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ABSTRACT

The sociological study of race and ethnic minorities has often been described as limited and biased. This claim is being investigated through a content analysis of articles dealing with race and ethnic minorities (identified by DIALOG Information System descriptors) that were published in the American Journal of Sociology and the American Sociological Review from January 1963 through December 1992.

The results of this analysis show that identified race and ethnicity articles in both journals predominantly cover topics of social organization, the economy, social problems and urban ecology, followed by an interest in the areas of education, demography, family, and political institutions. When each of these topic areas was examined in regard to their use of available theoretical approaches, findings display that articles in these two journals are predominated by
normative and integrational assumptions about society, and present an often social-psychological view of race and ethnic minority status.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Mainstream contemporary sociology has often been criticized as restricted and biased in its study and depiction of race and ethnic minorities (cf. Bash, 1979; Kinloch, 1979; Kinloch, 1988; Mirandé, 1985; Nisbet, 1966; Rex, 1983). While studies have outlined the limitations in research scope and representation of individual theoretical approaches, an empirical examination of research issues and utilization of race and ethnic relations theories is absent. This analysis attempts to provide some empirical insight into research topics and their theoretical representation in the area of race and ethnic minorities. Through a content analysis of articles dealing with race and ethnic minorities (identified by DIALOG Information System) that were published in the American Journal of Sociology (AJS) and the American Sociological Review (ASR) from January 1963 through December 1992 this study will be able to give a more comprehensive and detailed overview of contemporary mainstream sociology's approach towards race and ethnic minorities. This analysis is, thus, another link in the ongoing study of the subfield of race and ethnic
relations' development. It provides empirical evidence for previous descriptive research and establishes a basis for future investigations of the representation of race and ethnic minorities in terms of theory utilization, research emphasis, and perceived image of minority status.
CHAPTER 2

DISCUSSION OF RELEVANT LITERATURE

According to the literature, sociology's theoretical approaches in the subfield of race and ethnic relations can be broadly outlined by the following trends. Initially, sociologists left the study of race and ethnic groups to biologists and anthropologists, and did not develop any distinct sociological approaches in theory and methodology (Odum, 1951). Sociology, therefore, came to the study of race and ethnic relations later than other social sciences and partly built its early theoretical and methodological approaches on procedures of disciplines like, biology, psychology, or anthropology. It further followed the general field in its extensive emphasis on moralistic Eurocentric social thought, exhibiting early stages of research that included Darwinistic and hereditary perspectives, derived from organic/biological oriented theories. Initial sociological approaches were very limited, often based on racist and ideologically influenced standpoints. Race was seen as a relatively stable and fixed biological factor with predispositions of superior and inferior capabilities (McLemore, 1991; Odum, 1951; Rex, 1983).
More contemporary interests of socio-biological approaches include the study of intelligence, weakness of black culture and family structure, ethnocentric versions of underdevelopment and modernization (cf. Jensen, 1969; Kinloch, 1979; Ryan, 1971).

After the initial stage of Darwinistic and hereditary perspectives, the study of race and ethnic relations adopted general sociology's increasing concern with statistical matters and scientific methodology (Brown & Gilmartin, 1969; Furner, 1975; McCartney, 1970; Vidich & Lyman, 1985). Open ideological advocacy slowly disappeared and was replaced by the concept of assimilation which is largely associated with professors of the Chicago School of Sociology (Bulmer, 1984; Wacker, 1983). Particularly ethnic groups were portrayed as passing through a race relations cycle that ends with the total assimilation to white Anglo-Saxon values (Bash, 1979; McLemore, 1991; Wacker, 1983). Little attention was spent on independent minority cultures and structures, since they were assumed to gradually disappear (Bash, 1979; Kinloch, 1979). The perspective of assimilation directed sociology towards a concern with adjustment and integration of ethnic immigrants into American society, rather than with the dynamics or relations of ethnic groups, or with the changes new groups brought to the existing social structures. Examples of theoretical
approaches deal with the establishment of ethnic enclaves and their role in the process of assimilation and pluralism (Gordon, 1964; Gordon, 1978). With the research focus and the issue at hand being structural integration, conflict was of secondary interest. No concern was given to ethnic, economic, or cultural differences of individual groups, and their influence or persistence within American social structures (Bash, 1979; Nisbet, 1966; Rex, 1983).

