

THE PUBLIC IMAGE OF THE SOCIOLOGIST
AND OTHER PROFESSIONALS

by

ANNETTE CLARE MIROCKE

B.S., Kansas State University, 1976

A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Social Work

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

Manhattan, Kansas

1978

Approved by:


Major Professor

Documents
LD
2668
TH
1978
MST
C.2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
LIST OF FIGURES	iii
LIST OF TABLES	iii
Introduction	1
THEORY	1
LITERATURE REVIEW	4
DISSEMINATION OF KNOWLEDGE	6
PROBLEM STATEMENT	12
METHOD	13
Content Analysis	13
Sources	13
The Content Analysis Schedule	15
SUMMARY OF MAJOR VARIABLES AND THEIR EXPECTED RELATIONSHIPS	19
DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS	21
Reliability, Validity, and Suggestions for Further Research	47
BIBLIOGRAPHY	51
APPENDIX	55
ABSTRACT	76

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Several people helped push me along the path to completion of this thesis: my fellow graduate students, who empathized with me since they were in the same boat; the chairperson of my committee, Neal Flora, who gave me constant encouragement, helpful ideas and comments, and always read drafts and handed them back with lightning speed; the other members of my committee, Dick Brede and Jim Miley, whose ideas and comments were inspiring; my parents (and grandparents), who said they believed I could do anything if I really tried, and who gave me the beginnings of the idea for this thesis topic, and my late grandmother, Clara E. Hendrix, who always encouraged me in whatever I did.

Finally, I want to thank Art (Bo) Evans, without whom I would probably never have finished this thesis. His unflinching love, support, reassurance, patience, and understanding outlasted my periodic frustration; his enlightening ideas and his urging me to do my best are what kept me going.

To all of these people, thank you.

LIST OF FIGURES

	<u>PAGE</u>
FIGURE 1 - Type of Professional Listed in Order of Their Percent of the Total Sample	25
FIGURE 2 - Profession General Referent Made About, in Order of the Percentage of Time They Were Cited	35
FIGURE 3 - Percentage of Time Each Method Was Mentioned	36
FIGURE 4 - Percent Each Type of Statistic Was Mentioned, by Total and Independent Variables	44

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>PAGE</u>
TABLE 1 - Name of Periodical by Year of Periodical	22
TABLE 2 - Type of Professional by Year of Periodical	24
TABLE 3 - Name of Sponsor by Year of Periodical	29
TABLE 4 - Name of Sponsor by Name of Periodical	29
TABLE 5 - Whether Professional's Name Was Mentioned by Name of Periodical	31
TABLE 6 - Whether Professional's Race Was Mentioned by Name of Periodical	33
TABLE 7 - Whether Professional's Race Was Mentioned by Type of Professional	33
TABLE 8 - Whether Direct Quotes Were Used by Name of Periodical	34
TABLE 9 - Type of Method by Year of Periodical	37
TABLE 10- Type of Method by Name of Periodical	38
TABLE 11 - Type of Method by Type of Professional	39
TABLE 12 - Whether Statistics Were Mentioned by Name of Periodical	40
TABLE 13 - Whether Simple Counts Were Used by Type of Professional	41
TABLE 14 - Whether Financial Statistics Were Used by Name of Periodical	42
TABLE 15 - Opinion of Contribution of Researcher by Name of Periodical	46

Introduction

Anyone who has ever majored in sociology, upon going home to relatives and friends, has most likely encountered the question "what is sociology?" But more recently, since sociology has been disseminated in the mass media, comments like the following may become more common: "Oh yeah, I've read about sociologists--most of the studies they do tell us what we already know anyway", or, "Sociologists sit in ivory towers telling us all what's wrong with us, but they don't provide any answers" The latter comments got me interested in the idea of just what the public image of sociology is. While doing library research, I found only one article dealing specifically with this topic. But I found that some theoretical articles dealing with professions raised interesting questions that related to the area, and I became interested in the ways sociological knowledge is disseminated.

THEORY

Znaniecki points out that knowledge is a prerequisite for most social roles. "The fact is that every individual who performs any social role is supposed by his social circle to possess and believes himself to possess the knowledge indispensable for its normal performance" (Znaniecki, 1940: 24). Znaniecki also says that basically, two types of knowledge can be found: "...specialized knowledge which particular individuals need in their occupational roles and common knowledge which all adult individuals need as members of the community" (1940: 25). These two types of knowledge can overlap and effect each other. Axelrod says in effect that since the common knowledge is what most humans share, the community "calls out to it" more (Axelrod, 1977: 188). According to Znaniecki, the systems of knowledge which scientists build

and their methods of building them may be influenced by "the social patterns with which scientists are expected to conform as participants in a certain social order and by the ways in which they actually realize those patterns" (1940: 22). Thus the larger social community has an effect on and interacts with the professional community, and their knowledge may overlap.

Znanięcki says that there are two types of disseminators of knowledge: 1) educating teachers, and 2) popularizers who spread scientific information "and tend to arouse theoretic interests among the adult population actually participating in organized society" (1940: 150-51). The popularizer's job is rather difficult, because s/he must appeal to people whose main interests in life "are already settled and essentially practical", and if they feel the need for more knowledge than they already possess, they want useful, practical knowledge. The popularizer cannot change their interests, "for his contacts with them, whether through speech or writing, are not sufficiently close or continuous to exert a deep personal influence; nor has he any powerful social instruments at his disposal to modify the course of their lives. He may indeed try to make them see the deeper theoretic implications of whatever useful information they actually desire: this is a kind of appeal often made by modern popularizers of physical, chemical, biological, psychological, sociological, and economic theories" (Znanięcki, 1940: 151).

What the popularizer of knowledge really stimulates is amateur interest in knowledge. Amateur knowledge obviously requires a minimum amount of leisure time, so in the past it was almost entirely limited to the wealthy. More recently, however, it has been spreading rapidly (Znanięcki, 1940: 152).

Znaniecki states that the works of popularizers, to be successful, "must deviate considerably from the difficult standards of genuine scholarship. This is generally recognized; and scholars, especially younger scholars in institutions of higher learning, are not encouraged to do much popularizing, lest it impair their intellectual discipline" (1940: 153).

Durkheim's ideas let us know that the professional or scientist must have the support of the public in order to maintain his/her authority. He says that opinion, primarily a social thing, is a source of authority. Science is often the antagonist of opinion, "whose errors it combats and rectifies. But it cannot succeed in this task if it does not have sufficient authority, and it can obtain this authority only from opinion itself. If a people did not have faith in science, all the scientific demonstrations in the world would be without any influence whatsoever over their minds. Even today, if science happened to resist a very strong current of public opinion, it would risk losing its credit there" (1947: 208). It might be said that Durkheim's ideas go along with the "externalist" school, i.e., the idea that the factors that determine the state of a discipline's paradigm lie beyond the discipline altogether, usually in such institutions as the church, political system, or economy (Useem, 1976: 147).

These theories lay the groundwork for the ideas I wish to present from the literature on professions. The attributes of a profession vary, depending on which author you read. Despite the variations in the concept, one recurring theme emerges--the command of specialized knowledge setting the professional apart.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Professions are commonly defined as occupations which possess a monopoly of some esoteric and difficult body of knowledge. This knowledge is considered to be necessary for the continuing functioning of society, since supposedly no one else knows or can do these things the professional knows or can do. The knowledge comes from scientific research and logical analysis, rather than from practical experience. Lengthy training is considered necessary, because the knowledge is supposed to be so complex. Some articles mention that the professional serves clients in need of his/her knowledge or services. The professional is free of lay control ("professional autonomy") according to most of the literature. That autonomy is allowed because the professional is assumed to have altruistic motivations and a code of ethics. High income and community prestige are auxiliary traits that are often associated with professional status, which are perceived to be the just reward to those who command scarce but valuable knowledge and administer it with such responsibility. Medicine and law are mentioned the most often as being professions, having both high income and prestige. Also mentioned are the clergy and university teaching, where income is relatively low but prestige high (Flexner, 1915: 578-81; Greenwood, 1957; Gross, 1958; Becker, 1962: 35-38; Barber, 1963: 672; Wilensky, 1964: 138; Ferrucci and Gerstl, 1969; Goode, 1969: 267; Haug and Sussman, 1969; Roth, 1974: 7, 13; Haug, 1975: 197-200; Lopata, 1976: 438). Howard Becker says that rather than having exact definitions, professions are simply "those occupations which have been fortunate enough in the

politics of today's work world to gain and maintain possession of that honorific title profession is a collective symbol...." (1962: 33).

Do sociologists possess the attributes to be called professionals? Several authors mentioned that sociology is a profession (Nettler, 1947: 553; Parsons, 1959: 547; Riley, 1960: 914; Phillips, 1971: 308). Two authors have commented on the question of esoteric knowledge: Barber (1963: 672) says that during the last hundred years the social sciences, including sociology, have developed "generalized and systematic knowledge of a professional level." And Phillips says that rather than being perceived as a "cloistered scholar", the sociologist is now seen as a professional, "an expert whose knowledge and advice are considered sufficiently valuable to be worth soliciting and applying to contemporary social issues" (1971: 308). Some authors even spoke of sociologists having clients, another attribute of being a professional. Gouldner even uses the term "clinical sociologist"; this person is supposed to diagnose clients' problems (1965: 19). The people or entities that were termed as clients of the sociologist varied by author. Clients named were business firms, governmental units, social service agencies, research offices, labor, schools, courts, mental and general hospitals, "the poor", university students, and those who may need research done on their products or audiences, e.g., corporations or the mass media (Parsons, 1959: 556; Rodman and Kolodny, 1965: 93; Fisher, 1969: 433; Lazarsfeld and Reitz, 1975: 3-4). Other attributes of professionals, such as having an altruistic or service orientation, and being free of lay control, were also mentioned (Rodman and Kolodny, 1965: 95; Gouldner, 1965: 13, 19, 21; Lazarsfeld and Reitz, 1975: 10-11).

Theories of the nature of professions (which will be presented in the next section) prove useful when studying how sociologists are perceived by the general public. Seminal to the public identity of sociologists is the question of whether or not they are perceived as having a monopoly on a difficult but necessary body of knowledge.

DISSEMINATION OF KNOWLEDGE

The main thing that makes one a professional is being viewed as the possessor of esoteric knowledge. A monopoly on knowledge can be maintained by discussing it only with other professionals; only allowing members of the professional community to judge research papers; divulging just a minimal amount of knowledge to clients, etc. To do all these things, the professional needs public acceptance that s/he is an expert with altruistic motivation (Haug and Sussman, 1969: 153). However, now some authors claim that it has become less feasible for professionals to hold a monopoly on a body of knowledge.

A number of articles discuss the fact that professionals are losing their monopoly on knowledge. The theoretical ideas of Znaniecki and Durkheim can be found in many of the articles.

Marie Haug says that the erosion of the knowledge monopoly is a result of rising levels of public schooling, sophistication, and specific client education, along with computerization (which changes accessibility patterns to knowledge) and new occupations in the division of labor, which disseminate information more widely. The expanding knowledge base within the profession itself can also cause a strain on monopolization; one individual cannot possibly have knowledge of a whole field; instead, people break out into various branches of specialization, limiting their knowledge (1975: 202). Haug says that the consequences

of this are "decline of trust in professional decisions and diminution of professional power and authority over clients. Ideological challenges to professional status accompany these developments [reminiscent of what Durkheim said], which converge to suggest a deprofessionalized future" (1975: 197, 211).

Like Haug, Lopata says that knowledge monopolization is decreasingly possible. This is a consequence of several things: "In the first place, the main fields of expertise have become so vast that the members of the professions and experts in other bodies of knowledge are less and less able to share a common universe of discourse, to agree on priorities and procedures, or to present to the public a common front....The fragmentation of the fields of expertise is often apparent to the members of the society at large, particularly when experts step out of their environment in an attempt to influence others (e.g., the case surrounding the busing of children in an attempt to desegregate American urban schools), or when their knowledge appears as bits and pieces in the mass communications media" (Lopata, 1976: 442). One result of all this, according to Lopata is at least partial rejection of the experts and their advice: "It is not surprising that people who have available to them medical, legal, psychological and even sociological knowledge from the New York Times, the Chicago Tribune, and the National Enquirer consider themselves "almost as good" experts in our fields as we consider ourselves--anyway, our colleagues....Descendants of often relatively uneducated immigrants have by now reached a level of sophistication in a variety of previously esoteric knowledge bodies to become their own experts" (Lopata, 1976: 442). The contents of Haug's and Lopata's articles

contain most of the basic elements that are found scattered throughout the other articles dealing with this subject, most of which focus specifically on sociology rather than on professions in general.

