

Mid-American Review of Sociology

21. CERFI—Centre d'Etudes et de Recherches et de Formations Institutionnelles (Study Center for Research and Organizational Development).
22. Namely, one is reminded of the numerous conflicts that arose between the Maisons des Jeunes (youth centers) and various towns.
23. Richard Cloward, Frances Piven, *Regulating the Poor: The Functions of Public Welfare*, New York, Pantheon Books, 1971.
24. R. Castel, "Genèse et ambiguïté de la notion de secteurs en psychiatrie," *Sociologie du Travail*, I, 1975, has shown with regard to mental health sectors how the present mental health policy was first a medical utopia before becoming a governmental policy.
25. Alain Touraine, *La voix et le regard*, Paris, Seuil, 1978.
26. Here we are taking up again Pierre Birnbaum's conclusions in his work, *Les sommets de l'Etat*, op. cit.

THE ACADEMIC ELITE IN SOCIOLOGY:
A REASSESSMENT OF TOP-RANKED
GRADUATE PROGRAMS

Jeffrey H. Bair
and

William E. Thompson
Emporia State University

Mid-American Review of Sociology, 1985, Vol. X, No. 1:37-44

Changing Times (1983) listed the top eleven graduate programs according to a National Academy of Sciences study. Given the questionable and subjective nature of the evaluation process which produced these ratings this paper examined the composition of the faculties of these top eleven departments. It was found that these departments were substantially linked to each other by hiring each others' graduates, and hence, enhancing each others' reputations.

INTRODUCTION

In the November 1983 edition of *Changing Times* magazine a listing of the most highly regarded doctoral programs in 32 academic disciplines was presented. These rankings were based on a five-volume study published by the National Academy of Sciences. This study entitled *An Assessment of Research—Doctorate Programs in the United States* reviewed 2,700 Ph.D. programs in 32 disciplines from anthropology to zoology.

In the ratings reported by *Changing Times* two key measures of reputation from the National Academy of Sciences study were combined: first, how professors around the country rated their peers in the same discipline; and second, how well the faculty thought each program educated research scholars and scientists. *Changing Times* combined these two measures and derived a ranking of the top 10% of the programs in each discipline. Clearly, both of these criteria are purely subjective, and attest primarily to the prestige accorded these graduate programs.

For the discipline of sociology *Changing Times* listed the top eleven departments according to the National Academy of

Sciences study which they evaluated. Given the questionable and subjective nature of the evaluation process which produced these ratings we felt that it would be interesting to examine the composition of the faculties of these top eleven departments. We suspected that these departments might be substantially linked to each other by hiring each others' graduates, and hence, enhancing each others' reputations. We also suspected that there might be a high degree of academic inbreeding, or the hiring of graduates from their own programs among the top-rated departments.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In 1966 a comprehensive evaluation of graduate education by the American Council on Education was published (Cartter, 1966). This report presented a subjective evaluation of sociology departments. It assumed that the reputation of a graduate department reflects the presence of objective criteria upon which subjective evaluation is based. The Cartter report concluded that the leading departments could be identified using either (objective or subjective) approach, because the two kinds of data corroborate each other (Cartter, 1966:5).

Lewis (1968) reported general agreement between subjective and objective rankings of sociology departments. He also pointed out that Cartter's findings and conclusions must be regarded in terms of prestige rankings rather than quality. Cartter's claim to an objective measurement of quality cannot be taken seriously. His data were subjective reputational rankings of schools obtained through questionnaires and interviews.

Knudsen and Vaughan (1969) attempted to reveal the relationship between objective and subjective measures of the quality of sociology departments in the United States. They found that for both the quality of graduate faculty and the effectiveness of the graduate program, close correspondence between objective and subjective rankings held only for those institutions at the very top. And, except for these institutions, there was relatively little correspondence between the objective measures of quality of graduate faculty and the effectiveness of the graduate program. Knudsen and Vaughan suggested that status as measured by subjective evaluations, as in the case of the Cartter (1966)

report, can be objectively verified only for the elite or clearly superior institutions.

Shamblin (1970) raised several major issues regarding the Knudsen and Vaughan (1969) study. First, Knudsen and Vaughan assumed quantity of publication as a measure of the quality of college departments. Shamblin points out it might have been that the emphasis on quantity was having a harmful effect on quality. Second, Knudsen and Vaughan confused the concepts "prestige" and "quality" and used a measure of the former as an indicator of the latter. Third, they claimed that their study was an attempt to "objectively verify" prestige, which was by its very nature subjective. Last, Knudsen and Vaughan ignored the relationship between prestige and power. They failed to note the existence of an "Establishment" of sociology and the obvious interrelationship between the leading mainstream departments and the leading mainstream journals.

