



City Research Online

City, University of London Institutional Repository

Citation: Fincham, J. (1975). The development of sociology first degree courses at English universities, 1907-1972. (Unpublished Doctoral thesis, City University London)

This is the accepted version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version.

Permanent repository link: <https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/7462/>

Link to published version:

Copyright: City Research Online aims to make research outputs of City, University of London available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. URLs from City Research Online may be freely distributed and linked to.

Reuse: Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIOLOGY FIRST DEGREE COURSES
AT ENGLISH UNIVERSITIES, 1907 - 1972

JILL FINCHAM

Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

THE CITY UNIVERSITY,
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES,
JULY, 1975.

CONTENTS

	Page no.
List of Tables	3
Acknowledgments	4
Abstract	5
Chapter I Introduction	7
Chapter II Before 1907; 1907-1918. The Beginning of Sociology in English Universities	19
Chapter III 1919-1945. LSE, Bedford College, and the first Specialist Sociology Degree	68
Chapter IV 1946-1962. Post-war Progress, the London Degrees, and Sociology at the Civic Universities	114
Chapter V 1963-1972 (I). University Development and the Setting up of new Sociology Degrees	162
Sociology degree structure in six university groups:	
Group 1. The Ancient Universities	179
Group 2. Constituent Colleges of London University	180
Group 3. The Older Civic Universities	184
Group 4. The Younger Civic Universities	191
Group 5. The New Universities	196
Group 6. The Technological Universities	211
Chapter VI 1963-1972 (II). Subjects Taught in First Degrees in Sociology	233
Compulsory or core subjects:	
1. Sociological Theory	255
2. Methods	262
3. Comparative Social Institutions	270
4. Social Structure of Modern Britain	275
5. Social Psychology	282

CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page no.
Chapter VI 1963-1972 (II) First Degrees in Sociology (cont.)	
Optional subjects:	
Group A.	
1. Social Anthropology	292
2. Social Administration	295
3. Social Philosophy	298
Group B.	
1. Industrial Sociology	303
2. Political Sociology	310
3. Sociology of Deviance	315
4. Sociology of Religion	322
5. Sociology of Education	327
6. Urban Sociology	331
7. Demography	333
8. Race Relations	338
9. Sociology of the Family	340
10. Social Stratification	344
11. Sociology of Medicine	346
Group C.	
1. Sociology of Development	347
2. Sociology of Revolution	355
Group D.	
1. Sociology of Knowledge	357
2. Sociology of Science	359
3. Sociology of Culture	361
Chapter VII First Degree Sociology in England During 65 Years	374
Appendices	415
Alphabetical List of Publications and Other Sources Referred to in Text	421

TABLES

		Page no.
Chapter IV		
IV.1	English universities existing in 1946 with sociology degree courses by 1961/2	125
IV.2	English university colleges granted charters 1946-1962	125
Chapter V		
V.1	English universities and colleges of London University teaching sociology for first degrees in 1972	165
V.2	Number of first year places for sociology offered by universities and colleges of London University in October 1967	166
V.3	Subjects listed as included with first year sociology courses in Careers Research and Advisory Centre Degree Course Guide 1970/71	227
Chapter VI		
VI.1	Optional subjects in sociology first degrees 1963 to 1972	235
VI.2	Subjects listed as included in Sociology: Specialised Studies in Careers Research and Advisory Centre Degree Course Guide 1970/71	249
VI.3	Frequency with which Group B Optional Subjects 1-8 were listed in Sociology: Specialised Studies in Careers Research and Advisory Centre Degree Course Guide 1970/71	303

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am indebted to the following for allowing access to unpublished material: Dr. Walter Adams, then Director of the London School of Economics and Political Science, for access to the LSE Archives; Professor H.C. Edey, then Chairman of the Board of Studies in Economics of the University of London, for access to the Minutes of the Board, at Senate House; and Professor O.R. MacGregor, then Secretary of the Board of Studies in Sociology of the University of London, for access to the Minutes of the Board, at Bedford College. For providing physical access to these archives I am grateful to Mr. J. Pike, Financial Secretary of the London School of Economics, and the staff of the LSE Filing Department, and to Miss A. Trowles, Secretary of the Department of Sociology at LSE; to Miss M. Simonis, Secretary of the Department of Sociology at Bedford College; and to Miss Joan Gibbs, of the Paleography Room, University of London Library.