Sociology has a disadvantage as a profession in that it deals with subject matter many people have personal familiarity with, as well as wide, if limited, coverage of social issues in the mass media. Has sociological knowledge been popularly disseminated? In 1959 Parsons said that "the term sociology is coming increasingly to be a central symbol in the popular ideological preoccupations of our time" (p. 553). Odum says that the classification of a large number of volumes as "sociology" and much general "sociological" writing may be indicative of "a growing emphasis upon sociology as the chief of the social sciences from a popular point of view. Next to religion, fiction, and juveniles, books catalogued in the Publisher's Weekly as "sociology" are next in order, with "economics" a close second, and sometimes the two grouped together" (Odum, 1951: 16). Horowitz states that the dissemination of sociological findings "has become a serious and full-scale matter in the United States" (1968: 34). He says a huge audience exists for such books as William H. Whyte's The Organization Man, David Reisman's The Lonely Crowd, Michael Harrington's The Other America, C. Wright Mills' The Power Elite, E. Franklin Frazier's Black Bourgeoisie, and others. Horowitz believes that this indicates that "sociology has come of age as a public source of legitimacy" (1968: 34). In addition, the terms "sociology" and "sociologists" are presently seen and heard regularly in the mass media.

As Haug and Lopata said, new occupations, increasing specialization, venturing outside one's field, and rising levels of public schooling disseminate professional knowledge more widely. Sociologists have

found themselves serving more--and more varied-- "clients" than ever before. They not only teach at the university level, but may teach at the high school level (indicating higher levels of public schooling and exposure to sociology), may work doing research for the government, labor, or business, etc. (Fisher, 1969: 433). This could be an example of both specialization and of venturing outside the academic field of expertise. At times, sociologists have been asked to testify in court cases, e.g., in civil rights litigation, or to give census-type facts. There is the danger here that they may find themselves in the position of the psychiatrists, with two or more of them offering with equal certainty contradictory testimony (Clark, 1953: 10; Rose, 1967: 116). Neil Smelser talks about the increasing number of subdivisions and specializations in sociology, and the proliferation of schools of thought. Consequently, there is disagreement among sociologists about the fundamental problems, concepts, theories, and methods in the field. "Because of this internal diversity, it is a difficult, even presumptuous, task to present a single view of the character of the field" (Smelser, 1967: 8). This, along with the information on sociologists testifying in court, backs up two things Haug and Lopata said: that no one individual can know all there is to know about the field of sociology, and that the layperson can challenge the experts when they contradict each other in public.

This brings us to another topic: that professionals can be and have been challenged as to whether they are really knowledgeable persons, as a result of their knowledge being disseminated. Phillips says that sociologists seem to have been unable to provide knowledge that explains very much of the social behavior in which they are interested (1971: 314). Hughes reminds us of what Durkheim said about the importance of public

opinion to science: "Social unrest shows itself precisely in questioning of the prerogatives of the leading professions. In time of crisis, there may arise a general demand for more complete conformity of professionals to lay modes of thought, discourse, and action" (Hughes, 1958: 83). Odum speaks about the public testing sociologists' knowledge. He says lawyers and other specialists in government and politics are asking what sociologists have to say about what they consider the chief social problems of the day. "The newspapers and the public in general keep asking the sociologists about crime, and poverty, and other problems--What facts can you give us? What is your science good for and how is it being applied?...there are many challenges and critical notes. What are the sociologists doing? What should they do?...Thousands.... protest sociology's failure to come to grips with life, and they want to make it more human" (Odum, 1951: 16).

How is sociological knowledge disseminated in the mass media? In a very interesting article, Walum discusses what happened to a paper she presented at the 1973 meetings of the American Sociological Association. She says that in the normal processing of sociology, the sociologist's work is judged, disseminated, replicated, and challenged by sociologists, and that the criteria of evaluation are the criteria of sociology (Walum, 1975: 28). The paper Walum gave at the ASA meetings was disseminated in a different way: by newspapers, magazines, radio and television broadcasts. The sociology, Walum says, was transformed into "human interest""the topic which was newsworthy was not the sociological dimensions of the paper" (1975: 29). The gender of the author was emphasized in the media. Quotes were placed around sentences that were not actually quotations. The information became simplified: "the ideas in the paper

became translated into ideas which are more familiar to the public and therefore, more easily assimilated" (Walum, 1975: 29). This reminds us of what Znaniecki said about the popularizer of knowledge--that s/he must simplify information so that it is interesting to the public. There was a lot of feedback and criticism, but not much from sociological colleagues; almost all of it was from the public (Walum, 1975: 29-30). Because of the intervention of journalism in the normal dissemination of Walum's sociology paper, she had no control over the distorting process of transforming the material into ideas that were readily assimilated by the lay public. Further, Walum says, "Perhaps an even more serious consequence for sociology is that what the press covers as sociology tends to become equated with sociology in the public's image" (1975: 30). For example, particular meetings and particular books, which the ASA had defined as important and significant, were not communicated to the public. The media coverage greatly enlarged in numbers and scope the audience for the original paper, so, rather than being evaluated only by other sociologists, the paper was evaluated in many different ways, depending on the relevance to the various audiences (Walum, 1975: 30). This is reminiscent of what I said about the "externalist" point of view--that the state of a discipline's paradigm is affected by factors outside the discipline itself, like the government or the public. Taking Walum's point of view, the popular dissemination of sociological findings greatly affects the discipline of sociology.

Another article also discussed public dissemination of sociological knowledge. The Moynihan report was a classic case of a Report which was not written for a lay audience being disseminated widely. The Report was apparently intended for exclusive use by high-level officials of

the Johnson administration, but it was "leaked" to the press. "Many blacks became intensely hostile to the Report, which they perceived as an attempt to hold blacks morally responsible for their economic plight and to justify intervention in the private lives of black families....this hostility resulted from a great deal of misunderstanding about the actual content of the report....this misunderstanding was largely a result of the way the Report was presented in the press" (Lazarsfeld and Reitz, 1975: 156-57).

PROBLEM STATEMENT

I agree with Lopata when she says that knowledge monopolization becomes difficult when experts step out of their environment in an attempt to influence others, and/or when their knowledge appears as bits and pieces in the mass media. Does dissemination of sociological knowledge increase or decrease its identity as a profession? What sociological knowledge is being disseminated, and in what form? My research is based on the following assumption made by Walum in her article: what the press covers as sociology tends to become equated with sociology in the public's image. So, I propose that information labeled as "sociology" is sociology to the public. The same will be true of what it is reported that "sociologists" do. Content analysis will be used to identify that information.

Although sociologists may say that their research is being distorted and that the public "knows absolutely nothing about what sociology really is", what the public receives through the media is sociology in their eyes. And I want to find out what that image is: what research is disseminated, and in what form. I will also compare this to images of other professionals in the press; as I'll explain later, because of limited time and resources, it would not be feasible to look only at sociologists.

METHOD

Content Analysis

I chose the method of content analysis for this study. It seemed to be the most systematic and comprehensive way of examining the main things discussed in the first chapter of this paper.

Berelson said that the process of communication is "who says what to whom, how, with what effect" (1952: 13). Elaborating on this, Babbie says that content analysis, as a mode of observation, involves the standardized coding of the what in this formulation. He adds: "The analysis of data collected in this mode may be addressed to the why and with what effect" (1975: 26). Babbie also lists the advantages and disadvantages of the content analysis method.

Advantages:

- *Safety--repetition of any research done wrong can be done easily. This enhances reliability.
- *Unobtrusiveness--researcher seldom has an effect on what s/he's studying. Since the articles have already been written, e.g., subsequent content analysis can have no effect on them.

Disadvantages:

- *Content analysis is limited to the examination of recorded communications.
- *Validity--there may be difficulty in counting and coding methods that adequately represent one's theoretical concepts.

(Babbie, 1975: 234).

Sources

I selected Time magazine and Reader's Digest as the sources of information on which to do content analysis. Originally, I had wanted to

use sources that aimed at lower, middle, and upper class audiences. The only information available, according to the librarian, on the makeup of the readership of publications was included in the "Target Group Index", which is compiled by the Axiom Market Research Bureau, Inc. It lists characteristics of the adult audience of readers of 125 periodicals. I concentrated on education, occupation, and income of the readers. I focused on magazines which overtly dealt with issues that sociologists claim as areas of exclusive or at least special knowledge, eliminating magazines with more specific, applied content. Examples of magazines not expected to mention sociologists are hot rod, beauty, farm, and magazines like True Confessions. After going through this information, only two general interest periodicals appeared to have "lower class" readership: Jet and The National Enquirer. The latter was not available over an extended period of time (1968-77), not even on microfilm. I rejected Jet because the readership was too limited (97% black), which would make it impossible to generalize to the whole lower class.

Because of this, I had to abandon the original "class" categories. I adjusted by deciding I would use one periodical aimed at a "general" or "average" audience (this would include the lower and part of the middle class of the previous categories); the other aimed at a more highly educated, more well-off readership (this would include part of the middle and all of the upper class of the previous categories).

Audubon Magazine, Forbes, Fortune, Natural History, Scientific American, Smithsonian, and Time all had a readership that was in the upper education, occupation, and income brackets. I rejected all but Time because once again, I felt that either the readership or the subject matter was too limited. For example, Forbes and Fortune concerned business al-

most exclusively. So I chose Time for the readership that was upper-middle class and above because it deals with a wide range of issues. I chose the Reader's Digest as the periodical that aimed at the "general public" or below upper-middle class readership for the same reason--it covers a very wide range of subjects. Besides, there was meager competition concerning SES statistics--Reader's Digest was truly "average" on all counts.

The Content Analysis Schedule

In Chapter One, I reported that Odum said that the public asks what sociologists have to say about the chief social problems of the day. Since I couldn't possibly look at all the articles on all social problems, I decided to focus on one. I chose to study the time period from 1968 to 1977, because it appeared to be both a sufficient and manageable amount of time. For this time period, I decided that either race or sex roles would probably be among the most popular things mentioned related to social problems. After skimming both Time and Reader's Digest for that period, I narrowed it down to just race because it was mentioned more often than sex roles.

Many of those cited in Chapter One said that sociology is being disseminated more often. Whether this is true was determined simply by counting how often references to sociologists appear over time.

The sources consisted of every Reader's Digest published from 1968-77 and the first issue of every month of Time from 1968-77 (one each month, or 120 issues each). The sample consisted of every article concerning the subject of race relations that made reference to a profession or professional (as it was defined in the literature review of this thesis). I investigated all professionals, because my yield would have simply

been too small if I had looked only at sociologists. Further, a finding that sociologists were seldom mentioned could be misinterpreted unless compared to other professionals. An index card was kept for each issue, and if usable articles were found, the title was copied on the card, and assigned a three-digit identification number. This same identification number was then transferred to a codesheet. As I learned from my pretest, most articles mentioned more than one profession; therefore, more than one codesheet was required. For example, an article with the ID number 001 might mention two professionals: a lawyer and a doctor. The lawyer's codesheet would have an ID number of 001-A; the doctor's would be 001-B.

After doing a pretest of 40 issues and having two judges besides myself use the instrument to check for reliability, I coded the following items for each case:

- | | |
|--|---|
| ___ year | ___ methods mentioned? |
| ___ source | ___ if yes, type of method |
| ___ professional mentioned? | ___ statistics mentioned? |
| ___ if yes, type of professional | ___ if yes, type of statistic |
| ___ sponsor of research mentioned? | ___ contribution of professional
seen as.... |
| ___ if yes, name of sponsor | |
| ___ name of professional mentioned? | |
| ___ race of professional mentioned? | |
| ___ direct quotes used? | |
| ___ general referent used? | |
| ___ if yes, profession general referent made about | |

Zito says that it is important that categories on a content analysis schedule are mutually exclusive and exhaustive, i.e., capable of including within the set of them all possible cases to be examined. If this can be accomplished, reliability (repeatability with consistency of results) is improved (Budd, 1967: 66; Zito, 1975: 32). I believe that my instrument is reliable because most of the items call for either a simple yes-no answer or the possible responses are precisely enumerated in a codebook, and a number code was assigned to each response so that data could be easily transferred from the codesheet to computer cards. Also, the two judges I had read the same article coded the same responses I did on a codesheet that was not even in the final form yet.

Most items on the content analysis schedule are self-explanatory. Source simply indicates whether the article used is from Time or Reader's Digest. The fourth item asks whether or not a professional is mentioned rather than just a profession; if yes, the fifth asks exactly what type of professional is referred to.