With regard to inbreeding, Berelson (1960) and also Caplow and McGee (1965) pointed out the relatively high departmental inbreeding of the most prestigious departments, because if they want to maintain their high prestige, they cannot hire a large number of Ph.D.s from lower-rated departments. Gross (1970) dealt with the prestige order among sociology departments and found that the higher the prestige of a department, the greater was the proportion of home-grown graduate faculty. Shichor (1970) was in partial agreement with Gross's finding. He found the relation between departmental inbreeding ("home-grown faculty") and the prestige of the department to be curvilinear, where the highest ranking and lowest ranking departments had the highest rates of inbreeding, while mid-level departments had the lowest rate.

FINDINGS

Using the American Sociological Association's 1983 *Guide to Graduate Departments in Sociology* the full-time faculties of these eleven top-ranked sociology departments were examined. The item of primary interest was where full-time faculty members at these institutions had received their doctoral degrees.

In analyzing the faculties of these top-rated departments it was obvious that there was a large amount of interrelationship

between these departments in terms of where the faculty had received their doctoral degrees. Table 1 lists the top-ranked departments and indicates the percentage of the full-time faculty who received their doctoral degree from one of the other top-ranked departments on the list (which would include those who received their degree from the same department where they are currently on the faculty).

Table 1

Percentage of Faculty From Schools Ranked Among the Academic Elite

Rank		%	N
1	U. of Wisconsin, Madison	69.8	53
2	U. of Michigan, Ann Arbor	78.6	28
3	U. of Chicago	68.2	22
4	U. of North Carolina, Chapel Hill	75.0	24
5	U. of California, Berkeley	84.2	19
6	Harvard University	71.4	14
6	Stanford University	83.3	12
7	U. of Washington, Seattle	68.0	25
8	Columbia University	81.2	16
8	Indiana U., Bloomington	61.3	31
8	UCLA	63.6	33
			277

*According to *Changing Times* (1983).

As can be seen in Table 1, all of the top-ranked departments had a substantial proportion of their faculty who had received their Ph.D. degree from a member of the "Academic Elite." The University of California, Berkeley, had the highest percentage of degree holders from among the top-ranked departments (84.2%), and Indiana University at Bloomington had the lowest (61.3%). Most of the schools had anywhere from 2/3 to over 3/4 of their faculty having graduated from one of the prestige programs.

Table 2 addresses the issue of *academic inbreeding* among the top-ranked sociology programs. As can be seen, Harvard and Michigan tied in having the largest percentage of their own graduates on their full-time sociology faculties (28.6%). Columbia

University and the University of Chicago also had rather large percentages of their own graduates on their sociology faculties (25% and 18.2% respectively). Interestingly, Indiana had hired only one of its graduates (3.2%) and UCLA none.

Table 2

Percentage of Own Graduates on Faculty

	%	N
University of Wisconsin	11.3	53
University of Michigan	23.6	28
University of Chicago	18.2	22
University of North Carolina	8.3	24
University of California	26.3	19
Harvard University	28.6	14
Stanford University	8.3	12
University of Washington	8.0	25
Columbia University	25.0	16
Indiana University	3.2	31
UCLA	0.0	33
		277

Table 3 looks at the number of Ph.D.s produced from each department who were represented on the full-time faculty of one of the elite departments in 1983. Michigan had 41 of its graduates in faculty positions in one of the elite sociology departments. Chicago and Harvard followed closely with 36 and 33, respectively. Again, Indiana and UCLA had the lowest, with Indiana only placing three of its Ph.D.s in one of the top-rated programs (remember, one of these is on the faculty at Indiana), and UCLA only two.

DISCUSSION

Graduate departments in sociology (or any other discipline) must rely to a large extent upon their reputations to attract highly qualified faculty and graduate students to participate in their programs. Further, as students complete the Ph.D. and enter the academic job market, they are acutely aware of the

Table 3

Number and Source of Ph.D.s For
Faculty of Academic Elite Departments

Source	Number
Wisconsin	21
Michigan	41
Chicago	36
North Carolina	9
Berkeley	24
Harvard	33
Stanford	6
Univ. of Washington	7
Columbia	15
Indiana	3
UCLA	2
	197

fact that the reputation of the institution from which they receive their degree becomes an important variable in their employability. Helmer's study (1974:50) indicated "there is a strong correlation between the prestige of the institution where a sociologist earns his Ph.D. and the prestige of the department where he gets his first and later jobs." While a variety of variables enter into the screening process for faculty selection, it would be naive to argue that the subjective evaluation accorded the degree-granting institution is not part of the decision process. Thus, graduate programs around the country vie for respectability, status, and in some cases, "one-upmanship."