I am also indebted to the Careers Research and Advisory Centre, Cambridge, for permission to use material from their Degree Course Guide: Sociology, Social Administration and Anthropology, 1970/71; to Ronald G. Stansfield, Reader in Industrial Sociology at The City University, for access to early records on the British Sociological Association and the Teachers' Section; to David Weir, Alan Dawe and Tony Barnett, for copies of unpublished papers on the teaching of sociology; and to all those members of the staffs of Departments of Sociology at English universities, who sent material in response to my request for recent examples of reading lists, lecture programmes and similar items, issued to students on sociology first degree courses.

ABSTRACT

A descriptive historical account of the development of sociology first degree courses at English universities, 1907-1972, begins with the background to the endowment, in 1907, of the first chairs of sociology, at the London School of Economics. The archives of the School, and of the University of London, are drawn upon in describing sociology in the early London BSc Economics and BA/BSc Sociology. An outline follows of university development, and of sociology degree structure at English universities, from 1946 onwards.

Examples of lecture and seminar programmes and reading lists for sociology undergraduate courses, provided by university sociology departments, are used, with published material, to delineate sociology degree structure, 1963-1972, at six groups of institutions: ancient universities; constituent colleges of London university; older civic universities; younger civic universities; new universities; technological universities.

Subject-matter in sociology degrees, 1963-1972, is discussed under five core subjects (Sociological Theory, Methods, Comparative Social Institutions, Social Structure of Modern Britain, Social Psychology) and nineteen optional subjects (Social Anthropology, Social Administration, Social Philosophy, Industrial Sociology, Political Sociology, the Sociology of Deviance, of Religion,

and of Education, Urban Sociology, Demography, Race Relations, Sociology of the Family, Social Stratification, and the Sociology of Medicine, of Development, of Revolution, of Knowledge, of Science, and of Culture)

Technological universities were less likely to have specialised sociology, and more likely to have sandwich, degrees; otherwise, no clear relationship emerged between type of university and type of sociology degree. Individual lecturers, with some exceptions, were chief decision-makers in selection of detailed course subject-matter. The main changes over time were: inclusion of more empirical studies; 'real world' events reflected in courses; sociology regarded as a liberal education. Sociology attained status as an academic discipline in a piecemeal fashion, and was in a transitional stage in universities in 1972.

Questions for future research are suggested.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

'There has regularly been more interest in the organisation of learning than in the substance of it.'

Sunday Times, editorial, 9 March 1975

It is the purpose of this thesis to attempt to describe the subject-matter of sociology first degree courses at English universities from 1907 to 1972.

The present investigator has been, since undergraduate days, curious to discover how the selection of knowledge to be passed on to students taking first degree courses in England, was made. This selection of knowledge, it was evident, was not made purely, if at all, on vocational grounds, except for degrees in such subjects as medicine, law, and engineering. Admittedly, there was, in all degree subjects, the possibility that the student, after graduation, might become a lecturer in, or teacher of, the subject of his or her first degree. Then, the circle of the transmission of knowledge would begin again, and in this limited sense, any degree might be said to have a vocational aspect.

Aside from this consideration, however, great value seemed to be placed by some sections of English society, on the acquisition of knowledge at university, while other sections of society (including some employers) classified much of this as 'useless' knowledge. This situation prompted various questions, and, as sociology

was the subject chosen for investigation, these questions were: 1. How had sociology come to be included in the subjects taught at English universities? 2. Who decided what was to be included in a sociology first degree course, and what was to be left out? 3. Was the knowledge which was transmitted in sociology first degrees, more or less the same at universities all over the country? If not, how did the content of first degrees in sociology differ at different universities? 4. How did the knowledge selected to be transmitted in first degree courses in sociology change over time? 5. Was sociology taught as a vocational subject or as an academic subject? 6. How was the growth of sociology as an academic discipline related to its development as a university subject?

