1). summary measures
            (a). measures of central tendency
            (b). per cent
            (c). deviation from the mean
            (d). standard deviation
            (e). tabular analysis
            (f). ratios
            (g). other
            (h). unspecified
         (2). correlational techniques
            (a). simple
               (1). rho
               (2). r
               (3). other
               (4). unspecified
            (b). complex
               (1). path analysis
               (2). multiple correlation
               (3). partial correlation
               (4). factor analysis
               (5). regression
               (6). other
               (7). unspecified
      (3). indicators
         - Formulas developed for the measurement of some characteristic.
b. inferential techniques
   (1). analysis of variance
   (2). chi square
   (3). t-test
   (4). other
   (5). unspecified

VIII. Citations and Authorship

A. Number of Pages
   -This is the total number of pages in the article including the reference page(s).

B. References
   1. Total Number of References
      -This category constitutes a simple count of the number of single references listed in the appropriate section, or when no reference list occurs at the end of the article, count and classify the references listed in the footnotes. Do not count multiple citations of the same reference, but count and classify different references within a single footnote. Total references includes books, periodicals, unpublished papers, etc.
   2. Journal Citations
      -Classify according to title, and journal list.
      a. sociological journals (no.)
      b. psychological journals (no.)
      c. interdisciplinary journals (no.)
   3. Books
      Count total number

C. Disciplinary Affiliation of author(s)
   -Categorize according to the department or organization listed in the article, or when absent, according to the membership at the time of publication.
   1. senior author (first listed)
      a. sociology department (includes anthropology)
      b. psychology department
      c. interdisciplinary
      d. department of Social work
      e. education department
      f. other department (specify)
      g. university affiliates
      h. organizations
      i. other
   2. location
      -Below is a list of how the states that occurred in the sample were classified.
      b. West- Colorado, California, Washington.
      c. Midwest- Missouri, Illinois, Iowa, Wisconsin, Indiana, Kansas, Ohio, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska.
      d. South- Louisiana, Virginia, Kentucky, Maryland, North Carolina, Florida.
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Using Journals as Field Trend Indicators

Academic journals have historically functioned as forums for the presentation of issues and research by those individuals who perceive themselves as members of the discipline to which the periodical addresses itself.

The present study involves an analysis of a sample of published articles from three academic journals that have historically contained social psychological research in sociology and psychology. While limiting the sampling population to social psychological articles from only three journals does create the possibility of some problems, for example representativeness, it is believed that such a limitation is necessary in view of the sheer size of the proposed task. It is very likely that an analysis of social psychology articles from all relevant journals, for all time periods of interest would perhaps produce a more all-inclusive representation of the field of social psychology.

Berelson (1952), author of a book which concerns itself with the use of the technique of content analysis in communications research, says that studies based on a small number of professional journals over time may not be a representative sample of research interests (Berelson, 1952:34). Berelson mentions that this distortion may be due to a number of different factors such as changes in article classification,
editorial policy, professional interest, or the evolution of new journals that would attract research publications for certain specializations or subareas of a particular field. Berelson mentions an article by Shanas (1945) which involves a content analysis of article titles for fifty years in the *American Journal of Sociology* to illustrate changing areas of interest in the field of sociology. Shanas found that articles on social reform which constitute 13 percent of the article population at the beginning of the twentieth century, dropped out of the Journal entirely after 1935. Holsti (1968) in a discussion of the Shanas findings with respect to the Berelson critique of this type of analysis, criticizes the use of this data to indicate field trends, because it could have been due to any of Berelson's previously mentioned factors rather than any real shift in the focus of the discipline. Berelson's criticisms that such results could merely be indicative of changing professional interest, shifts in editorial tastes, or the establishment of new journals doesn't really seem to strike the death blow to this aspect of the Shanas research conclusions. It is proposed that these factors are all an aspect of or interactive with the changing nature of a discipline. Using the Berelson (1952) criticisms and the Holsti (1968) application to the Shanas (1945) research, let us examine each of the proposed alternative hypotheses. It is productive to do this because these criticisms are relevant to the methodological assumptions of the current research on trends in social psychology.
If changing professional interest, especially on a broad scale, is not an important measure of the character of the field, then one must conclude that field consensus has nothing to do with the field itself, and any philosopher of science would vehemently dispute this. For example Kuhn (1970) talks about the key character of a science being based in the shared attitudes of the scientific community. Therefore, changing professional interests would constitute a legitimate and highly representative source for indicating changes within a discipline. If Berelson means idiosyncratic individual changes in professional interests by his statement, it is highly unlikely that fluctuations of this sort would even appear in the overall academic picture. Therefore in most cases, these types of changes would be irrelevant to trend studies.