The continuous existence of structural and cultural differences between racial and ethnic groups forced sociologists to broaden the scope of sociological inquiry. The subfield of race and ethnic relations, after a nearly complete domination of the structural-functional approach, added a general and widespread concern with social-psychological phenomena (Bash, 1979; Kinloch, 1979; McLemore, 1991; Nisbet, 1966; Odum, 1951; Rex, 1983). Early examples of research focused on the areas of stereotypes (e.g. Katz and Braly, 1933; Berelson and Salter, 1946; Gilbert, 1951); prejudice (e.g. Allport, 1958; Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, and Sanford, 1950; Myrdal, 1944; Festinger, 1957; Bogardus, 1933); and ethnocentrism (e.g. Sumner, 1906). This led to attempts at theoretical development with regard to the relationship between prejudice and discrimination (e.g. LaPiere, 1934; Defleur and Westie, 1958; Merton, 1949);
and the development of theoretical explanations for the basis and general consequences of stereotypes and prejudice: "self hate" of target group (e.g. Clark and Clark, 1933; Horowitz, 1936); social distance (e.g. Simmel, 1950; Park, 1924; Bogardus, 1933); frustration-aggression-hypothesis (e.g. Dollard, Doob, and Miller, 1939; Miller, 1941; Allport, 1958; Festinger, 1957). Of course, this is only a limited sample of research studies. According to the literature, however, it is representative of the foundation of social-psychological research studies in the area of race and ethnicity (McLemore, 1991; Rex, 1983; Schaefer, 1990).

During the 1960s and 1970s conflict and Marxist oriented perspectives became academically more accepted and finally occupied an eminent role in the subfield of race and ethnic relations, adding different theoretical explanations for phenomena like stereotypes, prejudice, discrimination, and social inequality. These theoretical approaches, with their critical stand towards the social structures and emphasis on conflict, stand in direct contrast to structural functionalism's and the assimilation perspective's consensus based view of functionally operating structures. The focus was lifted from the social issue of non-integration and non-assimilation as a social problem, and redirected
towards the inherent inequalities of socio-economic structures (Kinloch, 1974; Kinloch, 1979; Rex, 1983). This resulted in the following kinds of theoretical approaches: Group-Gains Theory (e.g. Noel, 1968; Simpson and Yinger, 1972); Split-Labor-Market Theory (e.g. Bonacich, 1972; Boswell, 1986; Beck, 1980); Institutional Discrimination (e.g. Carmichael and Hamilton, 1967; Feagin, 1977; Friedman, 1975; Baron, 1969); and Internal Colonialism (e.g. Blauner, 1972; Moore, 1970).

Each of the available approaches offers distinct insights into diverse aspects of the social environment of race and ethnic minorities through different levels of analysis (individual, groups, structure, organization, institution) and subject matters under study (i.e. discrimination, stereotypes, prejudices, structural inequality, socio-economic integration). Keeping in mind the differing assumptions about society (i.e. integration oriented, conflict oriented, cognitive emphasis, behavioral emphasis), sociology has a relatively extensive fund of available means of analysis. However, there is an absence of empirical work that focuses on how frequently any of these theoretical approaches are used and how they affect the overall scope of research issues. The question, therefore, is: To what extent does the above outlined fund of theoretical approaches depict the actual sociological study of race and ethnic minorities
in terms of research issues and theoretical explanations?

Some earlier studies, offer insight into the research topics of the general field of sociology (cf. Kinloch, 1988; Simpson, 1961; Wilner, 1985; Vincent, 1938; Vincent, 1949). Graham Kinloch's (1988) content analysis of articles published from 1895 to 1979 in AJS and ASR, for example, shows that the general field has a historical interest in self-definition, methodological and theoretical concerns. This is followed by a continuous interest in research issues found in the areas of social organization, the economy and political institutions. The discipline is further interested in social problems, (i.e. deviance and crime), other societies (i.e. during war), and the topic area minorities, which includes women, the aged, and various ethnic and racial groups. Religion, ecology, social change, education, and the family round out the scope of research interests (Kinloch, 1988).

In addition, studies are equally able to show that mainstream sociology prefers to discuss its topics of sociological interest in a distinct, possibly limited, fashion (cf. Kinloch, 1984; Kinloch, 1988; Wilner, 1985). Patricia Wilner defined it as,

... the Parsonian influence tilting sociology toward concern with consensus... and psychology and away from conflict. Survey research, ... which is appropriate for social psychological analysis, but ... incapable of studying structure, ...
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has emerged as the reigning methodology.

Thus... the dominant theoretical orientation and the dominant methodology in sociology lead in conventional directions, not toward the study of conflict and structure. (p.18)

Turning back the subfield of minorities, it seems reasonable to expect that the study of racial and ethnic groups would exhibit the same patterns of representation in AJS and ASR. However, since the sociological study of race and ethnic minorities was not the focus of the analyses referred to above, it is difficult to draw distinct conclusions about research emphasis and theoretical examinations found within the subfield. We only know that the general topic area of minorities (women and the aged are included) appears to be historically of average sociological interest in these two journals and does not reach a significant importance until the 1970s (Kinloch, 1988, pp. 187, 189). The literature does provide the information, that this increase of interest is usually linked to the greater political visibility of race and ethnic interest groups, the social climate initiated during the 1960s, and greater numbers of minority sociologists (Bash, 1979; Rex, 1983; Kinloch, 1988; Wacker, 1983). However, which theories and topics are emphasized within articles during any of the publication periods is not stated.