The next two items need more explanation. Berelson says that "content is produced by particular agents (writers, producers, directors, editors, etc.) and it is often their conception of audience attitudes and values, biased as it may be, which determines what appears. Not only that; communication content is also subject to the pressure of special interest groups which may have enough weight to determine, or at least influence, the nature of the content" (1952: 96). Because of this and some discussion in meeting with my thesis committee, I thought it would be interesting to see who the sponsors of popularized research are. Further, whether or not the sponsor is mentioned is one comparison with the form of journal articles--they usually mention who sponsored the

research they discuss.

All of the remaining items on the codesheet also are helpful in comparing popularized articles to the journal form. Some of the items were inspired by Walum, who said in Chapter One that her information was distorted and simplified. She said that her gender was emphasized (here, I am concerned with race). Neither gender nor race are usually emphasized in professional journal articles. Therefore, a non-professional criteria is added if race of the professional is mentioned. Walum also complained about articles misrepresenting what she said by not using direct quotes; hence, I ascertain whether direct quotes were used. I ask if the professional is designated or whether a general referent to a profession is used, e.g., "sociologists say".

In Chapter One, I said that professionals' knowledge comes from scientific research and logical analysis, rather than from practical experience. The items on my content analysis schedule that ask for methods and statistics reveal the extent to which this is emphasized. They also show the similarity or dissimilarity to journal form--almost all journal articles mention methods, and increasingly use statistics.

Finally, in light of what Durkheim said about the success of science being dependent on public opinion, the content analysis schedule allows space to note whether the contribution of the professional is viewed as positive, negative, or neutral. That is an attempt to evaluate the public's image of the professional. In order to reduce ambiguity and insure reliability, the profession(al)'s contribution was coded as positive or negative only if a definite, obvious statement was made to that effect (the statement was always written on the codesheet). If no statements were made concerning this, it was coded as neutral.

SUMMARY OF MAJOR VARIABLES AND THEIR EXPECTED RELATIONSHIPS

I see my thesis as being exploratory research; therefore I have no specific hypotheses. Generally, however, I venture to say: (1) that I expect "popularized" reports of what professionals say or do to be more simplified than the "professional", or journal reports. In Chapter One, I noted that both Walum and Znaniecki contend that this is so. Must the work of professionals (particularly sociologists) that is disseminated to the general public "deviate considerably from the difficult standards of genuine scholarship", as Znaniecki said? This was examined by comparing the form and content of popularly disseminated articles to that of journal articles (assuming that the latter would be considered "genuine scholarship" by most sociologists); e.g., are direct quotes, methods, and statistics used. (2) I consider year of publication, type of periodical, and type of professional (sociologists vs. nonsociologists) to be the independent variables, i.e., I anticipate a relationship between these and all the other variables. I have the following questions (which influenced why I picked the items I did on the content analysis schedule): Will sociologists be increasingly mentioned over time? Will they be mentioned more by one type of source than another; i.e., will "class" of readership influence how often sociologists are mentioned? Will the race of the professional--and which race--be mentioned? Will professional's names be mentioned or will general referents be used? Will methods and statistics be mentioned, as they are in professionally

* Much sociological research has shown that people's education and income (the two facets of social class that I used to determine the sources I used for this study) have an effect on how they are treated, how they act, etc. I chose to look at social class because I expected the periodicals to differ regarding what they presented to their respective audiences, since they differed by education and income.

disseminated articles? If they are used, will they be simplified? Will these things vary over time, and for type of periodical and type of professional?

I have a reason for why I think it would be foolish to make more specific predictions than those on the previous page. Holsti says "The basic format of content analysis research designed to study the effects of communication is: If messages have attributes A_x , B_x , and C_x , then the prediction is that the effect on the recipient will be A_y , B_y , and C_y ... any direct inference as to effects from content is at best tenuous" (1969: 87). I am sure that whether or not popularized knowledge is simplified will have an effect on what the reader perceives a sociologist or any other professional to be. If lots of statistics and big words were used, the reader's perception of the sociologist would be different than if s/he were only presented as giving opinions (Remember Walum's statement that what the press covers as sociology tends to become equated with sociology in the public's image). But to make specific predictions about this and call them hypotheses would be futile, because they would not be testable. This is why I would rather use the "working hypotheses" mentioned above.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

After completing the content analysis, I punched the data on computer cards and ran a frequency distribution (the "FREQ" program, authored by Ron Smith). This showed that 294 observations of specific professions were gained from 126 articles. Looking at the frequencies helped me to determine which coding categories could be combined, so that the data would be in a more manageable form for me to observe changes over time and differences between the magazines. For example, type of professional mentioned was collapsed from 36 to 21 categories. After doing this, I used the chi-square computer program ("CHISQ" program, authored by Ron Smith), which produced percentage tables, plus the following statistics: degrees of freedom, chi-square, and chi-square probability. I used the chi-square statistic since my variables fit the description of nominal level data: "There is no implication of any ordering of categories; there is no implication that distance exists between one category and the next; the categories are simply logically different or distinct from each other" (Loether and MacFavish, 1976: 16)...."The chi-square lends itself to the analysis of nominal level data" (p. 549--Budd, 1967: 33 and Zito, 1975: 34 also say this). In analyzing tables, a probability of error of .05 or less was accepted as significant, i.e., providing a level of confidence that a relationship does exist between the variables (Johnson, 1977: 233). "Significant" tables are presented in the text, with the rest (whether or not they show relationships between the variables) being found in the appendix. Like Denzin, I believe that it is important to examine negative or "deviant" cases (1970: 26). "Through deviant-case analysis the researcher is able to uncover additional and relevant factors that could lead to needed theoretical

revision" (p. 48).

Year of periodical, name of periodical, and type of professional (sociologists vs. all other types) were used as independent variables, and they were all run against all of the other variables. I ran every possible table I could: one set used the original coding categories, another took out the "not applicable" codes, and another used the independent variables as control variables (the control tables did not produce anything that could not already be detected in the other tables).

The periodical aimed at the more well educated (or upper middle class and above) audience had a higher percent of observations; i.e., Time discussed profession(al)s more often than did Reader's Digest. Table 1 shows that three-fourths of all observations were found in Time. Contrary to what was said in the literature review, professionals were not mentioned more often as time went on (68% of all observations were mentioned in 1968-72); however, this was probably because I looked at race, which was a more popular topic from 1968-72 than 1973-77 (more civil rights activity was taking place at this time). While about three-fourths of cases from Time were mentioned from 1968-72, observations from Reader's Digest were mentioned almost an equal percentage of time for both time periods. So the more educated audience is exposed more to professionals.

TABLE 1

NAME OF PERIODICAL BY YEAR OF PERIODICAL

Name of Periodical	Year of Periodical		Total
	1968-72	1973-77	
Time	72.9%	27.1%	100.0% (218)
Reader's Digest	53.9%	46.1%	100.0% (76)

$$\chi^2 = 9.341, P = 0.002, df = 1$$

Tables A and B (see appendix) show that professionals (rather than general referents) were mentioned in nine out of ten cases. This was true for both time periods and both sources. I did not expect this to be the case; rather, I expected general referents to be used more often than they were. This would have indicated that popularly disseminated knowledge is more simplified, and would have lent more of an air of obscurity, allowing professionals to maintain more of a knowledge monopoly. The fact that professional's names were used so often makes them more vulnerable to challenges; it enables readers to contact them much more easily if they wish.

Table 2 shows type of professional by year of periodical, before code names were combined(see next page).

TABLE 2

TYPE OF PROFESSIONAL BY YEAR OF PERIODICAL*

Type of Professional	Year of Periodical										% of Total	
	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977		
police commissioner	8.0**	2.2	0.0	6.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7
sociologist	12.0	2.2	3.5	10.3	21.4	16.7	11.4	8.3	15.4	3.6	7.5	8.8
clergy	20.0	21.7	3.5	0.0	14.3	0.0	2.9	8.3	0.0	14.3	8.8	8.8
Urban Coalition director	4.0	2.2	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0
elected politician	28.0	6.5	14.0	20.7	14.3	0.0	5.7	33.3	7.7	3.6	12.9	12.9
Urban League director	0.0	6.5	3.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	7.1	3.1	3.1
lawyer; judge	8.0	6.5	10.5	6.9	7.1	16.7	14.3	16.7	0.0	7.1	9.2	9.2
historian	0.0	6.5	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.1	2.0	2.0
not applicable; no professional mentioned	0.0	10.9	10.5	27.6	7.1	16.7	2.9	8.3	7.7	7.1	9.9	9.9
economist	0.0	6.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	0.0	3.6	1.7	1.7
public relations exec.	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.3
educator	4.0	10.9	15.1	6.9	7.1	16.7	20.0	8.3	0.0	3.6	10.9	10.9
journalist	12.0	6.5	4.7	6.9	7.1	0.0	11.4	8.3	0.0	10.7	7.1	7.1
U.S. president	4.0	2.2	4.7	6.9	7.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0	3.4	3.4
Nat'l. Community Relations Service director	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.3
HUD secretary	0.0	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.7
head of local or nat'l. NAACP	0.0	6.5	2.3	3.4	0.0	0.0	2.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.4	2.4
doctor												
planner	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.9	0.0	15.4	0.0	1.4	1.4
Boston Poverty Center director	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.7
director of OMB	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.7	0.0	0.0	3.6	1.0	1.0
prime minister	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	7.7	3.6	1.0	1.0
psychiatrist	0.0	0.0	3.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.1	1.7	1.7
pro. athletic coach	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.1	0.7	0.7
psychologist	0.0	0.0	3.5	3.4	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.6	2.0	2.0
anthropologist	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	3.6	0.7	0.7
secy. of dept. of Labor	0.0	0.0	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.7
U.S. attorney general	0.0	2.2	3.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	1.4
pres. of Carnegie corp.	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.3
political scientist	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	7.1	0.0	2.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0
social psychologist	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0
secretary of HEW	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	7.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.7
business executive	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.9	0.0	7.7	0.0	1.0	1.0
exec. director of Nixon cabinet comm. on educ.	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.3
secretary of state	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0	0.3	0.3
social worker	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.6	0.3	0.3
Total	percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	number	(25)	(46)	(86)	(29)	(14)	(6)	(35)	(12)	(14)	(28)	(293)

$$\chi^2 = 389.593, P = 0.007, df = 1$$

*Categories in this table are not yet combined.

** All numbers shown are percentages.

As the list below shows, sociologists were mentioned fifth out of 14 rankings, which is a pretty good standing.

FIGURE 1. TYPE OF PROFESSIONAL LISTED IN ORDER OF THEIR PERCENT OF THE TOTAL SAMPLE

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Type of Professional</u>	<u>% of Total Sample</u>
1	elected politician	12.9
2	educator	10.9
3	lawyer	9.2
4	clergy	8.8
5	sociologist	7.5
6	journalist	7.1
7	U.S. president	3.4
8	{ director of Urban League	{ 2.4
	{ head of national or local NAACP	{ each
9	{ historian	{ 2.0
	{ psychologist	{ each
10	{ police commissioner	{ 1.7
	{ economist	{ each
	{ psychiatrist	{ 1.4
11	{ doctor	{ each
	{ U.S. attorney general	{ 1.0
12	{ director of Urban Coalition	{ each
	{ director of OMB (Office of Management and Budget)	{ 1.0
	{ prime minister	{ each
	{ political scientist	{ .7
	{ social psychologist	{ each
	{ business executive	{ .7
	{ secretary of HUD (Dept. of Housing and Urban Development)	{ each
	{ planner	{ .7
13	{ pro athletic coach	{ each
	{ anthropologist	{ .7
	{ Dept. of Labor secretary	{ each
	{ secretary of HEW (Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare)	{ .7
14	{ public relations executive	{ .3
	{ director of National Community Relations Service	{ each
	{ director of Boston Poverty Center	{ .3
	{ president of Carnegie Corporation	{ each
	{ director of Nixon's cabinet committee on education	{ .3
	{ secretary of state	{ each
	{ social worker	{ .3

Elected politicians, educators, lawyers, clergy, sociologists and journalists were the type of professionals mentioned most often. According to what was said in the literature review (p. 6), these professions are most likely the ones that find it more difficult to maintain a monopoly on knowledge. Their knowledge has been exposed more to the public,

rather than being discussed only by other professionals. Table C (in appendix), which displays combined code names for year and type of professional mentioned, shows that there are no significant differences between time periods. There are also no big differences between publications except that educators make up more than twice as much of the total percentage for Time as for Reader's Digest. This might be expected, since Time was reputed to be the periodical with the more highly educated audience--the educators mentioned there were usually professors or administrators. Journalist was the only other type of professional that greatly differed by type of periodical. Journalists were mentioned a higher percentage of the time in Reader's Digest (aimed at the more "average" audience). In Table C, sociologists are the 6th most often mentioned type of professional, rather than 5th as in Table 2. Finally, Table D demonstrates that sociologists made up a slightly higher percentage of the total professionals mentioned for Reader's Digest than for Time (see appendix). Even though this could have occurred by chance ($P=.50$), it is still interesting to note that sociologists were exposed more to the less educated audience. As noted below, this could be because of busing.

