

between these two matrices leading to this change in the natural outcome is the exchanged locations of the "-", "+" and "+,-" cells.

3. In this respect, the Felsenthal-Diskin model was closer to our results than the other two models, but other results also led us to question whether the Felsenthal-Diskin substitute for a status-quo point was not also too limiting.

#### REFERENCES

- Cross, John G. 1969. *The Economics of Bargaining*. New York: Basic Books.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1983. *A Theory of Adaptive Economic Behavior*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Felsenthal, Dan S., and Abraham Diskin. 1982. "The Bargaining Problem Revisited." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 26:664-691.
- Harsanyi, John. 1956. "Approaches to the Bargaining Problem Before and After the Theory of Games: A Critical Discussion of Zeuthen's, Hicks', and Nash's Theories." *Econometrica* 24 (2):144-157.
- Heckathorn, Douglas D. 1978. "A Paradigm for Bargaining and a Test of Two Bargaining Models." *Behavioral Science* 23:73-85.
- Kalai, Ehud, and Meir Smorodinsky. 1975. "Other Solutions to Nash's Bargaining Problem." *Econometrica* 43:513-518.
- Nash, John F. 1950. "The Bargaining Problem." *Econometrica* 18:155-162.
- Schellenberg, James A. 1988. "A Comparative Test of Three Models for Solving 'the Bargaining Problem.'" *Behavioral Science* 33:81-96.
- Schellenberg, James A., and Daniel Druckman. 1986. "Bargaining and Gaming." *Society* 23 (September/October):65-71.
- von Neumann, John, and Oskar Morgenstern. 1944. *Theory of Games and Economic Behavior*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Zartman, William I. 1977. "Negotiation as a Joint Decision-making Process." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 21:619-638.
- Zeuthen, Frederik. 1930. *Problems of Monopoly and Economic Warfare*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

## CONFLICT AND ORDER: IMPLICATIONS FOR A RESEARCH AGENDA

D. Stanley Eitzen  
Colorado State University

Mid-American Review of Sociology, 1989, Vol. XIV, No. 1-2:89-92.

My sociological activities may appear to the untrained eye as scattered and unfocused. The subjects investigated have included status inconsistencies, youth, terrorists, athletes, coaches, racial minorities, governments, multinational corporations, banks, and universities. I have written textbooks for introductory sociology, social problems, criminology, family, and sport. And, I have penned essays on ethics, values, violence, crime, the Superbowl, the Olympics, and the structural transformation of the economy. Despite the seeming disparity in these topics and the variety of social categories studied, there is a strong theoretical thread that brings coherence to these works--the conflict paradigm. This paper examines the implications of this paradigm that guide my current research agenda.

The assumptions of the conflict perspective focus research attention in particular directions (the following is taken from Eitzen 1981, 1984, 1988). To begin, central to a conflict analysis is that the institutions of society are reflections of the larger society in general and the "master" institutions of the economy and polity in particular. This means, in effect, that power and wealth are inextricably intertwined and that they dominate the rest of society.

I have had a long-standing interest in power and the powerful. This has resulted in research on the corporate inner group, organizational linkages among the corporate elite, entrepreneurial capitalism, interlocking ownership among the major banks, and domestic and international corporate social expenditures. Currently, I am involved in an ongoing project with David R. Simon analyzing crimes by the powerful. This research centers on crimes by corporations and governments. In addition to presenting the rich and plentiful descriptive material on these subjects we are working to reconceptualize corporate and political crimes in a more logical fashion than has been the case in the literature (Simon and Eitzen forthcoming).

The primacy of the economy in shaping social life has resulted in a recently published collection of readings (Eitzen and Baca Zinn 1989). This book focuses on the convergence of four forces: microelectronic technology, the globalization of the economy, the swift movement of capital, and the shift of the economy from one based on manufacturing to one based on information and services, and their consequences for society, organizations, communities, and individuals. The profound changes resulting from these forces have led me to investigate further the economic mechanisms that are increasing inequality throughout American society.