The analysis to follow is based on articles dealing with race and ethnic minorities published from January
1963 through December 1992 in the *AJS* and the *ASR*. An attempt is made to examine sociological topics of interest in the area of race and ethnic minorities and assess the influence of theoretical approaches on the representation and comprehension of sociology's study of race and ethnic minorities. This analysis, obviously does not reflect the total representation of race and ethnic groups by contemporary American sociology. It should, however, provide more detailed insight into some of the most central research issues and means of analysis found over the last thirty years.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Sample

The DIALOG INFORMATION SYSTEM counted 3929 articles published in *AJS* and 2031 articles published in *ASR* from January 1963 through December 1992. A total of 223 articles from this time period were identified by the DIALOG descriptors "race", "racial", "ethnic", "minority", and "minorities". Of these articles 119 appeared in *AJS* and 104 were published in *ASR*.

Procedure

First, a list of all identified articles by title and year was compiled for each journal, and then separately examined in chronological order. Based on the central emphasis of each article (staying with the central feature of each article title) a set range of topics evolved, and was classified into the following eight categories (major topic areas): economy, social problems, social organization, education, family, demography, political institutions, and urban ecology.
Once articles were classified according to major topic area the distribution for each decade (1963-72, 1973-82, 1983-92) was calculated. Then the two journals were compared in regard to major topics and their distribution.

Next, the total distribution (both journals combined) of articles and major topics from January 1963 through December 1992 was computed. The articles within each category were reviewed and classified in terms of their particular research emphasis (see Table 4), outlining in more detail what each major topic area entails. Finally, the major topic areas and their sub-topics were discussed in regard to their use of the theoretical approaches, assumptions about society, levels of analysis, and subject matters outlined in Chapter 2 pp. 3-7.
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS

Proportions of Article Topics

Although the major article topics for each journal are the same, proportional distributions by topics differs. AJS has a greater proportion than ASR of articles in demography and urban ecology, whereas ASR pays greater attention to social problems and the economy. The topic areas of education, political institutions, the family, and social organization have similar distributions in the two journals.

American Journal of Sociology

When we examine AJS over the last 30 years, by decades of publication, we find that 32.7% of the articles identified as dealing with race/ethnic minorities were published from 1963 through 1972. The greatest proportion (47.1%) was published during the following decade (1973 - 1982), and the remaining 20.2% were published from 1983 through 1992.
On the whole, the treatment of race/ethnic minorities in *AJS* over the entire 30 year period is characterized by a significant proportional drop in publication for the decade 1983-1992 and a predominance of the topic areas social organization, urban ecology, the economy, and social problems over the entire 30 year period (Table 1).

**TABLE 1**

**MAJOR TOPIC DISTRIBUTION IN THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR TOPIC</th>
<th>63-72</th>
<th>73-82</th>
<th>83-92</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMY</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(42)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMOGRAPHY</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMILY</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN ECOLOGY</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL N:</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
American Sociological Review

ASR published 24.1% of its race/ethnic minority articles from January 1963 through December 1972. 36.5% of the identified articles appeared between 1973 and 1982, and the largest proportion (39.4%) was published from January 1983 through December 1992.

TABLE 2

MAJOR TOPIC DISTRIBUTION IN THE AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR TOPIC</th>
<th>63-72</th>
<th>73-82</th>
<th>83-92</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMY</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLITICAL</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTITUTIONS</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMOGRAPHY</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMILY</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN ECOLOGY</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL N:</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The total picture emerging for ASR shows a steady proportional increase in the publication of race/ethnic minority articles over the three decades and a predominance of the topic areas social organization, the economy, and social problems for the whole 30 years (Table 2).

To summarize: although, the proportions for certain major topic areas differ between AJS and ASR, one can draw the conclusion that both journals predominantly deal with race/ethnic minorities in regard to issues falling under the topic areas social organization, the economy, and social problems. The one exception being AJS's concentration on urban ecology, which is not reflected in ASR. In addition, we know that the publication of race/ethnic minority articles increased proportionally for both journals through the decade 1973 to 1982. After that point a dramatic drop in publication was found in AJS, while a continued increase characterized ASR.