Using Tables C and D, we see that sociologists differ from the overall sample concerning time period and source. As said before, 68% of all cases appeared from 1968-72. But 59% of all cases mentioning sociologists occurred during this time period. I believe that sociologists were mentioned more often than the overall sample from 1973-77 because of busing. The Supreme Court ruled that busing could be used to achieve racial desegregation on April 20, 1971 (Information Please, 1978: 42). So articles on busing occurred after that date, putting most

of them from 1973-77. Many articles mentioning sociologists concerned busing, specifically sociologist James Coleman and his study of busing. Busing was the single issue noted most often in relation to sociology. This probably also contributes to why observations referring to sociologists were mentioned a higher percent of the time in Reader's Digest than was the overall sample of cases (While 74.1% of all observations appeared in Time, 68.2% of cases mentioning sociologists appeared in that periodical). I would expect Reader's Digest to carry busing articles more often than Time because the readers of the former magazine are below upper-middle class, and hence they are more directly involved with the busing issue: their children are most often the ones being bussed.

Part 1 of Table E (see appendix) indicates that only one in ten cases discusses empirical studies* (slightly more were mentioned from 1973-77 than from 1968-72). When studies were discussed sponsors were mentioned half the time. This is certainly different from journal articles, as most of them report on empirical studies. It seems to support what Znaniecki said--that the works of popularizers, to be successful, "must deviate considerably from the difficult standards of genuine scholarship" (1940: 153). Part 2 of Table E shows that sponsors of research were mentioned in about two-thirds of 1968-72 studies, and about one-third of 1973-77 studies. It is interesting to note that both studies and research sponsors were discussed slightly more often in Reader's Digest (see Table F)--one would expect them to occur much more often in Time, for the more educated audience.

* I got this number by adding the total in the "yes" and "no" rows. I know that they constitute cases that discussed studies, because I coded all other cases "not applicable" on this variable.

Part 1 of Table G shows that a higher percentage of articles citing sociologists mentioned studies (18.1% vs. 9.5%). Part 2 demonstrates that of those observations mentioning studies, sponsors of research were referred to half of the time with nonsociologists, and one-fourth of the time for sociologists (see appendix). This indicates that sociologists don't deviate quite as much from the journal article form* as the rest regarding presentation of study results, but the sponsors of that research are half as likely to be mentioned.

Overall, there was no clearly dominant sponsor of research. But there were big differences concerning the independent variables and this variable--see Tables 3, 4, and H. Even though two of these tables have a significant chi-square probability, the table cell values are quite small, and therefore probably not too generalizable. Gallup and Harris (polls) were the most commonly mentioned sponsor, but they were referred to only from 1968-72, and much more often in Time than Reader's Digest (Table 4). Although the federal government was the second most often mentioned sponsor in Time, it was never cited in Reader's Digest. This may show a conservative bias on the part of Reader's Digest--never give the government credit for anything but the military. While Gallup and Harris were the sponsors most often spoken of in Time, the Reader's Digest was most often referred to in Reader's Digest. Though interesting, this may be a fluke, because the three cases where this occurred were articles on Alex Haley's research on his book Roots, which the Reader's Digest helped pay for.

*Whenever I discuss whether or not popularized knowledge is similar to journal form, I am referring to whether popularized knowledge has been simplified, as Znaniecki and Walum predicted it would be. When the format of popularized knowledge differs from journal format (or professionally disseminated knowledge), I consider it to be simplified. This is related to the image of the professional, because simplified knowledge could lead readers to think "Oh, I already knew that--it's so simple", thereby harming the professional's image of being the possessor of esoteric knowledge. On the other hand, knowledge that has not been simplified can weaken the professional's monopoly on knowledge, simply by exposing it.

TABLE 3
NAME OF SPONSOR BY YEAR OF PERIODICAL

<u>Name of Sponsor</u>	<u>Year of Periodical</u>		<u>% of Total</u>
	<u>1968-72</u>	<u>1973-77</u>	
Southern Regional Council	9.1%	0.0%	6.7% (1)
Gallup and Harris Polls	45.5%	0.0%	33.3% (5)
Research Organizations	27.3%	0.0%	20.0% (3)
Reader's Digest	0.0%	75.5%	20.0% (3)
Federal government or Census Bureau	18.2%	25.5%	20.0% (3)
Total	100.0% (11)	100.0% (4)	100.0% (15)

$$X^2=11.59, P=0.02, df=4$$

TABLE 4

NAME OF SPONSOR BY NAME OF PERIODICAL

<u>Name of Sponsor</u>	<u>Name of Periodical</u>		<u>% of Total</u>
	<u>Time</u>	<u>Reader's Digest</u>	
Southern Regional Council	0.0%	1.3%	0.3% (1)
Gallup and Harris Polls	1.8%	1.3%	1.7% (5)
Research Organizations	0.9%	1.3%	1.0% (3)
Reader's Digest	0.0%	3.9%	1.0% (3)
Federal Government or Census Bureau	1.4%	0.0%	1.0% (3)
Not applicable; no sponsor mentioned	95.9%	92.2%	94.9% (279)
Total	100.0% (218)	100.0% (76)	100.0% (294)

$$X^2=12.78, P=0.025, df=5$$

The federal government was the only sponsor mentioned for sociological studies (Table H in appendix). Debate already abounds concerning whether the government controls what sociologists study (e.g., Horowitz, 1967 and Useem, 1976). Besides the federal government, sociological journals also mention private industry, foundations, cities, etc. as research sponsors.

Tables 5, I and J all show that when professionals were mentioned, their names were almost always mentioned.* Overall, articles were very seldom authored by professionals. This jibes with the expectation that popularized information would deviate from the journal form of article, where the professional always authors the article. In Table 5, we see that professionals authored articles 20% of the time in Reader's Digest, and only .5% of the time in Time. This is the opposite of what one might expect; it would seem that the magazine aimed at the more educated audience would be more similar to the journal form of article. But before jumping to conclusions, I think that the format of the two magazines should be considered. In Time, where there are more short, newsy articles, it is practically a necessity that people be interviewed, rather than allowing them to write articles (Richard Nixon was the only professional in Time to author an article, and it was very short). Reader's Digest's longer articles afford more opportunity for professionals to be authors.

*One might ask how a professional could possibly be mentioned without his/her name being used. In the four cases where this occurred, the article would denote a certain city (like Los Angeles) and say "the police commissioner said...." I considered cases like this as too specific to be called general referents (e.g., "sociologists say"); therefore, they were coded under "professional mentioned".

TABLE 5

WHETHER PROFESSIONAL'S NAME WAS MENTIONED BY NAME OF PERIODICAL

Whether Name Is Mentioned	Name of Periodical		% of Total
	Time	Reader's Digest	
Yes	98.5%	77.1%	92.9% (247)
No	1.0%	2.9%	1.5% (4)
Professional Wrote Article	0.5%	20.0%	5.6% (15)
Total	100.0% (196)	100.0% (70)	100.0% (266)

$$X^2=38.427, P=0.000, df=2$$

Table I indicates that there was only slight variation between the two time periods concerning whether professional's names were used. Table J reveals that when professionals were mentioned, sociologist's names were always used. Also, a higher percentage of sociologists authored articles than did their counterparts (see appendix).^{*} This once again makes them less deviant from the journal form of article. Authoring articles would seem to afford the professional more control over what types of things are mentioned. I looked back over the 15 cases where this occurred, and compared them with the entire sample of professionals. It appears that they did take advantage of the opportunity to control what was mentioned to some extent. Studies were discussed 26.6% rather than 10.2% of the time, and research sponsors were mentioned in three-fourths rather than one-half of studies. Race was mentioned 46.7% of the time when professionals authored articles versus 34.6% of the time in the overall sample. This seems strange since this rarely occurs in journal

^{*} The sociologist's name mentioned most often was James Coleman, who did research on busing.

articles. But the professional authoring an article almost never mentioned his/her own race; rather, it was referred to in the title or in a box before the article. While methods were mentioned in 69% of studies overall, they were mentioned in 100% of studies when professionals authored articles. While statistics were used in three-fourths of studies overall, they were only used in one-fourth of studies when professionals wrote articles. Finally, approximately three-fourths of all statistics mentioned were used when studies were not even discussed, whether the professional wrote the article or not. It looks as though statistics is the only category where professionals who wrote articles did not adhere fairly closely to the journal form. Perhaps professionals who authored articles didn't want to expose all of their knowledge to the public because it would make them more vulnerable. Or the editorial style of Reader's Digest may have precluded the use of statistics. I believe that the information in this paragraph is very important, because it helps to explain why many times, Reader's Digest seems to be similar to journal article form more than might be expected (e.g., in mentioning studies). 20% of their sample is made up of cases where professionals authored articles; this is a big enough percentage to sway the statistics a bit when this part of the sample falls overwhelmingly into one category.

Tables K, 6 and 7 show that professional's race was mentioned in one-third of all observations in which professionals were mentioned. This is dissimilar to the journal form of articles I have seen--they don't usually mention race when referring to professionals. Table K shows that race was mentioned a higher percentage of the time from 1973-77 (see appendix), and Table 6 displays that it was referred to in a higher

percentage of cases in Reader's Digest. So these two items (the 1968-72 time period and Time) were closer to journal form.

WHETHER PROFESSIONAL'S RACE WAS MENTIONED BY NAME OF PERIODICAL

<u>Whether Race Is Mentioned</u>	<u>Name Time</u>	<u>Periodical Reader's Digest</u>	<u>% of Total</u>
Yes	31.1%	44.3%	34.6% (92)
No	68.9%	55.7%	65.4% (174)
Total	100.0% (196)	100.0% (70)	100.0% (266)

$$X^2=3.95, P=0.046, df=1$$

Table 7 shows that sociologists' race was not nearly as likely to be mentioned as that of nonsociologists. Perhaps this was because when race was mentioned, it was almost always when referring to blacks; there may be fewer black sociologists than blacks in other professions.

TABLE 7

WHETHER PROFESSIONAL'S RACE WAS MENTIONED BY TYPE OF PROFESSIONAL

<u>Whether Race Is Mentioned</u>	<u>Type of Professional</u>		<u>% of Total</u>
	<u>Sociologist</u>	<u>Nonsociologist</u>	
Yes	18.2%	32.4%	31.3% (92)
No	81.8%	57.4%	59.2% (174)
NA	0.0%	10.3%	9.5% (28)
Total	100.0% (22)	100.0% (272)	100.0% (294)

$$X^2= 5.629, P=0.059, df=2$$

Tables 8, L and M show that when professionals are mentioned, direct quotes are used most of the time. Table L demonstrates that direct quotes were used more often from 1973-77. Table M shows that there was a higher percentage of direct quotes from sociologists than from non-sociologists (see appendix). Table 8 simply shows that direct quotes were used more often in Reader's Digest. This conforms with journal article style. But since there were no large or statistically significant differences, I have to say that all values of the independent variables conform to journal style and therefore are not harmful to the professional image; unless, of course, the direct quotes weren't really direct quotes (which we can never know for sure).

TABLE 8

WHETHER DIRECT QUOTES WERE USED BY NAME OF PERIODICAL

Whether Quotes Used	Name of Periodical Time	Reader's Digest	% of Total
Yes	85.2%	71.0%	81.5% (216)
No	14.3%	5.8%	12.0% (32)
Professional Wrote Article	0.5%	23.2%	6.4% (17)
Total	100.0% (196)	100.0% (69)	99.9% (265)

$$\chi^2=45.27, P=0.000, df=2$$

I expected a lot of the popularized articles to use general referents (e.g., "sociologists say"), rather than people's names. But they did not. For both time periods and sources, only 5.8% of observations used general referents (see Tables N and O in appendix). As Table P indicates (see appendix), just as elected politicians were the most often mentioned professionals, they were the profession that was

generally referred to most often. Figure 2 shows the order that the rest of the professions took when general referents were made.