It was the desire to find the answers to some of these questions which led to the present investigation.

The present state of research in the field.

There has been a recent increase, in England, in research into the subject of higher education. There have been statistical, economic, historical, philosophical, bibliographical and sociological studies (although the sociological research has, as Young pointed out in 1970,¹ tended to neglect curriculum in higher education). Despite all this research, there have been few extended studies of the curriculum of first degrees at English universities.

There have been some historical studies of a single degree subject at one university (for example, Palmer's study on the origins and development of the English school at Oxford,² and Hilken's account of the Engineering degree at Cambridge³). UNESCO has produced reports on the

university teaching of various subjects in various
countries.⁴ In addition, in the last decade or so,
degree course guides, intended for prospective students,
have surveyed briefly the degree courses in a single
subject, or in a group of related subjects, at all
universities in Great Britain, for a given year or years.⁵

However, few, if any, attempts have been made to
trace the development of one first degree subject at a
number of British universities from the beginning of its
university development, and over a period of years.

Definition of the field of the present investigation.

Sociology was chosen as the subject of this
investigation for three main reasons: first, because
its introduction into English universities was recent
enough to make it possible to survey its development
as an undergraduate subject, from its beginnings, to
the recent past; second, because, for many of the
years during which it was developing as a first degree
subject, sociology was taught only at the London School
of Economics and Political Science, whose Calendars had,
from the outset, given unusually full detail about the
syllabuses and reading lists for courses on sociology
and for sociology degrees; and third, because, although
sociology had developed so rapidly as a university subject,
and was taught in nearly all English universities, there
still seemed to be widespread puzzlement about what the
subject was, at university level.

Universities were defined as those educational
institutions receiving money through the University Grants

Committee, or having a royal charter. The decision to limit the universities studied in this investigation, to those in England, was made partly as a matter of feasibility, and partly because the degree structure of Scottish universities, and, to some extent, of those in Wales and Northern Ireland, differed from the degree structure of universities in England. This limitation was not meant, in any way, as a setting aside of the contribution of these universities to the development of English university sociology, and, obviously, the natural interchange of academic personnel and research continued to take place between the universities of the United Kingdom during the period covered by this investigation.

As with the geographical limitation, the reasons for excluding CNAA degrees at polytechnics, and Open University degrees, were, first, limitation of resources, and, second, the difference in structure between these newer institutions and the English universities already being considered.

A first degree was defined as a bachelor's degree, following the dictionary definitions of 'bachelor' as 'a man or woman who has taken the first degree at a university'⁶ and of 'bachelor's degree' as 'a degree awarded by a college or university to a person who has completed his undergraduate studies'⁷. It must be remembered, however, that 'not all degrees which have the title of "Bachelor" in England are first degrees'⁸ (examples of these are the Oxford B.Litt and B.Phil). Diplomas and certificates in sociology were dealt with only where their development was bound up with that of

sociology first degrees.

Wherever there was varying emphasis on sociology in different degrees in the same university, the most specialist sociology degree was given precedence in describing the treatment of sociology at that university. This mode of emphasis was not, however, always followed in the later chapters, where the great variety of degree patterns meant that the phrase 'specialist sociology degree' had, in practice, a number of different meanings in different universities, and a fuller description of the place of sociology in more than one degree at one university was sometimes, therefore, included.

The period covered by the research was arrived at in two ways. The year 1907 was the year in which the first sociology chairs were founded at an English university, and this presented itself as an obvious starting point.

A collection of some examples of contemporary course material for sociology degrees, was made by the present investigator in 1969 and 1970. The last year to which any sizeable amount of this material referred, was the academic year 1971/2. This provided a terminus ad quem.