Berelson also indicates that such findings could be due to the "...later addition of more specialized journals representing branches of the field." (Berelson, 1952:34). This is a possibility, because, when certain specialty areas within a discipline become large enough and/or important enough to supply the material to support such a specific publication, often one arises to meet the need. The reverse causal hypothesis does not make as much sense, i.e. a journal appears on the scene and a supporting population of researchers magically materializes to help fill the journal pages. It is also unlikely, as some critics have maintained, that researchers concoct studies purely for their
appropriateness to certain journals. In order for the previous condition to occur, the interests of individuals in a given general field would have to be extremely broad and malleable, or alternatively, subject to definition purely out of a compulsion in the practitioners of a discipline to publish anywhere. The actual relationship between journal origination and field areas is probably best represented by an interactive model. In other words, developing areas within a field may supply the impetus for the evolution of new journals, which in turn tend to promote that research area by providing a publication site, and therefore legitimizing it. This legitimation would occur only if the publication becomes respected in the field, and this comes about partly by supportive opinions in the scientific community concerning the appropriateness of the area and of the research representing it. Returning to Berelson's "new journal" hypothesis as it applies to the specific Shanas example, there were no new journals within sociology during the thirties which could be responsible for the disappearance of the social reform articles. The most likely explanation for what happened, is that the social reform area did disappear from sociology just as Shanas suggests, and that this type of applied sociology became part of a new field - Social Work. It was during the post-depression thirties that social work as a field became a more systematic and recognized area of study. Therefore, the best answer to this criticism of Berelson's is that it is good to check into the possibility
of the evolution of a new journal as a possible explanation for a finding of this sort. However, unless the new journal is of equal stature in the field, the fact that a main line journal ceased publication of this category of article is a significant and informative finding in and of itself. This indicates that this category is no longer considered an important area in the field.

Berelson's last category of alternative explanations is the proposition that editorial policy changes may be responsible for the Shanas finding. This possibility is perhaps the most difficult to deal with because it is hardest to research. The most obvious support for this hypothesis is found when a category of article types previously appearing in significant proportion disappear in correspondence with a change of editor in the journal. For this to happen, the editor would have to have complete dictatorial control over the journal contents, and be operating independent of trends dominant in the field. Individuals selected for journal editorships are usually the most respected individuals in the field. Given that these individuals have been trained, hence socialized professionally in that field, it is not probable that they will harbor opinions toward the nature of the field that are radically opposed to those characterizing the community of attitudes which describes the discipline itself. It is not being argued here that editors of journals have no effect upon journal content. It is recognized that this possibility is, in a few cases, a reasonable
thesis. However it is maintained that the type of control necessary to produce this kind of a change in the character of the journal independently of any corresponding trend in the field is a rare occurrence in academic journals. There are a number of reasons for this. A primary one is the fact that a system of checks and balances exists both within the journal and within the discipline. There are usually associate editors and referees in any given journal that handle most of the article selections. The editor can make journal policy statements to possibly influence these journal underlings, however it is not probable that policies created by the editor will go against historical trends within the journal or the discipline divorced of real disciplinary changes. It is additionally unlikely that the other editors will go along with radical changes recommended by the head editor. Even aside from these specifics of journal functioning, it is also only minimally tenable that a journal would long remain supported by the field members if it was not reflective of the discipline itself. So the dynamics of discipline trend—editorial policy relations seems much more likely to be causally directed by the character of a field, rather than the reverse. It is therefore proposed that influences going from editorial policies as the determining factor in journal content are possible, but will not be significantly present if the journal retains its academic stature in the field.