FIGURE 2. PROFESSION GENERAL REFERENT MADE ABOUT, IN ORDER OF THE PERCENTAGE OF TIME THEY WERE CITED

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Profession</u>	<u>% of time mentioned</u>
1	elected politicians	23.5
2	sociologists	17.6
3	{ social planners, social scientists	} 11.8 each
	{ doctors	
	{ lawyers	
4	{ historians	} 5.9 each
	{ writers	
	{ black therapists	
	{ black scholars	

Historians and black scholars were never generally referred to from 1968-72 and social scientists, writers, lawyers, and black therapists were never generally referred to from 1973-77. Historians were never generally referred to in Time, while writers, lawyers, black therapists and black scholars were never generally referred to in Reader's Digest (Tables P and Q in appendix). Since the cell values in all of these tables are so small, I am hesitant to draw conclusions from them. All that can be derived from all this is that since general referents occurred so little, in general the popularized information was not simplified. This enables the maintenance of professional identity, but it also makes professionals then more vulnerable to challenge: since most cases mention names, professionals are easier to contact.

Methods were discussed in 6.8% of all cases (Table R), and in 69% of cases mentioning studies (Table S). I suspect that methods are mentioned in all journal articles that discuss studies. This indicates that the format is simplified in popularized articles; combined with the fact that even when methods were mentioned they were not described as extensively as they are in journal articles. They just said things like "a survey was done..." So just because methods

were mentioned more often for some variables (see below) doesn't mean the information wasn't simplified. But this may also indicate that the idea of the professional possessing esoteric knowledge is being preserved, i.e., methods are too complicated for the public to understand anyway, so why mention them? Table S reveals that methods were mentioned a higher percent of the time from 1973-77, and methods were discussed a higher percent of the time in Reader's Digest (Table T). Finally, Table U shows that methods were mentioned a higher percent of the time in articles mentioning sociologists than in those naming nonsociologists (see appendix).

Types of methods mentioned display the simplicity that prevailed in the observations. Figure 3 shows how each method ranked.

FIGURE 3. PERCENTAGE OF TIME EACH METHOD WAS MENTIONED

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Method</u>	<u>% of time mentioned</u>
1	survey	30.0
2	Gallup or Harris poll	25.0
3	secondary analysis	10.0
	historical research	each
	interview	
	library research	
4	experiment	5.0
	"anthropometric studies"	each
	"sophisticated mathematical techniques"	

Most of the terms used to describe type of method are consistent with those that might be used in journal articles, but the similarity stops there. The terms are all that is used to describe the methods. In journal articles methods are described in detail. And the fancy terms used in some of the cases I looked at ("anthropometric studies" and "sophisticated mathematical techniques") help lend an air of mystery to the professional. So the professional still has some esoteric knowledge after all; s/he performs scientific research that not everyone can

understand (re: the literature review, p. 4). In Table 9, we see that Gallup or Harris polls were never mentioned from 1973-77. From 1968-72 Gallup and Harris polls are mentioned the most, followed by surveys, then secondary analysis, then experiments. No other method was used.

From 1973-77 surveys are mentioned most often, then historical analysis, then come all the other methods, except for secondary analysis, Gallup and Harris polls, and experiments (these are not mentioned at all). What all this means to professional identity is unclear.

TABLE 9

TYPE OF METHOD BY YEAR OF PERIODICAL

<u>Type of Method</u>	<u>Year of Periodical</u>		<u>% of Total</u>
	<u>1968-72</u>	<u>1973-77</u>	
secondary analysis	1.0%	0.0%	0.7% (2)
survey	1.5%	3.2%	2.0% (6)
Gallup or Harris poll	2.5%	0.0%	1.7% (5)
interview	0.0%	1.1%	0.3% (1)
"sophisticated mathematical techniques"	0.0%	1.1%	0.3% (1)
library research	0.0%	1.1%	0.3% (1)
historical research	0.0%	2.1%	0.7% (2)
"anthropometric studies"	0.0%	1.1%	0.3% (1)
NA; methods not mentioned	94.5%	90.4%	93.2% (274)
experiment	0.5%	0.0%	0.3% (1)
Total	100.0% (290)	100.0% (94)	100.0% (294)

$$X^2=17.536, P=0.04, df=9$$

In Table 10 we see that although surveys were mentioned the most, they were never mentioned in Reader's Digest. And Gallup and Harris polls, the second most common method, are only mentioned once in Reader's Digest. So Reader's Digest seems to be more qualitative in the methods it uses than Time. Perhaps they believe their audience will understand qualitative methods better than more quantitative ones.

TABLE 10

TYPE OF METHOD BY NAME OF PERIODICAL

<u>Type of Method</u>	<u>Name of Periodical</u>		<u>% of Total</u>
	<u>Time</u>	<u>Reader's Digest</u>	
secondary analysis	0.0%	2.6%	0.7% (2)
survey	2.8%	0.0%	2.0% (6)
Gallup or Harris poll	1.8%	1.3%	1.7% (5)
interview	0.0%	1.3%	0.3% (1)
"sophisticated mathematical techniques"	0.0%	1.3%	0.3% (1)
library research	0.0%	1.3%	0.3% (1)
historical research	0.0%	2.6%	0.7% (2)
"anthropometric studies"	0.0%	1.3%	0.3% (1)
NA; methods not mentioned	95.5%	88.2%	93.2% (274)
experiment	0.5%	0.0%	0.3% (1)
Total	100.0% (218)	100.0% (76)	100.0% (294)

$$X^2=25.756, P=0.002, df=9$$

Table 11 reveals that while sociologists used surveys most often (as did the overall sample), they used interviews next, and they did not use any

of the other methods. This makes it look as though sociologists are more limited in the methods they use than are other professionals.

TABLE 11
TYPE OF METHOD BY TYPE OF PROFESSIONAL

Type of Method	Type of Professional		% of Total
	Sociologist	Nonsociologist	
secondary analysis	0.0%	0.7%	0.7% (2)
survey	9.1%	1.5%	2.0% (6)
Gallup or Harris poll	0.0%	1.8%	1.7% (5)
interview	4.5%	0.0%	0.3% (1)
"sophisticated mathematical techniques"	0.0%	0.4%	0.3% (1)
library research	0.0%	0.4%	0.3% (1)
historical research	0.0%	0.7%	0.7% (2)
"anthropometric studies"	0.0%	0.4%	0.3% (1)
NA; methods not mentioned	86.4%	93.8%	93.2% (274)
experiment	0.0%	0.4%	0.3% (1)
Total	100.0% (22)	100.0% (272)	100.0% (294)

$$X^2=19.325, P=0.022, df=9$$

As we can see in Table 12, statistics were mentioned in one-third of all observations. Journals mention them more often, especially in recent years; and probably about 100% of the time when studies are discussed (especially since I considered almost any number a statistic!).

TABLE 12

WHETHER STATISTICS WERE MENTIONED BY NAME OF PERIODICAL

<u>Whether Sta- tistics Mentioned</u>	<u>Name of Periodical</u>		<u>% of Total</u>
	<u>Time</u>	<u>Reader's Digest</u>	
Yes	7.8%	7.9%	7.8% (23)
No	0.9%	6.6%	2.4% (7)
NA; not a study	68.3%	55.3%	65.0% (191)
Yes, even though not a study	22.9%	30.3%	24.8% (73)
Total	100.0% (218)	100.0% (76)	100.0% (294)

$$X^2=10.29, P=0.016, df=3$$

But statistics were used just two-thirds of the time studies were discussed in the sample. Three-fourths of all statistics mentioned were in observations where studies were not even discussed (Tables V, W, and X in appendix)! Journal articles, rarely, if ever, mention statistics without providing the source (or the study) the statistics originated from. I found that when popular articles used statistics that were not from a study, they did not even give a source for the figures. I would call this an extremely simplified version of professional information. This aligns with what Znaniecki said about the public wanting useful, practical knowledge. Statistics are both of these things; where they were derived is not so useful to the general public. Table V demonstrates that slightly fewer statistics were used without studies from 1973-77, but the figure is still too high to conform with journal style. Table W and Table 12 indicate that while statistics are used in almost all of the studies mentioned in Time, they are used in just over one-half of studies discussed in Reader's Digest. Perhaps Time thinks its readers

are better able to comprehend statistics than does Reader's Digest; or maybe statistics are more useful to the more educated audience. Observations mentioning sociologists were also a little closer to journal style--one-third of all the statistics mentioned in these cases were combined with studies, while just one-fourth of statistics found in observations mentioning nonsociologists were in cases using studies (Table X). So the image of the sociologist is slightly more professional.

Tables Y, Z and 13 show that when statistics were mentioned, simple counts were used two-thirds of the time. In Table Y, a 10% difference between time periods is displayed. Simple counts were used a higher percentage of the time from 1968-72 than from 1973-77. Table Z demonstrates that simple counts were used a higher percent of the time in Time than in Reader's Digest (see appendix). Table 13 shows that while simple counts were used in over two-thirds of cases where statistics were mentioned with nonsociologists, they were used in only one-third of cases involving sociologists (when statistics were mentioned).

TABLE 13

WHETHER SIMPLE COUNTS WERE USED BY TYPE OF PROFESSIONAL

Whether Simple Counts Used	Type of Professional Sociologist	Nonsociologist	% of Total
Yes	33.3%	67.0%	63.9% (62)
No	66.7%	33.0%	36.1% (35)
Total	100.0% (9)	100.0% (88)	100.0% (97)

$$X^2=4.023, P=0.044, df=1$$

In Tables AA, 14 and BB we see that financial statistics (usually dollar amounts) were used used one-third of the time statistics were

mentioned. Table AA indicates that this is true for both time periods, while Table BB shows that there is also no difference between cases mentioning either nonsociologists or sociologists (see appendix). But Table 14 reveals that there is a difference between sources, with Time using financial statistics 43.3% of the time statistics are mentioned, and Reader's Digest using them only 20% of the time. The magazine aimed at richer people talks about money a lot more.

TABLE 14

WHETHER FINANCIAL STATISTICS WERE USED BY NAME OF PERIODICAL

Whether Finan- cial Stats Used	Name of Periodical <u>Time</u>	<u>Reader's Digest</u>	% of Total
Yes	43.3%	20.0%	36.1% (35)
No	56.7%	80.0%	63.9% (62)
Total	100.0% (67)	100.0% (30)	100.0% (97)

$$X^2=4.87, P=0.027, df=1$$

Whether percentages were used varied with all the independent variables. Tables CC, DD, and EE in the appendix all show that percentages were used 64.9% of the time statistics were mentioned. While percentages were used 60% of the time statistics were mentioned from 1968-72, they were used 75% of the time from 1973-77 (Table CC). In Table DD it is revealed that when statistics were mentioned, percentages were used 70% of the time in Time, and 53% of the time in Reader's Digest. Table EE indicates that while observations mentioning sociologists used percentages in nearly nine out of ten cases, those with nonsociologists mentioned percentages about two-thirds of the time. So the most sophisticated of the simple statistics (which I suppose makes the

professional's knowledge look a bit more complex) was provided increasingly over time, to the richer and more educated audience, and when sociologists were mentioned.

Tables FF, GG and HH all show that dates* were used 16.5% of the time statistics were used (see appendix). Table FF demonstrates that there is very little difference between time periods concerning this variable. But Table GG shows that dates make up a higher percentage of Time's statistics than of Reader's Digest's. And Table HH indicates that dates make up a higher percentage of sociologists' total statistics than of nonsociologists. So Time and sociologists are connected with the more qualitative statistic.

Using the results of all the above tables concerning statistics, I constructed Figure 4, which shows the percentage of time each type of statistic was mentioned for each independent variable, and for the overall sample of cases that mentioned statistics. (see next page).

* Dates were coded as a statistic only when they served to compare things; things like date of birth were not coded as statistics.

FIGURE 4. PERCENT EACH TYPE OF STATISTIC WAS MENTIONED, BY TOTAL AND INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

Type of Statistic	For All Cases Using Statistics		Year of Periodical		Name of Periodical		Type of Professional	
			1968-72	1973-77	Time Reader's Digest		Sociologist	Non-sociologist
percent	35.8%	100.0% (176)	33.6%	40.0%	35.5%	40.0%	50.0%	34.0%
simple count	35.2%		37.9%	30.0%	33.8%	40.0%	19.0%	37.0%
financial statistics	19.9%		19.8%	20.0%	21.3%	15.0%	19.0%	20.0%
dates	9.1%		8.6%	10.0%	10.3%	5.0%	12.0%	9.0%
Total			99.9% (116)	100.0% (60)	99.9% (136)	100.0% (40)	100.0% (16)	100.0% (160)

What is shown in Figure 4 may seem somewhat different than what was shown in the other tables on type of statistic. This is because of the way I coded. If statistics were mentioned, I coded "yes", and entered all types of statistics mentioned. There was often more than one type used, and this is what showed up in the separate tables on type of statistic. For example, Table Y shows that simple counts were used two-thirds of the time statistics were mentioned, while Figure 4 reveals that simple counts made up 35.2% of all statistics mentioned. These two figures are not inconsistent; they simply describe different things.