Treatment and sources.

It must be emphasised that the present study has used neither the methods nor the theoretical equipment of the discipline whose university development it has attempted to outline. The approach was, from the outset, a descriptive and historical one. Published material

has been the basic source of information. This material has included, at various stages throughout the thesis, calendars, prospectuses, students' handbooks, regulations, and examination papers and statutes, published by universities; inaugural lectures, university histories, and conference reports; books and articles by sociology lecturers and others; government reports, and annual 'Reports to the Court' or vice-chancellors' reports of university progress; and other miscellaneous published material.

The main source of detailed information on syllabuses and lecture courses in sociology first degrees was found in university calendars and prospectuses, and the varying characteristics of these publications made it impractical to compare 'actual' courses only by reference to this kind of documentation. Calendars and prospectuses might be biased in their descriptions of courses ('ours is a good course'); out of date ('the list of staff is correct at the time of going to press'); unspecific ('not all options will be available in all years'); or incomplete; or have a mixture of some, or all, of these drawbacks. (Examination papers, where used, obviously varied in meaning according to the course which had preceded them.) For these reasons, unpublished material was sought to back up, or, in some cases, to correct, the published information.

The unpublished material fell into two main categories: that used as background for Chapters II, III and IV; and that used in Chapters V and VI.

Chapters II and III, and part of Chapter IV, are

concerned mainly with sociology at the London School of Economics. Chapter II covers the period from the endowment, by J. Martin White, of the first chairs of sociology, to the end of the First Great War; Chapter III covers the period between the wars, and ends in 1945, just prior to the publication of the Clapham Report; Chapter IV covers the period from 1946 to 1962, the year before the publication of the Robbins Report. For the majority of this period, the archives of the London School of Economics, and the minutes of the Martin White Benefaction Committee, of the Board of Studies in Economics, and of the Board of Studies in Sociology, of the University of London, were drawn upon for additional information, while a collection of unpublished 'Reminiscences of the London School of Economics' also provided background detail.

It was not feasible to use university archive material, once the number of universities offering sociology courses, grew larger. Chapters V and VI deal with the period 1963 to 1972; Chapter V outlines the background to the university development which took place then, and describes in broad outline the sociology degree structure in the following six university groups:

1. The Ancient Universities;
2. The Constituent Colleges of the University of London;
3. The Older Civic Universities;
4. The Younger Civic Universities;
5. The New Universities;
6. The Technological Universities.

Chapter VI attempts to describe the subject-matter offered in sociology degrees at these universities, in

the late sixties and early seventies. Chapter VII provides an overview of some points concerning the whole development of sociology first degrees in England from 1907 to 1972.

To gain additional material for Chapters V and VI, individual letters were sent by the investigator, in June 1969, to the departmental secretaries of all departments then teaching undergraduate sociology at English universities (see Appendix I), asking for examples of reading lists, lecture syllabuses and programmes, and other course material issued to students attending sociology courses over the previous three years (i.e. the academic years 1966/7, 1967/8 and 1968/9). The amounts of material received from different universities varied extremely widely, from a printed departmental brochure or a few sheets, to complete sets of material for the whole degree, for one or two years; but many departments had no copies of course material for previous years, and some sent instead, at that time, or later, sets of material originating in the academic year 1969/70, and referring to courses as far ahead as the academic year 1971/2. Material of some kind was received from every department, sometimes from the Professor or Head of Department, sometimes from individual lecturers, sometimes from the Departmental Secretary, and it was evident that situations concerning the collection and preservation of course material of this kind, varied widely from university to university. At some, there was no central filing system, individual lecturers keeping copies of their own material; at others, all

the material was issued to students and no file copies were kept; at others, spare material from previous years was presumably not regarded as of enough permanent value to be kept, particularly where storage space was limited. To the educational historian, this posed problems. The other source of course material was the student, but all students did not take all options - and only the most conscientious student would have been likely to keep a complete set of course material from a three-year (minimum) degree course. It seemed probable that a very large amount of detail about past courses at English universities, had been lost.