Total Distribution

Over the last 30 years 3.8% of all articles published in AJS and ASR were identified as dealing with race/ethnic minorities. 28.8% of these articles were published from January 1963 through December 1972. The largest proportion (42.4%) of identified articles was published in the next decade (1973-82), and the remaining
29.1% of race/ethnic minority articles was published from January 1983 through December 1992. The total distribution is dominated by the major article topics social organization, the economy, social problems, and urban ecology (Table 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAJOR TOPIC</th>
<th>63-72</th>
<th>73-82</th>
<th>83-92</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMY</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>(46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMOGRAPHY</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMILY</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN ECOLOGY</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL N:</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Up to this point it appears as if mainstream American Sociology over the last 30 years has dealt with racial/ethnic minorities predominantly in terms of issues falling under social organization, the economy, social problems, and urban ecology, followed by a much lesser concentration on education, demography, family, and political institutions. When looking at total distribution for this thirty year period (see Table 3), sociological interest in race and ethnic minorities peaked during the period 1973 to 1982. This reinforces the findings of other studies which linked an increase of interest during this time period to the social climate, the political visibility of race and ethnic interest groups, and the influx of minority scholars (cf. Kinloch, 1988; Wacker, 1983; Rex, 1983).

Although, the emphasis on topic areas is restricted and proportionally skewed towards issues dealing with social organization, economy, social problems, and urban ecology, it does not necessarily constitute a limited examination of race and ethnic minorities. If available means of analysis are being utilized in a balanced fashion, sociology can still offer a comprehensive image of race and ethnic relations. Therefore, to draw more definite conclusions about mainstream sociology's representation of race and ethnic minorities, it is important to examine in more detail the content (see
Table 4) of the published articles in regard to the use of theoretical approaches.

TABLE 4

TOTAL DISTRIBUTION OF MAJOR TOPICS AND SUB TOPICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Subtopics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECONOMY (N = 46)</td>
<td></td>
<td>stratification (28.3%); labor market/labor force (26.1%); enclave labor market (17.3%); mobility (10.9%); occupations (8.7%); discrimination (8.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS (N = 39)</td>
<td></td>
<td>crime/deviance (28.2%); social unrest/riots (23.1%); social agencies (23.1%); poverty (15.4%); juvenile delinquency (10.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS (N = 10)</td>
<td></td>
<td>political participation (66.7%); political affiliation (22.2%); political structure (11.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION (N = 14)</td>
<td></td>
<td>attainment (42.8%); education and socialization (28.6%); education and social problems (14.3%); segregation (14.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL ORGANIZATION (N = 59)</td>
<td></td>
<td>socialization/social consciousness (30.5%); intergroup relations (22.0%); intragroup structure (20.3%); intergroup conflict (8.5%); prejudice/stereotypes (6.8%); roles (5.1%); assimilation (3.4%); environmental conditions (3.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMOGRAPHY (N = 12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>fertility (91.6%); mortality (8.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMILY (N = 11)</td>
<td></td>
<td>marriage (54.5%); roles of family members (27.3%); family conditions (18.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN ECOLOGY (N = 32)</td>
<td></td>
<td>segregation (56.2%); communities (37.5%); desegregation and integration (6.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion of Topics in Terms of Theoretical Approaches

Economy

Turning to the topic area economy, the most lasting impression is left by articles dealing with the statistical manifestations of stratification. An overabundance of articles deals with quantitative descriptions of racial and ethnic economic differentiation. Through statistical manipulations of census data, studies describe the association between socio-economic status and the racial composition of the labor force (e.g. Frisbie and Neidert, 1977; Fossett and Swicegood, 1982; Galle, Wiswell, and Burr, 1985). Other empirical research depicts fewer employment opportunities for African Americans and Hispanics (e.g. Aldrich, 1973; Tienda and Lii, 1987), or describes the statistical differences between white ethnics and Blacks in terms of mobility, high status occupations, and earnings (e.g. Kaufman, 1983; Rosenfeld, 1980; Snyder and Hudis, 1976).

In addition, to demographic studies, we find a range of articles, discussing stratification in terms of social class. Through the use of Neo-Marxian conflict approaches, socio-economic attainments become a sign of social class, and indicate access to power and structural rewards (e.g. Szymanski, 1976; Wright, 1978). Other research links stratification, discrimination, and
differential rates of mobility to attitudes (stereotypes and prejudices) held by majority group members (e.g. Butler, 1976; Cummings, 1980). Similarly, social psychological phenomena like low self-esteem and alienation are seen as consequences of economic discrimination. Which, according to some articles, are especially experienced by African Americans and often result in a rejection of society's accepted goals (e.g. DiPrete, 1981).