Figure 4 shows that overall, percentages and simple number counts were mentioned most often. Financial statistics (almost always simply the cost of something) came next, with dates coming last. Professionally disseminated articles (journal articles) offer a wider variety of statistics, e.g., P levels and correlation coefficients. And they use percentages much more often than simple counts. There was no significant variation between the independent variables concerning how often each type of statistic was mentioned, except for type of professional. Sociologists used percentages a great deal more than any other statistic, so this makes their popularized knowledge more consistent with professionally disseminated knowledge. That more complicated statistics were not used perhaps makes it seem as though professionals do have some esoteric knowledge; that only they can comprehend the more complicated statistics. And the fact that sociologists were connected to higher-level statistics may make them look more professional, because the knowledge is slightly more complex. At the same time, however, the fact that information has been given lessens the monopoly on knowledge.

The fact that statistics were mentioned more often than methods when

studies were discussed is consistent with some of what Znaniecki said about popularized knowledge (see p. 2): it must appeal to people whose main interests in life "are already settled and essentially practical", and if they feel the need for more knowledge than they already possess, they want useful, practical knowledge. Statistics, more^{so} than methods, are practical. It is useful for people to have numbers available-- whether they know where they came from or not. If you can spout out a statistic to support what you're talking about, it helps to legitimize what you say.

Tables II, 15 and JJ show that opinions were almost never given concerning the contribution of the profession(al). When opinions were given, they were overwhelmingly positive. Table II indicates that this is true for both time periods (see appendix). In Table 15, we see that opinions were found much more often in Reader's Digest. By looking at both Tables II and 15, we can see that the only negative opinion was found in 1968-72, in Reader's Digest.

TABLE 15

OPINION OF CONTRIBUTION OF RESEARCHER BY NAME OF PERIODICAL

<u>Opinion</u>	<u>Name of Periodical</u>		<u>% of Total</u>
	<u>Time</u>	<u>Reader's Digest</u>	
Positive	1.4%	6.6%	2.7% (8)
Negative	0.0%	1.3%	0.3% (1)
Neutral or none given	98.6%	92.1%	96.9% (285)
Total	100.0% (218)	100.0% (76)	100.0% (294)

$$X^2=8.721, P=0.012, df=2$$

Finally, Table JJ shows that no opinions were given concerning the contribution of sociologists.

I included the space for opinions about the contribution of the profession(al) on the content analysis schedule because I thought it might provide some insight as to whether people considered professionals to be possessors of esoteric knowledge, to be altruistic, etc. This space was not very productive, however (see p. 46); so I cannot really know how the public feels about this. Even when opinions were given, they were directed more towards personal qualities than the professional role. For example, a Reader's Digest article on Whitney Young said: "Equally persuasive in the ghetto and the corporate board room, he is considered by many to be this country's most effective advocate of the Negro cause." Most of the opinions were found in Reader's Digest, and no opinions were found concerning sociologists.

In the previous discussion it seems as though type of professional was the independent variable that had the most effect on the dependent variables. But an inspection of only the tables that had significant chi-square probability levels (i.e., .05 or less) shows that most of these tables concerned type of periodical.* So, the relationship between type of periodical and the dependent variables was less due to chance or error than relationships that were not statistically significant. Type of professional came next, with year of publication not having much influence on the other variables.

Reliability, Validity, and Suggestions for Further Research

"To be reliable, a measuring instrument must yield stable responses under conditions of repeated observation" (Denzin, 1970: 102). "In simplest terms, reliability means repeatability with consistency of results"

* This doesn't mean much because the two periodicals did not differ that much in their presentation of the professional image as far as significant tables are concerned.

(Budd, et al, 1967: 66). The only way to completely determine the reliability of my content analysis schedule would be to apply it again to all the articles I looked at and see if I came up with the same results. I did this on a much smaller scale by having two "judges" apply the schedule to the same article. We all came up with the same responses--content analysis is probably one of the most reliable methods, since repetition of research can be done more easily than with most methods. My schedule was so simple that I believe it is reliable.

Denzin quotes Campbell (1963) when discussing internal and external validity. Internal validity asks whether the independent variables really made a difference, or whether the observational process caused the difference. Of the eight factors concerned with internal validity, I believe that only one applies to me: maturation, or "processes within the respondent [in this case, the researcher] operating as a function of the passage of time per se", e.g., growing tired (Denzin, 1970: 22). During the last two weeks of doing the content analysis, I was working at it for eight hours a day. This did indeed make me tired and frustrated at times. Another frustrating factor was that Time did not have a table of contents until 1977; I had to look at every page of the issues I was concerned with. I tried not to let these factors keep me from remaining "faithful" to the content analysis schedule, however.

External validity asks to what populations and settings the causal propositions may be generalized (Denzin, 1970: 22). Or, as Budd says, in its simplest terms validity means "actually measuring measuring what the researcher says he is measuring" (1967: 66). My instrument did measure what I expected it to measure. But I believe the generalizability of what I found is somewhat limited; although this was necessarily so: I

did not have the time to do all that I think would be necessary to make it generalizable. I would have been better able to generalize to the entire population of cases if I had: (1) Researched longer periods of time --the historical events connected with race that occurred during the time period I studied may have somehow effected the results. (2) Used more types of publications as sources. As stated before, Reader's Digest has an unusual style and format; people are given the opportunity to author articles. This makes it more difficult to compare with Time, a news magazine with shorter, more concise articles. It would have been good to have more magazines, with more of a variety of styles and format.

(3) Looked at all possible articles that might have mentioned sociologists, rather than only those concerning race. The subject examined may be connected with which professionals are mentioned; e.g., articles on sex roles, gangs, etc. may mention sociologists more than articles on race. (4) Compared the popularized material with the original research in journals, to see if the latter actually used studies, methods, and statistics as much as I assumed they did in this thesis. One problem with this thesis was that I couldn't be sure of what was contained in journal articles, because of the fact that the only journals I am familiar with are social science journals; other types of professional journals may not use methods and statistics so much. This thesis would have taken several years to complete if I would have done all of the above things. But I think they should be taken into account in further research on this subject. Taking all this into consideration, the main thing I can conclude from the research is that popularized articles are indeed more simplified than professionally disseminated knowledge, as the sources in the literature review predicted. Although the professional is allowed to maintain some

degree of esoteric knowledge since it is not explained as fully in popularized articles, s/he no longer possesses a monopoly on knowledge. In this thesis it was found that articles mentioning sociologists were not quite so simplified.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Axelrod, Charles D.
1977 Toward an Appreciation of Simmel's Fragmentary Style. The Sociological Quarterly 18 (Spring): 185-96.
- Axiom Market Research Bureau, Inc.
1975 Target Group Index, Volume F-1. Printed in USA.
- Babbie, Earl R.
1975 The Practice of Social Research. Wadsworth Publishing Co., Inc. Belmont, California.
- Barber, Bernard
1963 "Some Problems in the Sociology of the Professions". Daedalus, 92 (4): 669-88.
- Becker, Howard S.
1962 "The Nature of a Profession", pp. 27-46 in the Sixty-First Year-book of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II, Chicago.
- Berelson, Bernard
1952 Content Analysis in Communication Research. The Free Press: Glencoe, Illinois.
- Budd, Richard K., et al
1967 Content Analysis of Communications. The Macmillan Company, N.Y., New York.
- Campbell, Donald T.
1963 "From Description to Experimentation: Interpreting Trends as Quasi-Experiments", in Problems in Measuring Change, Madison, Wisconsin: University of Chicago Press.
- Clark, Kenneth B.
1953 "The Social Scientist as an Expert Witness in Civil Rights Litigation", Social Problems, 1: 5-10.
- Denzin, Norman K.
1970 The Research Act: A Theoretical Introduction to Sociological Methods. Aldine Publishing Co., Chicago.
- Durkheim, Emile
1947 The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life. The Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois.
- Fisher, Bernice M.
1969 "Claims and Credibility: A Discussion of Occupational Identity and the Agent-Client Relationship". Social Problems, 16: 423-33.

- Flexner, Abraham
1915 "Is Social Work a Profession?", pp. 576-590 in Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Correction. Chicago: Hildmann Printing Co.
- Goode, William J.
1969 "The Theoretical Limits of Professionalization", pp. 266-308 in Amital Etzioni (ed.) The Semi-Professions and Their Organization. The Free Press, New York.
- Gouldner, Alvin W.
1965 "Explorations in Applied Social Science", pp. 5-22 in Alvin Gouldner and S.M. Miller (eds.), Applied Sociology/Opportunities and Problems. The Free Press, New York.
- Greenwood, Ernest
1957 "Attributes of a Profession". Social Work, 2 (July): 45-55.
- Gross, E.
1958 Work and Society. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell.
- Haug, Marie R.
1975 "The Deprofessionalization of Everyone?" Sociological Focus, 8 (3): 197-213.
- Haug, Marie R. and Marvin B. Sussman
1969 "Professional Autonomy and the Revolt of the Client". Social Problems, 17: 153-61.
- Holsti, Ole R.
1969 Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities. Addison-Wesley Publishing Co. Inc., Philippines.
- Horowitz, Irving Louis
1967 The Rise and Fall of Project Camelot. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Horowitz, Irving Louis
1968 Professing Sociology: Studies in the Life Cycle of Social Science. Aldine Publishing Co., Chicago.
- Hughes, Everett C.
1958 Men and Their Work. London: The Free Press of Glencoe, Collier Macmillan, Ltd.
- Hughes Everett C.
1963 "Professions". Daedalus, 92 (4): 655-68.
- Information Please Publishing, Inc.
1977 Information Please Almanac, Atlas and Yearbook. Information Please Publishing, Inc. New York, N.Y.

- Johnson, Allan G.
1977 *Social Statistics Without Tears*. McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.
- Lazarsfeld, Paul F. and Jeffrey G. Reitz
1975 *An Introduction to Applied Sociology*. Elsevier Scientific Publishing Co., New York, N.Y.
- Loether, Herman J. and Donald G. McTavish
1976 *Descriptive and Inferential Statistics: an Introduction*. Allyn and Bacon, Inc., Boston, Mass.
- Lopata, Helena Z.
1976 "Expertization of Everyone and the Revolt of the Client", *The Sociological Quarterly* 17 (Autumn): 435-47.
- Nettler, Gwynne
1947 "Toward a Definition of the Sociologist". *American Sociological Review* 12 (5): 553-60.
- Odum, Howard W.
1951 *American Sociology: The Story of Sociology in the United States through 1950*. Greenwood Press, Publishers, New York.
- Parsons, Talcott
1959 "Some Problems Confronting Sociology as a Profession". *American Sociological Review* 24 (4): 547-59.
- Perrucci, R. and J.E. Gerstl (eds.)
1969 *The Engineers and the Social System*. New York: John Wiley.
- Phillips, Derek L.
1971 "Sociologists and their Knowledge", pp. 307-26 in Freidson, Eliot (ed.), *The Professions and their Prospects*, Sage Publications, Beverly Hills, California.
- Riley, Matilda White
1960 "Membership of the American Sociological Association, 1950-1959". *American Sociological Review*, 25 (6): 914-26.
- Rodman, Hyman and Ralph L. Kolodny
1965 "Organizational Strains in the Researcher-Practitioner Relationship", pp. 93-113 in Alvin Gouldner and S.M. Miller (eds.), *Applied Sociology/Opportunities and Problems*. The Free Press, New York.
- Rose, Arnold M.
1967 "The Social Scientist as an Expert Witness in Court Cases", pp. 100-18 in Paul F. Lazarsfeld, William H. Sewell, and Harold Wilensky (eds.). *The Uses of Sociology*. Basic Books, Inc., New York.
- Roth, Julius A.
1974 "Professionalism: The Sociologist's Decoy". *Sociology of Work and Occupations*, 1 (Feb.): 6-23.

Smelser, Neil J.

- 1967 "Sociology and the Other Social Sciences", pp. 3-44 in Paul F. Lazarsfeld, William H. Sewell, and Harold L. Wilensky (eds.), *The Uses of Sociology*. Basic Books, Inc., New York.

Useem, Michael

- 1976 Government Influence on the Social Science Paradigm. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 17 (Spring): 146-61.

Walum, Laurel Richardson

- 1975 "Sociology and the Mass Media: Some Major Problems and Modest Proposals". *The American Sociologist*, 10 (Feb.): 28-32.