With respect to this possibility of editorial influence
in the Shanas finding, the real drop in social reform article publication came between the 1900-1904 period and the 1905-1909 period when the percentage of journal space allocated went from 13 percent to 4.3 percent. This does not correspond to an editorial change because Albion Small was the editor of the American Journal of Sociology for the first twenty-six years of its existence (1895-1926), and then this job was taken over by an editorial board until 1932. Therefore, if the hypothesis is that Albion Small underwent a sudden change of attitude toward social reform articles somewhere between 1904 and 1905, and unilaterally decided to decrease their appearance in the Journal, it is not a very viable one. It is unfortunate that Holsti (1968) selected the Shanas study to apply the Berelson criticisms for illustrative purposes because almost any sociologist familiar at all with the history of his field would testify that this change of focus from an ameliorative to a more academic and empirical orientation in the positivistic tradition was not only a real, but an important transition for sociology. Therefore, Shanas is on firm historical ground supportive of this conclusion. The point to be made here is that in using this type of data to study trends in a field, it is good to do some cross-checking where possible from other sources in order to provide further validation for the data interpretations.

With regard to Berelson's initial statement about basing field trend conclusions on data obtained from the
content analysis of a few professional journals as subject to the previously discussed distortion factors, it is clear that the overall question is really one of representativeness. It is maintained that if the journals for analysis are selected carefully with respect to their characteristics in terms of the perceptions of the scientific community which supports them, then this type of purposive journal sampling need not be as limiting and as methodologically shakey as Berelson implies. In the Shanas case, the American Journal of Sociology as a site for the study of trends in sociology is a legitimate choice in view of the time period selected for study and the recognized historical academic stature of the journal. The previous lengthy and specific response to the Berelson (1952) criticisms and the Holsti application to the Shanas research was necessary to include in the defense of the method selected in the current study.
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List of Journals

Sociology Journals

Acta Sociologica
America Indigena
American Anthropologist
American Journal of Sociology
American Journal of Public Health
American Sociological Review
Anthropological Quarterly
Annee Sociologique
British Journal of Sociology
Comparative Group Studies
Human Organization
Journal of Educational Sociology
Journal of Health and Social Behavior
Journal of Marriage and the Family
Journal of Mathematical Sociology
Journal of Social Issues
Journal of Social Problems
Midwest Sociologist
Pacific Sociological Review
Publications of the American Sociological Society
Public Opinion Quarterly
Rural Sociology
School and Society
Science and Society
Social Forces
Social Research
Social Work
Society
Sociological Inquiry
Sociological Quarterly
Sociology and Social Research
Southwestern Journal of Anthropology
Urban Life and Culture

Psychology Journals

Acta Psychiatrica et Neurologica Scandinavica
Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica
American Behavioral Scientist
American Journal of Insanity
American Journal of Mental Deficiency
American Journal of Orthopsychiatry
American Journal of Psychiatry
American Journal of Psychology
American Psychologist
Annals of Medical Psychology
Archives of General Psychiatry
Archives fur Gesamte Psychology
Archives of Neurological Physiology
Archives of Neurological Psychiatry
Archives of Neurology and Psychiatry
Archives of Psychology
Australian Journal of Psychology
Behavioral Science
Behavior Research Methods and Instrumentation
British Journal of Educational Psychology
British Journal of Psychology
British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology
Canadian Journal of Psychology
Canadian Psychiatric Journal
Character and Personality
Child Development
Contemporary Psychology
Educational and Psychological Measurement
Gawein
Genetic Psychology Monographs
International Clinics
International Journal of Psychology
International Journal of Social Psychiatry
Japanese Psychological Research
Journal of Abnormal Psychology
Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology
Journal of Applied Psychology
Journal of Applied Social Psychology
Journal of Clinical Psychology
Journal of Clinical Psychopathology
Journal of Comparative Neurology
Journal of Comparative Psychology
Journal of Comparative Psychological Physiology
Journal of Consulting Psychology
Journal of Counselling Psychology
Journal of Educational Psychology
Journal of Experimental Psychology
Journal of Experimental Research in Personality
Journal of Experimental Social Psychology
Journal of Genetic Psychology
Journal of Mental Science
Journal of The National Institute of Industrial Psychology
Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease
Journal of Personality and Social Psychology
Journal of Projective Techniques
Journal of Projective Techniques and Personality Assessment
Journal of Pschedelic Drugs
Journal de Psychologie
Journal of Psychology
Journal of Social Psychiatry
Journal of Social Psychology
Mental Health Journal
Mental Hygiene
Perceptual and Motor Skills
Personality
Psychological Bulletin
Psychiatry
Psychiatric Neurology
Psychoanalysis Review
Psychobiology
Psychologische Forschung
Psychological Bulletin
Psychological Monographs
Psychological Record
Psychological Reports
Psychological Review
Psychologische Arbeiten
Psychometrika
Psychonomic Science
Psychopharmacologia
Social Psychiatry