A second implication of the conflict perspective that guides my current work is a basic mood of skepticism about cultural and social patterns. Existing power arrangements are distrusted because they, by definition, oppress the

powerless. Prevailing ideologies are questioned because they support the status quo. Myths are measured against reality. In short, this critical approach to social structure and culture demystifies, demythologizes, and, sometimes, I hope, emancipates. A current project, just underway, is a book tentatively entitled *Demythologizing Society* (coauthored with Maxine Baca Zinn), which will refute a number of commonly accepted myths by using sociological research findings and insights. Some of the myths investigated are: the belief that society is best understood in individual terms, science is value-free, the culture of minorities keeps them as minorities, women are inferior because of role programming, the law and the state are neutral, and reality is a given.

The conflict perspective directs attention toward social problems emanating from structural arrangements. Conflict is endemic to social organizations because the things that people desire such as property, prestige, and power are distributed unequally, resulting in a fundamental cleavage between the advantaged and the disadvantaged. The fundamental questions guiding my research efforts are: Under these social arrangements who gets what and why? Who benefits and who bears the social costs of change and stability? From this theoretical vantage point the distribution of resources and power are crucial keys for understanding social life because the powerless are dominated by the powerful; therefore, they are thwarted in achieving their basic needs. The three fundamental structures of inequality--class, race, and gender--have consistently been the focus of my empirical research. This research continues.

My current project focusing on social class investigates homelessness. A colleague, Doug A. Timmer, and I are doing a structural analysis of the homeless, using in-depth interviews obtained in Tampa and Chicago, to understand the complex sources of the new homeless phenomenon. In particular, we seek to determine how the changing economy, changing cities, changing housing patterns, changing families, and changing governmental policies have negatively impacted certain social categories. The interviews ask individuals how they became homeless? How being homeless has affected their well being, relationships, and outlook? How they cope? and, What they need to change their situations for the better? Our research objectives are to understand the macro-micro-nexus as social arrangements create and sustain inequality and to determine the appropriate social policies to ameliorate this social problem.

My interest in racial minorities goes back to my graduate student days, when I published a paper on the subject in the *Kansas Journal of Sociology* (Eitzen 1967). I have since published a number of studies on various manifestations of racism in sport. My current research project in this area concentrates on blacks in sport since World War II. In 1988 I spent a sabbatical semester in New York City using various libraries but particularly the Schomburg Library in Harlem researching the integration of blacks in American sport. My goal is to demonstrate, contrary to popular belief, that sport is not an oasis free from the racism found throughout the rest of society. The research findings show that black breakthroughs in sport parallel black

breakthroughs in other institutional sectors and while blacks have numerical and performance superiority in some sports, they are denied access to other sports and are continually and severely underrepresented in positions of leadership in the sports where they do participate. My ongoing research documents this through such mechanisms as racial stacking by positions and through unequal opportunities for those with equal abilities. The serious deficiency in this research is the lack of powerful theory to explain the strong empirical findings.

Gender inequity is another area of research concentration emanating from the conflict perspective. My current research problem here (coauthored with Maxine Baca Zinn) concentrates on the unequal treatment of women athletes. In effect, we ask: "Do sports reproduce or moderate the structure of gender privilege, separation and domination?" (Young 1984, p. 3). Using data from 1,185 colleges and universities, we compared the nicknames, logos, and mascots for male and female teams. We found that more than half of the schools have naming and other symbolic practices that trivialize, de-athleticize, diminish, and render invisible women athletes. Although this sexist phenomenon occurs throughout the United States, there are interesting regional patterns. Schools in the South, for example, are much more likely than nonSouthern schools to incorporate feminine suffixes and use lady in their naming of female teams. Both of these naming practices emphasize traditional notions of femininity but not their athleticism. NonSouthern schools, on the other hand, are more likely than Southern schools to use male names as a false generic (i.e., where both men's and women's teams are identified by a male name such as "Rams" or "Stags"). This naming practice ignores women teams. Regardless of the naming device employed, we conclude that most universities contribute to the maintenance of hegemonic masculinity (Eitzen and Baca Zinn forthcoming, 1989). Currently, we are investigating the resistance of these schools to change their sexist naming traditions.

I am also engaged in research (with Stephen R. Pratt) on gender differences among coaches. We sent questionnaires to the head coaches of the male and the female basketball teams in a sample of 600 American high schools. Our research is designed to find answers to: (1) Whether the proportion of female coaches continues to decline? (2) What are the differences, if any, in the coaching styles of male and female coaches? (3) Are there differences in coaching styles between male coaches of boys teams and male coaches of female teams? (4) If there are significant gender differences in coaching styles, what are the structural bases for them? and (5) What are the effects of leadership style (e. g., authoritarianism, rigor, and rules) on organizational effectiveness?