Wilensky, Harold L.

- 1964 "The Professionalization of Everyone?" *The American Journal of Sociology*, 70 (2): 137-58.

Zito, George V.

- 1975 *Methodology and Meanings/Varieties of Sociological Inquiry*. Praeger Publishers, New York, N.Y.

Znaniecki, Florian

- 1940 *The Social Role of the Man of Knowledge*. New York: Columbia University Press.

APPENDIX

TABLE A.

WHETHER A PROFESSIONAL WAS MENTIONED BY YEAR OF PERIODICAL

Whether Pro. Mentioned	Year of Periodical 1968-72	1973-77	% of Total
Yes	88.5%	91.5%	89.5% (263)
No	11.5%	8.5%	10.5% (31)
Total	100.0% (200)	100.0% (94)	100.0% (294)

$$\chi^2=0.605, P=0.436, df=1$$

TABLE B

WHETHER A PROFESSIONAL WAS MENTIONED BY NAME OF PERIODICAL

Whether Pro. Mentioned	Name of Periodical Time	Reader's Digest	% of Total
Yes	89.9%	88.2%	89.5% (263)
No	10.1%	11.8%	10.5% (31)
Total	100.0% (218)	100.0% (76)	100.0% (294)

$$\chi^2=0.183, P=0.668, df=1$$

TABLE C, PART 1

TYPE OF PROFESSIONAL BY YEAR OF PERIODICAL*

<u>Type of Professional</u>	<u>Year of Periodical</u>		<u>% of Total</u>
	<u>1968-72</u>	<u>1973-77</u>	
police commissioner	2.5%	0.0%	1.7% (5)
sociologist	6.5%	9.6%	7.5% (22)
clergy	10.0%	6.4%	8.8% (26)
directors of organizations	9.0%	5.3%	7.8% (23)
elected politician	19.5%	12.8%	17.3% (51)
presidential cabinet member	5.5%	4.3%	5.1% (15)
lawyer; judge	8.5%	10.6%	9.2% (27)
historian	2.0%	2.1%	2.0% (6)
NA; no professional mentioned	11.5%	9.6%	10.9% (32)
economist	1.5%	2.1%	1.7% (5)
educator	11.0%	10.6%	10.9% (32)
journalist	6.5%	8.5%	7.1% (21)
doctor	0.5%	3.2%	1.4% (4)
planner	0.0%	2.1%	0.7% (2)
psychiatrist	1.5%	2.1%	1.7% (5)
psychologist	2.0%	2.1%	2.0% (6)
anthropologist	0.0%	2.1%	0.7% (2)
political scientist	1.0%	1.1%	1.0% (3)
social psychologist	0.5%	2.1%	1.0% (3)
business executive	0.5%	2.1%	1.0% (3)
social worker	<u>0.0%</u>	<u>1.1%</u>	<u>0.7%</u> (1)
Total	100.0% (200)	100.0% (94)	100.0% (294)

$$\chi^2=25.655, P=0.177, df=20$$

* Categories in this table have been combined.

TABLE C, PART 2

TYPE OF PROFESSIONAL BY NAME OF PERIODICAL*

Type of Professional	Year of Periodical		% of Total
	1968-72	1973-77	
police commissioner	0.9%	3.9%	1.7% (5)
sociologist	6.9%	9.2%	7.5% (22)
clergy	9.2%	7.9%	8.8% (26)
director of or- ganization	6.4%	11.8%	7.8% (23)
elected politician	18.8%	13.2%	17.3% (51)
presidential cabinet member	5.5%	3.9%	5.1% (15)
lawyer; judge	11.0%	3.9%	9.2% (27)
historian	2.3%	1.3%	2.0% (6)
NA; no professional mentioned	10.1%	13.2%	10.9% (32)
economist	1.4%	2.6%	1.7% (5)
educator	12.8%	5.3%	10.9% (32)
journalist	4.6%	14.5%	7.1% (21)
doctor	0.9%	2.6%	1.4% (4)
planner	0.5%	1.3%	0.7% (2)
psychiatrist	1.4%	2.6%	1.7% (5)
psychologist	2.3%	1.3%	2.0% (6)
anthropologist	0.5%	1.3%	0.7% (2)
political scientist	1.4%	0.0%	1.0% (3)
social psychologist	1.4%	0.0%	1.0% (3)
business executive	1.4%	0.0%	1.0% (3)
social worker	<u>0.5%</u>	<u>0.0%</u>	<u>0.3%</u> (1)
Total	100.0% (218)	100.0% (76)	100.0% (294)

$$\chi^2=28.702, P=0.093, df=20$$

* Categories in this table have been combined.

TABLE D

TYPE OF PROFESSIONAL BY NAME OF PERIODICAL

<u>Type of Professional</u>	<u>Name of Periodical</u>		<u>% of Total</u>
	<u>Time</u>	<u>Reader's Digest</u>	
nonsociologist	93.1%	90.8%	92.5% (272)
sociologist	6.9%	9.2%	7.5% (22)
Total	100.0% (218)	100.0% (76)	100.0% (294)

$\chi^2=0.441$, $P=0.506$, $df=1$

TABLE E, PART 1

WHETHER SPONSOR OF RESEARCH WAS MENTIONED BY YEAR OF PERIODICAL

Whether Sponsor Mentioned	Year of Periodical		% of Total
	1968-72	1973-77	
Yes	5.5%	4.3%	5.1% (15)
No	3.5%	8.5%	5.1% (15)
NA; not a study	91.0%	87.2%	89.8% (264)
Total	100.0% (200)	100.0% (94)	100.0% (294)

$$\chi^2=3.441, P=0.178, df=2$$

TABLE E, PART 2

WHETHER SPONSOR OF RESEARCH WAS MENTIONED BY YEAR OF PERIODICAL

Whether Sponsor Mentioned	Year of Periodical		% of Total
	1968-72	1973-77	
Yes	61.1%	33.3%	50.0% (15)
No	3.9%	66.7%	50.0% (15)
Total	100.0% (18)	100.0% (12)	100.0% (30)

$$\chi^2=2.222, P=0.136, df=1$$

TABLE F, PART 1

WHETHER SPONSOR OF RESEARCH WAS MENTIONED BY NAME OF PERIODICAL

<u>Whether Sponsor Mentioned</u>	<u>Name of Periodical</u>		<u>% of Total</u>
	<u>Time</u>	<u>Reader's Digest</u>	
Yes	4.1%	7.9%	5.1% (15)
No	5.0%	5.3%	5.1% (15)
NA; not a study	90.8%	86.8%	89.8% (264)
Total	100.0% (218)	100.0% (76)	100.0% (294)

$$X^2=1.671, P=0.433, df=2$$

TABLE F, PART 2

WHETHER SPONSOR OF RESEARCH WAS MENTIONED BY NAME OF PERIODICAL

<u>Whether Sponsor Mentioned</u>	<u>Name of Periodical</u>		<u>% of Total</u>
	<u>Time</u>	<u>Reader's Digest</u>	
Yes	45.0%	60.0%	50.0% (15)
No	55.0%	40.0%	50.0% (15)
Total	100.0% (20)	100.0% (10)	100.0% (30)

$$X^2=0.6, P=0.438, df=1$$

TABLE G, PART 1

WHETHER SPONSOR OF RESEARCH WAS MENTIONED BY TYPE OF PROFESSIONAL

<u>Whether Sponsor Mentioned</u>	<u>Type of Professional</u>		<u>% of Total</u>
	<u>Sociologist</u>	<u>Nonsociologist</u>	
Yes	4.5%	5.1%	5.1% (15)
No	13.6%	4.4%	5.1% (15)
NA; not a study	81.8%	90.4%	89.8% (264)
Total	100.0% (22)	100.0% (272)	100.0% (294)

 $X^2=3.577$, $P=0.167$, $df=2$

TABLE G, PART 2

WHETHER SPONSOR OF RESEARCH WAS MENTIONED BY TYPE OF PROFESSIONAL

<u>Whether Sponsor Mentioned</u>	<u>Type of Professional</u>		<u>% of Total</u>
	<u>Sociologist</u>	<u>Nonsociologist</u>	
Yes	25.0%	53.8%	50.0% (15)
No	75.0%	46.2%	50.0% (15)
Total	100.0% (4)	100.0% (26)	100.0% (30)

 $X^2=1.153$, $P=0.282$, $df=1$

TABLE H

NAME OF SPONSOR BY TYPE OF PROFESSIONAL

<u>Name of Sponsor</u>	<u>Type of Professional</u>		<u>% of Total</u>
	<u>Sociologist</u>	<u>Nonsociologist</u>	
Southern Regional Council	0.0%	0.4%	0.3% (1)
Gallup and Harris Polls	0.0%	1.8%	1.7% (5)
Research Organizations	0.0%	1.1%	1.0% (3)
Reader's Digest	0.0%	1.1%	1.0% (3)
Federal Government or Census Bureau	4.5%	0.7%	1.0% (3)
Not applicable; no sponsor mentioned	95.5%	94.9%	94.9% (279)
Total	100.0% (22)	100.0% (272)	100.0% (294)

$$\chi^2=3.867, P=0.568, df=5$$

TABLE I

WHETHER PROFESSIONAL'S NAME WAS MENTIONED BY YEAR OF PERIODICAL

<u>Whether Name Was Mentioned</u>	<u>Year of Periodical</u>		<u>% of Total</u>
	<u>1968-72</u>	<u>1973-77</u>	
Yes	94.4%	89.8%	92.9% (247)
No	0.6%	3.4%	1.5% (4)
Professional Wrote Article	5.1%	6.8%	5.6% (15)
Total	100.0% (178)	100.0% (88)	100.0% (266)

$$\chi^2=3.633, P=0.162, df=2$$

TABLE J

WHETHER PROFESSIONAL'S NAME WAS MENTIONED BY TYPE OF PROFESSIONAL

<u>Whether Name Was Mentioned</u>	<u>Type of Professional</u>		<u>% of Total</u>
	<u>Sociologist</u>	<u>Nonsociologist</u>	
Yes	86.4%	83.8%	84.0% (247)
No	0.0%	1.5%	1.4% (4)
Professional Wrote Article	13.6%	4.4%	5.1% (15)
NA; no pro. mentioned	0.0%	10.3%	9.5% (28)
Total	100.0% (22)	100.0% (272)	100.0% (294)

$$\chi^2=5.998, P=0.111, df=3$$

TABLE K

WHETHER PROFESSIONAL'S RACE WAS MENTIONED YEAR OF PERIODICAL

<u>Whether Race Mentioned</u>	<u>Year of Periodical</u>		<u>% of Total</u>
	<u>1968-72</u>	<u>1973-77</u>	
Yes	31.5%	40.9%	34.6% (92)
No	68.5%	59.1%	65.4% (174)
Total	100.0% (178)	100.0% (88)	100.0% (266)

$$\chi^2=2.323, P=0.127, df=1$$

TABLE L

WHETHER DIRECT QUOTES WERE USED BY YEAR OF PERIODICAL

Whether Quotes Used	Year of Periodical		<u>% of Total</u>
	1968-72	1973-77	
Yes	80.2%	84.0%	81.5% (216)
No	14.1%	8.0%	12.0% (32)
Professional Wrote Article	<u>5.6%</u>	<u>8.0%</u>	<u>6.4%</u> (17)
Total	99.9% (177)	100.0% (88)	99.9% (265)

 $\chi^2=2.451, P=.31, df=2$

TABLE M

WHETHER DIRECT QUOTES WERE USED BY TYPE OF PROFESSIONAL

Whether Quotes Used	Type of Professional		<u>% of Total</u>
	<u>Sociologist</u>	<u>Nonsociologist</u>	
Yes	77.3%	81.9%	81.5% (216)
No	9.1%	12.3%	12.1% (32)
Professional Wrote Article	<u>13.6%</u>	<u>5.8%</u>	<u>6.4%</u> (17)
Total	100.0% (22)	100.0% (243)	100.0% (265)