Ethnic/enclave labor markets, viewed from a conflict perspective, indicate the exploitation (i.e. underpayment) of ethnic groups by the dominant population (e.g. Bonacich, 1972). This stands in direct contrast to the depiction of enclave labor markets as agents of assimilation, safe havens from discrimination, and means of ethnic/racial solidarity (e.g. Bailey and Waldinger, 1991). Indeed, a large number of articles stresses aspects of consensus and cohesion and their positive effect on socio-economic integration. In the case of Japanese Americans, economic success is the result of strong intragroup solidarity (e.g. Jiobu, 1988), whereas, white ethnics achieve high rates of upward mobility through motivation and cultural assimilation (e.g. Featherman, 1971; Neidert and Farley, 1985).
In brief, race and ethnic groups are frequently described in a quantitative fashion. The articles that do work with distinct theoretical approaches mostly deal with race and ethnic relations from a functional perspective of ethnocentrism and structural assimilation. Research studies of the conflict perspective and social psychological approaches are emphasized the least.

Social Problems

Articles under the topic area of social problems primarily discuss crime and deviance, social unrest, and their association with poverty. A large proportion of the articles dealing with deviant behavior of African Americans is interested in the relationship between rates of crime, biases in the justice system, poverty, and the resulting "subculture of violence". While most articles in AJS and ASR agree that Blacks are overrepresented among persons arrested, they differ in attributing this overrepresentation to biases found in the criminal justice system or a greater perpetration of crime by African Americans. Research studies do show a greater involvement of black males (age 18-25) in rape, robbery, and assault. These higher rates of crime are statistically related to urban segregation, racial composition, the southern region, and economic inequality and theoretically explained by the "subculture of
violence" thesis (e.g. Blau and Blau, 1982; Messner, 1983). Racial residential segregation combined with poverty leads to family instability, alienation, non-existing ties to the larger society, and possible criminal behavior (e.g. Blau and Blau, 1982; Eggebeen and Lichter, 1991; Green, 1970; Hindelang, 1981; Messner, 1983; South and Messner, 1986; Quadagno, 1990).

According to these articles, economic deprivation and limited access to the structural rewards system are the major causes for crime. Because more African Americans than whites, live below the poverty level and in segregated, economically unstable areas, they get locked in a cycle of poverty that breeds deviant behavior and leads to more frequent arrests.

Once African Americans have entered the criminal justice system, research studies point to a racial bias in the police force and criminal sentencing. Articles show that crimes with black victims often result in less severe punishments. If the victim is white, however, especially black offenders are generally charged more severely, receive longer sentences, or the death penalty (e.g. Hagan and Albonetti, 1982; LaFree, 1980). Juvenile delinquency is discussed along the same lines of socio-economic and environmental conditions (subculture). In these studies, however, bias in the justice system is primarily associated with the police force, rather than
with the courts (e.g. Dannefer and Schutt, 1982).

When discussing social unrest, articles are partly interested in demographic factors of severity, e.g. number of injured or dead, destruction of property, number of demonstrators, size of police force (e.g. Danzger, 1975; Spilerman, 1976). In addition, we find research studies examining poverty, political mobilization, and specific events (e.g. assassination of Dr. King) as the underlying causes of "racial disorder" (e.g. DeFronzo, 1971; Morgan and Clark, 1973; Spilerman, 1976). However, regardless of the motives or outcome, articles tend to stress the disruptive aspects of social unrest (e.g. Danzger, 1975; Morgan and Clark, 1973; Spilerman, 1976). Through the use of functional/integrational approaches in the area of social unrest and the extensive application of the culture of poverty/subculture of violence hypothesis, we find a distinctly pathological view of African Americans within this topic area.

Political Institutions

Political institutions is the proportionally smallest major topic area. This is quite surprising considering the dynamic political events of the 1960s in particular. Radical political movements, however, were labeled a threat to society and are, therefore, treated
as a social problem in AJS and ASR.

Articles that are classified under the topic area of political institutions primarily use survey and census data to give quantitative descriptions of political participation and party identification (e.g. Ragin, 1979; Knoke and Felton, 1974). Voting behavior and party identification of white ethnics (e.g. Irish, Scandinavians, Germans, Anglo-Saxons, or Jews) is statistically correlated with cultural assimilation, religious identification, income, and education (e.g. Greeley, 1974). Political participation of Blacks, on the other hand, is associated with residential concentration and social-psychological factors like alienation and political trust (e.g. Guterbock and London, 1983). The overall picture emerging from this topic area consists partly of demographic descriptions of political participation. A few research studies discuss voting behavior and political mobilization as a "struggle for equality" and an expression of class consciousness (e.g. Burstein, 1991; Leggett, 1963). The majority of articles, however, is not interested in discussions of political movements. Instead, they prefer to investigate the effects of individual socio-economic and social-psychological variables on political integration (e.g. Greeley, 1974; Guterbock and London, 1983; Knoke and Felton, 1974). In general, this topic area shows a
distinct preference for research of white ethnics, and favors social-psychological, cultural, and adjustment oriented discussions of differential political behavior.