A fundamental assumption of conflict theorists is that human beings are the architects of social organization and history. This means that social structures are subject to human intervention, transformation, and improvement. The research (as well as my teaching and textbook writing) that I do has potential public policy significance and this is an awesome

responsibility. Just as bad theory leads to bad policy, good research, driven by good theory, may lead to positive changes. I aspire in my work to make just such a difference. This goal will be achieved if I am effective in three related areas: (1) by doing good research which reveals that social problems emanate from social structure; (2) by engaging in social criticism, which Herbert Gans called for so forcefully in his 1988 Presidential Address to the American Sociological Association (1989, p. 7); and (3) by being a public sociologist, i. e., by being a keen analyst of society who communicates effectively to sociologists, students, and the lay public. I have organized my professional life to accomplish these tasks. In doing so, I am guided by Emily Dickinson's dictum: "Tell all the truth but tell it slant." The work (and I do not consider it work) continues.

#### REFERENCES

- Eitzen, D. Stanley. 1967. "A Conflict Model for the Analysis of Majority-Minority Relations." *The Kansas Journal of Sociology* 3 (Spring):76-89.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1981. "Athletics and Higher Education: A Conflict Perspective." Paper presented at the annual meetings of the North American Society for the Sociology of Sport, Dallas (November).
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1984. "Conflict Theory and the Sociology of Sport." *Arena Review* 8 (November):45-54.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1988. "Conflict Theory and Deviance in Sport." *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* 23:193-204.
- Eitzen, D. Stanley and Maxine Baca Zinn. 1989. "The De-Athleticization of Women: The Naming and Gender Marking of Collegiate Athletic Teams." *Sociology of Sport Journal* 6 (December, forthcoming).
- Eitzen, D. Stanley and Maxine Baca Zinn (eds). 1989. *The Reshaping of America: Social Consequences of the Changing Economy*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Gans, Herbert J. 1989. "Sociology in America: The Discipline and the Public." *American Sociological Review* 54 (February):1-16.
- Simon, David R. and D. Stanley Eitzen. 1990. *Elite Deviance*. 3rd ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, forthcoming.
- Young, T. R. 1984. "The Sociology of Sport: A Critical Overview." *Arena Review* 8 (November):1-14.

## AFRICA ON MY MIND: ENCOUNTERS IN THE FIELD\*

M. Elaine Burgess  
University of North Carolina-Greensboro

Mid-American Review of Sociology, 1990, Vol. XIV, No. 1-2:93-111.

### INTRODUCTION

Some years ago Robert Merton (1964, p. 19) observed that our literature on research methods tells us ways in which we ought to think, feel, and act but says precious little about the ways in which we actually do think, feel, and act. The significance of this insight became painfully clear during my most recent research stint in southern Africa. Certainly the tradition of sharing personal reminiscences about research and setting remains, for reasons related to discipline norms, rare among sociologists. Our stress on detachment and the *public persona* ordinarily precludes concern for the interaction between *private person* and the field. There are notable exceptions, of course--one thinks of William Foote Whyte's "disarmingly candid" accounts of his *Street Corner Society* work (1981, 1955), or Renee Fox's essay on her Belgium medical research (1962).<sup>1</sup> But we have little of the richness found in the memoirs of anthropological scholars such as Malinowski (1922), Bohanon (1964), Briggs (1970), Mead (1977), and more recently Ben Reina (1984). They are reports that I have come, quite belatedly, to appreciate in spite of having long internalized sociology's proscriptions.

The fact is that by the time I returned from South Africa two years ago, I felt an urgent need to share something more personal with colleagues than the typical "preliminary findings" or "state of South Africa" report. Following a brief presentation in this vein at a departmental colloquium, colleagues urged me to develop the theme. After some hesitancy--there is professional risk--work is underway,<sup>2</sup> and KU's invitation to send *MARS* something on current research seemed a propitious opportunity to stray from the more traditional chronicling into the "experiential mode." For with me still is the intensity of feeling that South Africa evokes; perhaps my commentary will provoke some rethinking re sociological endeavors.

\* I wish to express my appreciation to colleagues, most especially Elizabeth Fink, for thoughtful suggestions and feedback, and to the Centre for Intergroup Studies, University of Cape Town for financial and "moral" support.