 $\chi^2=2.18, P=.45, df=2$

TABLE N

WHETHER A GENERAL REFERENT WAS USED BY YEAR OF PERIODICAL

Whether Gen. Ref. Used	Year of Periodical 1968-72	1973-77	% of Total
Yes	5.5%	6.4%	5.8% (17)
No	94.5%	93.6%	94.2% (276)
Total	100.0% (199)	100.0% (94)	100.0% (293)

$$X^2=0.085, P=0.77, df=1$$

TABLE O

WHETHER A GENERAL REFERENT WAS USED BY NAME OF PERIODICAL

Whether Gen. Ref. Used	Name of Periodical Time	Reader's Digest	% of Total
Yes	5.5%	6.7%	5.8% (17)
No	94.5%	93.3%	94.2% (276)
Total	100.0% (218)	100.0% (75)	100.0% (293)

$$X^2=0.137, P=0.71, df=1$$

TABLE P

PROFESSION GENERAL REFERENT MADE ABOUT BY YEAR OF MAGAZINE

Profession General Referent Made About	Year of Periodical		‰ of Total
	1968-72	1973-77	
social scientists; social planners	18.2%	0.0%	11.8% (2)
doctors	9.1%	16.6%	11.8% (2)
historians	0.0%	16.6%	5.9% (1)
elected pol- iticians	18.2%	33.3%	23.5% (4)
sociologists	18.2%	16.6%	17.6% (3)
writers	9.1%	0.0%	5.9% (1)
lawyers	18.2%	0.0%	11.8% (2)
black therapists	9.1%	0.0%	5.9% (1)
black scholars	0.0%	16.6%	5.9% (1)
Total	100.1% (11)	99.7% (6)	100.1% (17)

$$\chi^2=7.523, P=.53, df=8$$

TABLE Q

PROFESSION GENERAL REFERENT MADE ABOUT BY NAME OF PERIODICAL

Profession General Referent Made About	Name of Periodical		% of Total
	Time	Reader's Digest	
social scientists; social planners	8.3%	20.0%	11.8% (2)
doctors	8.3%	20.0%	11.8% (2)
historians	0.0%	20.0%	5.9% (1)
elected pol- iticians	25.0%	20.0%	23.5% (4)
sociologists	16.6%	20.0%	17.6% (3)
writers	8.3%	8.3%	5.9% (1)
lawyers	16.6%	0.0%	11.8% (2)
black therapists	8.3%	0.0%	5.9% (1)
black scholars	8.3%	0.0%	5.9% (1)
Total	99.7% (12)	100.0% (5)	100.1% (17)

$$X^2=5.361, P=.67, df=8$$

TABLE R

WHETHER METHODS WERE MENTIONED BY YEAR OF PERIODICAL

<u>Whether Methods Mentioned</u>	<u>Year of Periodical</u>		<u>% of Total</u>
	<u>1968-72</u>	<u>1973-77</u>	
Yes	5.5%	9.6%	6.8% (20)
No	3.5%	2.1%	3.1% (9)
NA; not a study	<u>91.0%</u>	<u>88.3%</u>	<u>90.1%</u> <u>(265)</u>
Total	100.0% (200)	100.0% (94)	100.0% (294)

$$\chi^2=2.005, P=0.366, df=2$$

TABLE S

WHETHER METHODS WERE MENTIONED BY YEAR OF PERIODICAL

<u>Whether Methods Mentioned</u>	<u>Year of Periodical</u>		<u>% of Total</u>
	<u>1968-72</u>	<u>1973-77</u>	
Yes	61.1%	81.8%	69.0% (20)
No	<u>38.9%</u>	<u>18.2%</u>	<u>31.0%</u> <u>(9)</u>
Total	100.0% (18)	100.0% (11)	100.0% (29)

$$\chi^2=1.367, P=0.242, df=1$$

TABLE T

WHETHER METHODS WERE MENTIONED BY NAME OF PERIODICAL

<u>Whether Methods Mentioned</u>	<u>Name of Periodical</u>		<u>% of Total</u>
	<u>Time</u>	<u>Reader's Digest</u>	
Yes	61.1%	81.8%	69.0% (20)
No	<u>38.9%</u>	<u>18.2%</u>	<u>31.0%</u> (9)
Total	100.0% (18)	100.0% (11)	100.0% (29)

 $\chi^2=1.367$, $P=0.242$, $df=1$

TABLE U

WHETHER METHODS WERE MENTIONED BY TYPE OF PROFESSIONAL

<u>Whether Methods Mentioned</u>	<u>Type of Professional</u>		<u>% of Total</u>
	<u>Sociologist</u>	<u>Nonsociologist</u>	
Yes	75.0%	68.0%	69.0% (20)
No	<u>25.0%</u>	<u>32.0%</u>	<u>31.0%</u> (9)
Total	100.0% (4)	100.0% (25)	100.0% (29)

 $\chi^2=0.078$, $P=0.778$, $df=1$

TABLE V

WHETHER STATISTICS WERE MENTIONED BY YEAR OF PERIODICAL

<u>Whether Statistics Mentioned</u>	<u>Year of Periodical</u>		<u>% of Total</u>
	<u>1968-72</u>	<u>1973-77</u>	
Yes	22.4%	22.2%	22.3% (23)
No	4.5%	11.1%	6.8% (7)
Yes, even tho not a study	<u>73.1%</u>	<u>66.7%</u>	<u>70.9%</u> (73)
Total	100.0% (67)	100.0% (36)	100.0% (103)

 $\chi^2=3.129$, $P=0.37$, $df=2$

TABLE W

WHETHER STATISTICS WERE MENTIONED BY NAME OF PERIODICAL

Whether Statistics Mentioned	Name of Periodical		% of Total
	Time	Reader's Digest	
Yes	24.6%	17.6%	22.3% (23)
No	2.9%	14.7%	6.8% (7)
Yes, even tho not a study	12.5%	67.6%	70.9% (73)
	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>99.9%</u>	<u>100.0%</u>
Total	(69)	(34)	(103)

$$\chi^2=4.989, P=0.07, df=2$$

TABLE X

WHETHER STATISTICS WERE MENTIONED BY TYPE OF PROFESSIONAL

Whether Statistics Mentioned	Type of Professional		% of Total
	Sociologist	Nonsociologist	
Yes	30.0%	21.5%	22.3% (23)
No	10.0%	6.5%	6.8% (7)
Yes, even tho not a study	60.0%	72.0%	70.9% (73)
	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>100.0%</u>	<u>100.0%</u>
Total	(10)	(93)	(103)

$$\chi^2=0.628, P=0.76, df=2$$

TABLE Y

WHETHER SIMPLE COUNTS WERE USED BY YEAR OF PERIODICAL

Whether Simple Counts Used	Year of 1968-72	Periodical 1973-77	% of Total
Yes	67.7%	56.3%	63.9% (62)
No	32.3%	43.8%	36.1% (35)
Total	100.0% (65)	100.0% (32)	100.0% (97)

$$X^2=1.217, P=0.269, df=1$$

TABLE Z

WHETHER SIMPLE COUNTS WERE USED BY NAME OF PERIODICAL

Whether Simple Counts Used	Name of Time	Periodical Reader's Digest	% of Total
Yes	68.7%	53.3%	63.9% (62)
No	31.3%	46.7%	36.1% (35)
Total	100.0% (67)	100.0% (30)	100.0% (97)

$$X^2=2.109, P=0.146, df=1$$

TABLE AA

WHETHER FINANCIAL STATISTICS WERE USED BY YEAR OF PERIODICAL

Whether Financial Statistics Used	Year of 1968-72	Periodical 1973-77	% of Total
Yes	35.4%	37.5%	36.1% (35)
No	64.6%	62.5%	63.9% (62)
Total	100.0% (65)	100.0% (32)	100.0% (97)

$$X^2=0.041, P=0.838, df=1$$

TABLE BB

WHETHER FINANCIAL STATISTICS WERE USED BY TYPE OF PROFESSIONAL

Whether Financial Statistics Used	Type of Professional		% of Total
	Sociologist	Nonsociologist	
Yes	33.3%	36.4%	36.1% (35)
No	66.7%	63.6%	63.9% (62)
Total	100.0% (9)	100.0% (88)	100.0% (97)

$$\chi^2=0.032, P=0.856, df=1$$

TABLE CC

WHETHER PERCENTAGES WERE USED BY YEAR OF PERIODICAL

Whether Per- centages Used	Year of Periodical		% of Total
	1968-72	1973-77	
Yes	60.0%	75.0%	64.9% (63)
No	40.0%	25.0%	35.1% (34)
Total	100.0% (65)	100.0% (32)	100.0% (97)

$$\chi^2=2.119, P=0.145, df=1$$

TABLE DD

WHETHER PERCENTAGES WERE USED BY NAME OF PERIODICAL

Whether Per- centages Used	Name of Periodical		% of Total
	Time	Reader's Digest	
Yes	70.1%	53.3%	64.9% (63)
No	29.9%	46.7%	35.1% (34)
Total	100.0% (67)	100.0% (30)	100.0% (97)

$$\chi^2=2.573, P=0.108, df=1$$

TABLE EE

WHETHER PERCENTAGES WERE USED BY TYPE OF PROFESSIONAL

Whether Per- centages Used	Type of Professional		% of Total
	Sociologist	Nonsociologist	
Yes	88.9%	62.5%	64.9% (63)
No	<u>11.1%</u>	<u>37.5%</u>	<u>35.1%</u> (34)
Total	100.0% (9)	100.0% (88)	100.0% (97)

$$X^2=2.497, P=0.114, df=1$$

TABLE FF

WHETHER DATES WERE USED BY YEAR OF MAGAZINE

Whether Dates Used	Year of Periodical		% of Total
	1968-72	1973-77	
Yes	15.4%	18.8%	16.5% (16)
No	<u>84.6%</u>	<u>81.3%</u>	<u>83.5%</u> (81)
Total	100.0% (65)	100.0% (32)	100.0% (97)

$$X^2=0.176, P=0.674, df=1$$

TABLE GG

WHETHER DATES WERE USED BY NAME OF PERIODICAL

Whether Dates Used	Name of Periodical		% of Total
	Time	Reader's Digest	
Yes	20.9%	6.7%	16.5% (16)
No	<u>79.1%</u>	<u>93.3%</u>	<u>83.5%</u> (81)
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

$$X^2=3.045, P=0.08, df=1$$

TABLE HH

WHETHER DATES WERE USED BY TYPE OF PROFESSIONAL

Whether Dates Used	Type of Professional		% of Total
	Sociologist	Nonsociologist	
Yes	22.2%	15.9%	16.5% (16)
No	77.8%	84.1%	83.5% (81)
Total	100.0% (9)	100.0% (88)	100.0% (97)

$$\chi^2=0.236, P=0.629, df=1$$

TABLE II

OPINION OF CONTRIBUTION OF RESEARCHER BY YEAR OF PERIODICAL

Opinion	Year of Periodical		% of Total
	1968-72	1973-77	
Positive	3.0%	2.1%	2.7% (8)
Negative	0.5%	0.5%	0.3% (1)
Neutral or none given	96.5%	97.9%	96.9% (285)
Total	100.0% (200)	100.0% (94)	100.0% (294)

$$\chi^2=0.661, P=0.718, df=2$$

TABLE JJ

OPINION OF CONTRIBUTION OF RESEARCHER BY TYPE OF PROFESSIONAL

Opinion	Type of Professional		% of Total
	Sociologist	Nonsociologist	
Positive	0.0%	2.9%	2.7% (8)
Negative	0.0%	0.4%	0.3% (1)
Neutral or none given	100.0%	96.7%	96.9% (285)
Total	100.0% (22)	100.0% (272)	100.0% (294)

$$\chi^2=0.75, P=0.686, df=2$$

THE PUBLIC IMAGE OF THE SOCIOLOGIST
AND OTHER PROFESSIONALS

by

ANNETTE CLARE MIROCKE

B.S., Kansas State University, 1976

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Social Work

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1978

This thesis uses content analysis to examine the popular dissemination of sociological and other professional knowledge. It compares this with the form of professionally disseminated knowledge, and looks at knowledge over time and by social class. I assume that what the press covers as sociology tends to become equated with sociology in the public's image.

A professional was considered to be the possessor of esoteric knowledge. As predicted in the theory section and the literature review, popularly disseminated knowledge tended to be more simplified than professionally disseminated knowledge. For example, studies were seldom mentioned; when they were mentioned, methods were seldom discussed. Often, when statistics were used, the source was not even given. What this means to professionals' identity as possessors of esoteric knowledge is not exactly clear. On the one hand, simplified knowledge could suggest to readers that professionals don't really know very much that other people don't know. But other readers could interpret the simplicity of popularized knowledge as meaning that the more complex knowledge professionals possess is too complicated to publish, because the public cannot comprehend it anyway.

The popularized knowledge of sociologists was not as simplified as that of other professionals; possibly making it look as though they are possessors of more complex knowledge. Surprisingly, the periodical aimed at the middle and lower class audience presented information that was less dissimilar to professionally disseminated knowledge than did the periodical aimed at the upper middle class and above audience. However, this may have been because of the format and style of the two magazines, and the differences were usually small. Finally, the form of popularized knowledge did not differ much by time period.