**Education**

Articles in the major topic area of education focus primarily on differential educational attainments for race and ethnic groups. As in other topic areas, we find some studies that offer only statistical descriptions. Demographic articles, however, are in the minority, and aside from a few statistical descriptions of public school segregation (e.g. Farley and Taeuber, 1974), the majority of research studies is based on distinct theoretical approaches.

Articles base differences in the process of educational attainment on parental status, race, and aspirations of students. For example, status differentiation create "insiders" and "outsiders" to institutional channels of power and rewards. The gap in educational achievement between Blacks and whites is, therefore, not a question of intelligence but caused by differences in socio-economic status (e.g. Portes and Wilson, 1976).

Articles further associate lower educational attainments of Black and Hispanic students with prejudicial attitudes held by majority group members
(i.e. teachers). Some educators still tend to label Black and Hispanic students as less competent or motivated. Teachers, therefore, might have lower expectations regarding their educational achievement and, thus, offer them fewer educational opportunities. Similarly, some minority students might accept these negative labels and then experience low self-esteem, possible reject/give up education, or try to escape through deviant behavior - self-fulfilling prophesy (e.g. Middleton, 1963; Tenhouten, Lei, Kendall, and Gordon, 1971; Yuchtman-Yaar and Semyonov, 1979).

In addition to the just noted on social-psychological theories of labeling, research studies discuss differences in educational achievement from a structural perspective. The differential financing of predominantly black inner-city and white suburban schools has created separate and unequal education systems (e.g. James, 1989). Resulting differences in quality of education lower the chance of many African American students in employment or access to college. Just as frequently, however, articles make no mention of institutional inequality. Instead, studies work from a theoretical perspective of adjustment. Education is, thus, still seen as the "great equalizer" and agent of socialization that could promote inter-racial friendships and prepare students for successful integration into
society (e.g. Hallinan and Williams, 1987; Hallinan and Williams, 1989; Ritterband and Silberstein, 1974). Overall, although of limited size, this major topic area offers a relatively comprehensive discussion of the causes and effects of minority status and its impact on educational achievement.

Social Organization

Social organization is the proportionally most dominating topic area. It primarily deals with issues relating to the socially organized relationships between groups and the influence of these relations on behavior, attitudes, and social consciousness.

A number of articles investigate the influence of class consciousness on social relations and show that economic minority status of African Americans and Hispanics results in feelings of subjugation, low self-esteem, frustration, alienation, and stress (e.g. Bloom, Whiteman, and Deutsch, 1965; Jackson and Burke, 1965; Hughes and Demo, 1989; Hurst, 1972; Yancey, Rigsby, and McCarthy, 1972). More frequently, however, research studies focus on intergroup relations in terms of ethnocentrism, culture, and ethnic/racial identification. Prejudices and stereotypes held by white ethnics are associated with religious orthodoxy, strong ethnic identification, and intragroup cohesion (e.g. Alba and
Chamlin, 1983; Borhek, 1970; Roof, 1974; Tomaskovic-Devey and Tomaskovic-Devey, 1988). According to the above mentioned articles, these factors of intragroup socialization can play an important role in the development of race and ethnic intergroup relations. On the one side, strong intragroup cohesion has a positive effect on the structural and cultural stability of the group (e.g. Metzger, 1971). On the other side, it creates strong feelings of ethnocentrism and superiority which can lead to discrimination, ethnic/racial antagonism and intergroup conflict (e.g. Bonachich, 1972; Fendrich, 1967).

Articles further examine the influence of environmental conditions on socialization and race/ethnic group relations. Communities, for example, determine intergroup association and contact through demographic composition (e.g. Blum, 1985). Equal-status interracial contact positively influences self-esteem and social identification, and leads to racially more tolerant attitudes. Socio-economic segregation, on the other hand, creates social distance and inhibits interaction (e.g. Blum, 1985; Ford, 1973: Johnston and Yoels, 1977; Schooler, 1976; Schuman and Gruenberg, 1970; Smith, 1981).

Overall, this major topic area deals with racial and ethnic groups as agents of socialization. Social status
relative access to power), race and ethnicity influence group relations, social consciousness, attitudes, and social behavior. These factors, either, help or hinder individuals in becoming successful members of society, and, thus, create minority or majority status. Aside from a limited emphasis on social class, articles predominantly focus on social-psychological and socio-cultural aspects of minority/majority social organization.

Demography

The major topic area of demography deals with the study of socio-biological aspects of race/ethnic groups. Extremely limited in focus, articles discuss the different rates of infant mortality (e.g. Willie and Rothney, 1962) and fertility rates of African Americans, Hispanics, and Asians. Based on census and social science survey data, articles are dominated by the debate between proponents of a structural or cultural view of fertility. High fertility rates for African Americans, Hispanics, or Asians, are either discussed as the result of ethnic norms, independent from structural integration, (e.g. Goldscheider and Uhlenberg, 1969; Roberts and Lee, 1974) or in terms of subordinate/structural group status (e.g. Lopez and Sabagh, 1978). Because of the ambiguous state of the debate, no clear theoretical approach emerges.
which confines the image of minority status to individual statistical descriptions of fertility rates, ethnic identity, or structural attributes (e.g. income, education).