Interdisciplinary Journals

Human Relations

Sociometry

Family Process
Appendix iv

LIST OF ARTICLES IN SAMPLE

(N = 240)

Adinolfi, Allen A., Robert I. Watson, and Robert E. Klein

Adler, Alfred

Adler, Nancy E.

Alexander, Chester

Allport, Gordon W.

Allport, Gordon W.

Almack, John C.

Alpert, Harry
1939 "Emile Durkheim and sociologismic psychology." American Journal of Sociology 45:64-70.

Argyle, Michael

Arnold, Magda B.
Bagby, English

Barron, Frank

Bass, Bernard M., Margaret W. Pryer, Eugene L. Gaier, and Austin W. Flint

Bassett, Raymond

Becker, Howard

Becker, Myron G., and Charles P. Loomis
1948 "Measuring rural urban and farm and non-farm cleavages in a rural consolidated school." Sociometry 11:246-261.

Benjamins, James

Benton, Alan A.

Berger, Joseph and M. Hamit Fisek

Berkowitz, Leonard

Berkowitz, Leonard
Berkowitz, Leonard

Bernard, Jessie

Bernard, L. L.

Bernard, L. L.

Binder, Arnold, David McConnell and Nancy A. Sjoholm

Bjerstedt, Ake
1955 "Sociometric relations in elementary school classes." Sociometry 18:147-152.

Blake, Robert R.
1953 "The interaction-feeling hypothesis applied to psychotherapy groups." Sociometry 16:253-265.

Blake, Robert R., Howard Berkowitz, Roy Q. Bellamy, and Jane S. Mouton

Blatz, William E.

Blau, Peter M.

Blau, Zena S.

Bodenhafer, Walter B.
Bolton, Charles D.  

Bonney, Merl E.  

Borgatta, Edgar F. and Leonard S. Cottrell Jr.  

Bowerman, Charles E. and Stephen J. Bahr  

Breton, Raymond  

Brigham, John C.  

Brim, Orville G. and David B. Hoff  

Brissett, Dennis  

Brown, Andrew, Joan Morrison and Gertrude B. Couch  

Burgess, Ernest W.  

Burgess, Ernest W. and Paul Wallin  

Burhans, David T. Jr.  
Burnstein, Eugene, Harold Miller, Amiram Vinokur, Stuart Katz, and Joan Crowley  

Burrow, Trigant  

Buss, Arnold and E. Neil Murray  

Bustamante, Jorge A.  

Byrd, Eugene  

Calder, Bobby J., Michael Ross, and Chester A. Insko  

Campbell, Donald T., William H. Kruskal, and William P. Wallace  

Campbell, John D. and Marian Radke Yarrow  

Cantril, Hadley  

Cartwright, Desmond  

Cason, Hulsey  

Cheyne, James A. and Michael G. Efran  
Clark, Alexander L. and Paul Wallin

Clark, Kenneth B. and James Barker

Clark, Russell D. and Larry E. Word

Coleman, James S. and John James

Cook, Thomas D., John R. Burd and Terence L. Talbert

Creegan, Robert F.

Cressman, Luther S.

Danet, Brenda and Michael Gurevitch

Danielsson, Bengt

Davis, Fred

Day, Robert C. and Robert L. Hamblin

De Groot, A. D.
DeWolfe, Alan S.

Dodd, Stuart C.

Dodd, Stuart Carter

Doise, Willem

Doob, Leonard

Dunlap, Knight

Dunphy, Dexter C.

Eisler, Edwin R.

Eldridge, Seba

Epstein, Seymour

Eriksen, Charles W. and James L. Kuethe

Faris, Ellsworth
Faris, Robert E. L.  