The eleven graduate programs which were top ranked by the national study cited in *Changing Times* are undoubtedly excellent graduate programs in sociology. It is certainly *not* our contention that they are not. However, it is our contention that several factors are at work in any procedure in which academic departments are ranked in such a manner. Primarily, it is our contention that a rather small group of institutions (11 in this case) tend to enhance each others' reputations by hiring each others' graduates over a period of time. Remember that the study cited by *Changing Times* used two measures of reputation in order to establish their list of the "best" graduate departments: how professors rated their peers in the same discipline; and how well the

faculty thought each program educated research scholars and scientists. In looking at these criteria, they are inherently linked and it should be realized that when faculty among these "academic elites" are asked to rate their peers at other schools, they are, to a large extent, rating their former professors and/or students. In other words, there are a total of 277 full-time faculty at these eleven schools, and 197 of them graduated from one of these eleven schools (see Table 4). It is obviously in their vested interests to rank their alma maters highly.

Table 4

Size of Department

	Full-time Faculty	Full-time Graduate Students
Wisconsin	53	165
Michigan	28	120
Chicago	22	87
North Carolina	24	63
Berkeley	19	154
Harvard	14	81
Stanford	12	58
Washington	25	47
Columbia	16	100
Indiana	31	65
UCLA	33	97
	277	1,037

Other faculty members at smaller and less prestigious programs around the country must also have rated these eleven schools very highly. Our data suggests that the extremely favorable rankings of these departments may be due to the large number of graduates these programs have put into the discipline. Many of their graduates are at much less prestigious schools, but continue to subjectively rank their alma mater as the very best. The high concentration of these schools' graduates at other schools within this circle of "academic elites" tends to create a network of relationships among the faculty members at these schools.

Ultimately, it should be asked, "are these indeed the best Ph.D. programs in sociology in the country?", or "do these

schools comprise an 'academic elite' who have the largest number of faculty members in the discipline who have a vested interest in maintaining the 'definition of the situation' (Thomas, 1931) that they are the best?" Our data suggests the latter and appears to support Helmer's (1974:42) contention that "the hierarchy of prestige is thus fundamentally a hierarchy of power unequally distributed. No more in sociology than in the rest of the world do the deserving get their just reward."

REFERENCES

- American Sociological Association
1983 Guide to Graduate Departments of Sociology. Washington, D.C.: American Sociological Association.
- Berelson, B.
1960 Graduate Education in the United States. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Caplow, T. and R.J. McGee
1965 The Academic Marketplace. New York: Anchor-Doubleday.
- Cartter, A.M.
1966 An Assessment of Quality in Graduate Education. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.
- Changing Times
1983 "Best Places to be for a Ph.D." Changing Times (November):64-67.
- Gross, G.R.
1970 "The Organization Set: A Study of Sociology Departments." American Sociologist 5:25-29.
- Helmer, J.
1974 The Deadly Simple Mechanics of Society. New York: The Seabury Press.
- Knudsen, D.D. and T.R. Vaughan
1969 "Quality in Graduate Education: A Re-evaluation of the Rankings of Sociology Departments in the Cartter Report." American Sociologist 4:12-19.
- Lewis, L.S.
1968 "On Subjective and Objective Rankings of Sociology Departments." American Sociologist 3:129-131.
- Shamblin, D.H.
1970 "Prestige of Sociology Departments and the Placing of New Ph.D.s" American Sociologist 5:154-156.
- Shichor, D.
1970 "Prestige of Sociology Departments and the Placing of New Ph.D.s" American Sociologist 5:157-160.
- Thomas, W.I.
1931 The Unadjusted Girl. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

AN EMPIRICAL EXAMINATION OF THE EXISTENCE
OF ART, ART/CRAFT, AND CRAFT SEGMENT
AMONG CRAFT MEDIA WORKERS*

Jerry Neapolitan
and

Maurice Ethridge

Tennessee Technological University

In the last twenty years there has been a dramatic resurgence in the creation, sales, and use of hand-crafted objects in the United States. However, the craft media workers of today no longer serve their local community creating utilitarian objects, but work in diverse styles according to diverse standards. Becker (1978) has proposed that three largely distinct segments exist among craft media workers: an art segment, an art/craft segment, and a craft segment. These segments can be distinguished from each other by their differing conventions and orientations. These conventions and orientations then serve as the basis for cooperative activity and result in the segments not only creating different styles of objects but with different institutional links and audiences. This study, utilizing data from a national survey of craft media workers conducted for the National Endowment for the Arts, tests Becker's propositions by examining whether craft media workers who have different conventions and orientations constitute different segments having different training, involvements, markets, goals, satisfactions, and problems.

For western society prior to the Renaissance, art was not distinguished from craft. It was during this period that painting and sculpture attained a new status and importance, largely through elite support, and art emerged as a distinct and elite enterprise. Craft, on the other hand, sank to a lower status of being "merely" utilitarian or decorative in contrast to the higher

*Data for this analysis were collected by Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., in a nationwide survey of craft-artists sponsored by the National Endowment for the Arts.