Family

Marriage is a predominant sub-topic discussed within the major topic area of family. Through the use of census data marital instability is statistically investigated in its association to race and socio-economic factors like income or education (e.g. Urdy, 1967). The majority of articles, however, is interested in aspects of integration and deals with the effects of ethnicity, race, and spatial availability of marriage partners on marital assimilation (e.g. Gurak and Fitzpatrick, 1982; Lichter, LeClere and McLaughlin, 1991; Mittlebach and Moore, 1968).

Articles discussing extended families, teen-age mothers, and parental roles are focused on the aspect of socio-cultural adjustment, socialization, and successful socio-economic integration (e.g. Angel and Tienda, 1982; Moore and Snyder, 1991). Again, we see an uneven utilization of theoretical approaches. Articles stress cultural preference as the reason for extended households, not economic need. Teen-age pregnancy is not examined in regard to structural or socio-economic causes
but in terms of social-psychological effects on the children and their educational achievement. Particularly striking is the emphasis on maternal authority in African American families. Strong female role models are discussed as important agents of socialization, that positively affect the educational attainments of their adolescent children (e.g. Kandal, 1971). Since father figures are not mentioned, it leaves an impression of absence or non-significance.

Research and representation in this major topic area reinforces the already noted emphasis on issues of social adjustment, cohesion, and consensus. White ethnics especially are referred to in positive terms of marital adjustment, marital assimilation, and two-parent/stable households. Black and Hispanic families are predominantly described in negative terms, e.g. instability, low socio-economic status, "non-normative" numbers of children (often mentioned in association with poverty), and unsuccessful agents of social integration (e.g. Farley and Hermelin, 1971; Urdy, 1966). Again, available means of analysis are being unevenly utilized, articles primarily stress social-psychological influences of family conditions and only mention institutional or structural factors in the form of statistical descriptions.
Urban Ecology

Urban ecology is proportionally (number of articles) one of the largest topic areas. In terms of theoretical means of analysis, however, it is one of the most limited. Urban population distributions and residential concentrations are basically described in a purely demographic and empirical fashion. Articles are more concerned with mathematical models, than with distinct versions of ecological theory (cf. Saunders, 1981).

Patterns of segregation are statistically related to region, population size, racial composition, and immigration patterns (e.g. Guest and Weed, 1976; Roof, 1980; Taeuber and Taeuber, 1964; van Valey, Roof, and Wicox, 1977). In addition, articles describe the close association between residential segregation, social class, and the "cycle of poverty" (e.g. Darroch and Marston, 1971; Erbe, 1975; Massey, 1981).

A number of articles deal with community integration and spatial assimilation, drawing the conclusion that Blacks (in contrast to Asians and Hispanics) remain spatially more isolated (e.g. Logan and Schneider, 1984; Massey and Denton, 1985; Massey and Denton, 1987; Massey and Denton, 1988). The more permanent residential segregation of African Americans' influences socio-economic conditions adversely, producing underclass communities, family disruptions, crime, mortality, lower
educational standards, and increased welfare dependence (e.g. Massey, 1990).

The image of race and ethnic minorities emerging from this topic area depicts African Americans in particular, as living in inner-city, poverty stricken neighborhoods. This hinders their successful socio-economic and psychological integration into society. The point needs to be made, that the majority of articles, in this topic area, came only from one journal - AJS, which might have further contributed to this limited and bias representation.
CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSION

This study analyzed articles (identified by DIALOG descriptors) published from January 1963 through December 1992 in the American Journal of Sociology and the American Sociological Review, as indices of mainstream sociology's study of race/ethnic minorities. Over the last thirty years, 3.8% of all articles published within these two journals, were identified as dealing with race and ethnic minorities. Research primarily concentrated on the areas of social organization, the economy, social problems, and urban ecology, followed by a lesser emphasis on issues found within education, demography, the family, and political institutions. The general field's major topic areas such as social change, religion, other societies, theoretical and methodological concerns are not independently present within the sub-field of race and ethnic minorities (cf. Kinloch, 1988).