Feldman, Saul D.  
1973  "Impediment or stimulant? marital status and graduate education." American Journal of Sociology 78:982-994.

Fessenden, Seth  

Festinger, Leon  

Fischer, Paul H.  

Forman, Robert E.  

Frank, Lawrence K.  
1944  "What is social order?" American Journal of Sociology 49:470-477.

Frankel, Esther B., and Reva Potashin  

Frazier, E. Franklin  

Freedman, Jonathan L. and Scott C. Fraser  

French, Elizabeth G.  

Gabennesch, Howard  
Garland, Howard and Bert R. Brown

Gaudet, Frederick J. and Robert I. Watson

Giddings, Franklin H.

Gillin, John

Goldman, Morton, Bernard J. Haberlein and Gloria J. Feder

Goodacre, Daniel M. III
1951 "The use of a sociometric test as a predictor of combat unit effectiveness." Sociometry 14:148-152.

Gove, Walter R.

Gove, Walter R. and Jeannette F. Tudor

Graham, Virginia T.

Gregory, W. Edgar

Griffitt, William

Gross, Edward

Gustafson, David P. and Jack E. Gaumnitz
Gutman, Gloria M. and Robert E. Knox

Haaland, Gordon A. and M. Venkatesan

Hallinan, Maureen T.

Hammersmith, Sue K. and Martin S. Weinberg

Harary, Frank

Harms, Ernst

Harvey, O. L.

Havinghurst, Robert J. and Kenneth Feigenbaum

Healy, William

Henshel, Anne-Marie

Hettema, Joop

Hirschberg, Grace and A. R. Gilliland

Hoffman, L. Richard
1958 "Similarity of personality: a basis for interpersonal attraction?" Sociometry 21:300-308.
Holt, A. E.
1926 "Case records as data for studying the conditioning of religious experience by social factors." American Journal of Sociology 32:227-236.

House, Floyd N.

Howard, William and William D. Crano
1974 "Effects of sex, conversation, location, and size of observer group on bystander intervention in a high risk situation." Sociometry 37:491-507.

Hulett, J. E. Jr.

Hutchins, Edwin and Fred E. Fiedler

Jackson, Jay M.

Johnson, Homer H.

Johnson, Jean E. and Howard Leventhal

Kadane, Joseph B.

Kahn, Arnold
1972 "Reactions to generosity or stinginess from an intelligent or stupid work partner: a test of equity theory in a direct exchange relationship." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 21:116-123.

Kantor, J. R.
1922 "How is a science of social psychology possible." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 17:62-78.

Kantor, J. R.
Kaufman, Harold F.  

Kirkpatrick, Clifford  

Klapp, Orrin E.  

Klein, George and Nathan Schoenfeld  

Komarovsky, Mirra and Willard Waller  

Konecni, Vladimir J.  

Korte, Charles  

Lalljee, Mansur and Mark Cook  

Largey, Gale P. and David R. Watson  

Larsen, Otto N. and Richard J. Hill  

Leik, Robert K.  

Lemann, Thomas B. and Richard L. Solomon  
1952 "Group characteristics as revealed in sociometric patterns and personality ratings." Sociometry 15:7-90.

Lewin, Kurt  
Lind, Katherine N.  
1936  "The social psychology of children's reading."  
American Journal of Sociology 41:454-469.

Lindesmith, Algred R. and Anselm L. Strauss  
1952  "Comparative psychology and social psychology."  
American Journal of Sociology 58:272-279.

Linton, Ralph  
1938  "Culture, society and the individual."  

Liu, William T., Ira W. Hutchison and Lawrence K. Hong  
1973  "Conjugal power and decision making: a methodological note on cross-cultural study of the family."  
American Journal of Sociology 79:84-98.

Luria, Zella  
1959  "A semantic analysis of a normal and neurotic therapy group."  

Mahoney, E. R.  
1974  "Compensatory reactions of spatial immediacy."  
Sociometry 37:423-431.

Mark, Joseph C.  
1953  "The attitudes of the mothers of male schizophrenics toward child behavior."  
Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 48:185-188.

Masouka, Jitsuichi  
1936  "Race preference in Hawaii."  
American Journal of Sociology 41:635-641.