The analysis in terms of theoretical approaches shows a predominantly demographic and integrational approach for the major topic area economy. Conflict theory and social-psychological perspectives are of minor consequence. The topic area of social problems discusses
social unrest from a functional/integrational perspective and exhibits a distinctly pathological view of the African American community. Studies dealing with a structural conflict approach are confined to only a few articles dealing with poverty. The research area of political institutions mostly focuses on statistical evidence of political integration. Although, additional articles investigate the effect of class and alienation on the differential political mobilization of white ethnics and Blacks, functional/integrational views are predominant. In regard to theoretical perspectives, education is the most balanced topic area. Cognitive, behavioral, structural functional, as well as conflict perspectives are being evenly utilized to investigate the different aspects of educational minority status. The largest topic area, social organization, predominantly deals with the social-psychological causes and effects of racial/ethnic intergroup differentiation. Only a few articles work with a Marxist view of class and examine intergroup conflict (ethnic antagonism) in terms of economic exploitation. Research in socio-biological studies is limited and dominated by a debate about the normative or structural aspects of fertility rates. The topic area of family offers statistical descriptions of social status for black and white families, but is predominantly interested in the influence of family
conditions and roles on the process of socialization. Means of analysis are evenly distributed between social-psychology and structural integration. Urban ecology primarily deals with residential segregation and poverty found for specific geographical areas. Theoretical approaches are limited to a few conflict articles dealing with the negative effects of segregation on socio-economic status and some social-psychological studies of the "culture of poverty" thesis.

The analysis of article topics in terms of theoretical approaches shows a predominant use of integrational approaches. This data supports Kinloch's (1988) and Wilner's (1985) observations of AJS and ASR's "... stable concern with social assimilation, morale, adjustment, cohesion, and control (p.193). We further find a large number of articles that stress the social-psychological causes and effects of race and ethnic minority/majority relations. This tendency to work from a micro perspective (e.g. labeling, social distance, ethnocentrism), contributes to a psychological, instead of a structural, reality of minority status. Of course, this does not imply that conflict oriented perspectives, evidence of economic exploitation and institutional discrimination are ignored. What we do find, however, is a very limited utilization of Neo-Marxian/conflict approaches and a predominantly numerical depiction of
socio-economic differentiation.

Further research of contemporary sociology's study and representation of race and ethnic minorities is obviously warranted. The role of integrational and social-psychological approaches should especially be investigated in journals catering to the study and representation of race and ethnic relations.

Within *AJS* and *ASR* a one-sided utilization of available theories, however, produced an image of race and ethnic minorities that is more grounded in socially learned attitude and behavior, than structure. Integration, therefore, becomes a question of "relearning" rather than more fundamental structural changes. It might, therefore, be of interest to investigate the influence of this view on proposed solutions, social policies and programs.

The most lasting impression of these research articles is definitely left by the overrepresentation of negative statistical images of African Americans, e.g. family instability, low educational attainments, criminal deviants, segregation and high rates of poverty. Topic area after topic area stresses statistical evidence of black-white differentiation. This creates an image of minority status through variable relationships and measurement responses, rather than theoretical interpretations. Sociology's increasing concern with
quantitative methods (cf. Kinloch, 1988; McCartney, 1970; Wilner, 1985), therefore, seems to have resulted in less emphasis on qualitative research in the study of race and ethnic minorities. Since the use of statistics has often been positively related to funding (McCartney, 1970), a more detailed analysis of the sociological study of race and ethnic minorities in terms of financial pressures would be of interest.

What other conclusion can be drawn from the findings? First, the fund of theoretical approaches outlined in the literature discussion appears to be largely accurate. However, this analysis shows that the subfield has not greatly advanced and added to its scope of research issues and theoretical approaches. Instead, we see a return to controversial views like the "culture of poverty" thesis. To gain a more comprehensive understanding of race and ethnic minorities, future research should include more examinations with organizations and institutional inequality as the unit of analysis. This would counterbalance an otherwise rather individualistic and moralistic conceptualization of minority/majority relations. Second, I would suggest a greater exposure to research studies from minority perspectives. This might balance out the overly normative and integrational approach towards social problems. At the very least, it would add another link to the total
spectrum of race and ethnic relations and help to complete understanding of minority status.

The point needs to be made that this study is subject to a number of limitations. First, by relying on the DIALOG Information System's identifiers, other articles dealing with racial and ethnic minority issues might have been missed. Second, the analysis is based on only two journals. Since the 1950s, however, specialty journals gave social scientists other outlets for their work. But since the focus of this study was to gain insights into mainstream sociology's research interests and representations of race and ethnic minorities, it made sense to start by focusing on journals at the core of the sociological profession. This of course means that we are probably dealing with one of the more conservative views of race and ethnic minorities, found within the field of sociology. Nevertheless, AJS and ASR are the two most prestigious non-specialty journals, and the articles they publish do provide insight into the most central research issues and theoretical approaches of mainstream sociology's study of race and ethnic minorities. Thus, it seems reasonable to conclude that mainstream sociology, after all its professional and academic advances, still shows the tendency to approach racial and ethnic minorities from an often moralistic and reformative perspective.
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