Maurer, David W.  
1939  "Prostitutes and criminal argots."  

Maurer, Heinrich H.  
1925  "Studies in the sociology of religion: the fellowship of a fundamentalist group: the Missouri synod."  

Maurer, Heinrich H.  
1926  "Studies in the sociology of religion: the consciousness of kind of a fundamentalist group."  
American Journal of Sociology 31:485-506.

McAuliffe, William E. and Robert A. Gordon  
McCormick, Thomas C.  
1931 "A point of view on instincts in social psychology."  

McDougall, William  
1921 "The use and abuse of instinct in social psychology."  

Mehrabian, Albert and Shirley G. Diamond  

Meier, Norman C.  
1925 "Motives in voting: a study in public opinion."  
American Journal of Sociology 31:199-212.

Mills, Judson and Elliott Aronson  

Moore, B. Jr.  

Moran, Louis J., Donald R. Gorham and Wayne H. Holtzman  


Moreno, J. L.  

Moreno, J. L.  
1944 "A case of paranoia treated through psychodrama."  Sociometry 7:312-327.

Moreno, J. L.  
1945 "The two sociometries, human and subhuman."  Sociometry 8:64-75.

Moulton, Robert W.  

Munn, Norman  
Murdock, George Peter
1941 "Anthropology and human relations." Sociometry 4: 140-149.

Nelson, Erland and Naida Nelson

Northway, Mary L. and Joyce Detweiler

Ogburn, William F.

Oppenheimer, Franz

Pangburn, Weaver

Patrick, G. T. W.
1925 "Can the sentiment of patriotism be refunded?" American Journal of Sociology 30:569-584.

Pearson, Ruth R.

Phillips, Bernard S.

Phillips, D. E.

Pierce, Douglas R.
1968 "Perceptual distortion cues to the dynamics of social interaction." Sociometry 31:412-419.

Piliavin, Irving and Scott Briar

Prince, Morton
Ransford, H. Edward

Reeder, Leo G., George A. Donahue, and Arturo Biblarz

Rice, Stuart A.

Rogers, Ronald W. and Donald L. Thistlewaite

Rogler, LLoyd H. and August B. Hollingshead

Rokeach, Milton

Rotter, Julian B.

Rule, Brendan G. and Pieter Duker

Samelson, Babette

Sarnoff, Irving and Daniel Katz

Schneider, David J. and Andrew C. Eustis

Schubert, Herman J. P. and Mazie Earle Wagner
Schuetz, Alfred

Schulman, Gary I.

Seeman, Melvin

Sheppard, Harold L.

Silverman, Lloyd H. and Doris K. Silverman
1962 "Ego impairment in schizophrenia as reflected in the object sorting test." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 64:381-385.

Smith, Donald E. and Alton L. Raygor

Smith, Mapheus

Speer, David C.

Stanton, Howard, Kurt W. Back and Eugene Litwak

Stogdill, Ralph M.

Stonequist, Everett V.

Stoodley, Bartlett H.

Strodtbeck, Fred L.
Strong, Samuel M.  

Swanson, Guy E.  

Thaver, Falak and William F. Oakes  

Thomas, Edwin J. and Clinton F. Fink  

Thomas, John L.  

Trout, David M.  

Turner, Ralph  

Uhr, Leonard, Margaret Clay, Arthur Platz, James G. Miller, and E. Lowell Kelly  

Van Der Kroef, Justus M.  

Videbeck, Richard and Alan P. Bates  

Wagoner, Robert A.  

Wallace, Walter L.  
Wardwell, Walter and Arthur L. Wood

Warriner, Charles K.

Wax, Murray

Weber, C. O.

Weigert, Andrew J. and Darwin L. Thomas

Weinstein, Eugene

Weller, Jack M. and E. L. Quarantelli

Wells, F. L.

Wells, Wesley Raymond

Wheaton, Blair

White, Harrison C.

Whitlow, C. M.

Wiggins, James A.
Williams, E. Y.

Williams, W. A.

Winch, Robert F.

Witty, Paul A. and Harvey C. Lehman

Witty, Paul A. and Harvey C. Lehman

Yinger, J. Milton

Young, Frank W.

Zipf, George Kingsley