It was noted that, in the examples collected, there were lists dated for every month in the year. There was obviously no optimum time for gathering course material which would apply to every university's academic year, as this material was continuously being produced, discussed, amended, or consumed, throughout the year, at one university or another.

In 1967 John Peel, then of the University of Hull, had made a collection for the Sociology Teachers' Section of the British Sociological Association, of 'Details of Courses Mainly Concerned with Sociological Theory and Methods in 29 British Universities'. The headings under which the information on each course was presented, were: 'Title of Course; Years Taught; Formal Syllabus; Extended Syllabus; Basic or Introductory Reading List; Further Reading; Additional Notes;

Examination Questions'. Most universities could furnish the information under the first three headings, and sent examination questions; but apart from this, for each heading, some universities returned the reply: 'Not available'. It seems likely that the conditions under which sociology course material was produced and preserved, described by the present researcher, were responsible for some, at least, of the omissions in Peel's 1967 collection. Also, Barnett, in collecting course material on 'Sociology of Developing/Underdeveloped Societies' in 1972, encountered a similar situation, where the material submitted ranged 'from one sheet of paper to quite large collections of seminar topics, lecture titles, book lists and discussion points'.⁹

A note on the reliability of sources.

It was not, in the later chapters of this investigation, always possible to check that a lecture or seminar course in fact took place as stated in the university calendar or prospectus. The lecture outlines, seminar topics, and reading lists collected, came closer in point of time to the 'actual' course, but even the existence of a duplicated or printed handout of course material for students did not guarantee that the course was held. Option outlines, in particular, were often dependent on student response for their acceptance and subsequent inclusion in the degree structure. It was in the nature of degree courses that they were often in a constant state of

change and updating, and modifications to reading lists, or changes in lecture or seminar topics, were bound to take place sometimes as the course proceeded. However, degree courses have been discussed as if they took place, to avoid the tedium of repeating that this could sometimes only be an assumption. In fact, the degree courses as planned in the calendar or prospectus, or drawn up by the lecturer, were, in themselves, indications of the way in which the subject of sociology was developing in the minds of those who shaped it as an undergraduate study, and it was considered more important to provide a description of this development, than to omit material for want of satisfying the criteria of strict historical accuracy as to whether in fact courses took place as described.

In particular, the long period of 65 years covered by the present study, and the large number of universities discussed in the later sections, meant that a more valid picture of the development of sociology first degrees could be built up in this way, than would have been the case with a study of one university, or with a study of a shorter period of time, where any shortfall in detailed historical accuracy, would have been of much greater importance.

To begin, then, to describe the long process of the development of first degree sociology in England, the background to the endowment of the first chairs in sociology, in 1907, will be outlined in the chapter which follows.

REFERENCES
CHAPTER I.

1. Young, Michael F.D., 'Curricula and the Social Organization of Knowledge', paper presented at the British Sociological Association Annual Conference, Durham, April 1970, p.1. (duplicated).
2. Palmer, D.J., The Rise of English Studies. An Account of the Study of English Language and Literature from its Origins to the Making of the Oxford English School. O.U.P., 1965.
3. Hilken, T.J., Engineering at Cambridge University, 1783-1965, C.U.P., 1967.
4. UNESCO, The Teaching of the Social Sciences in the United Kingdom, UNESCO, Paris, 1953.
5. Advisory Centre for Education, 16+ Guide: Sociology, ACE, Cambridge, 1967; Arnold, Eric, A Guide to English Courses in the Universities, John Murray, 1965; Banks, J.A., and Tropp, A., Sociology and Social Anthropology, A Guide for Intending Students, British Sociological Association, 1960 (and subsequent editions); Careers Research and Advisory Centre, Course Comparison Bulletin, Sociology and Social Administration, CRAC, Cambridge, 1966 (and subsequent editions).
6. Onions, C.F. (ed.), Shorter Oxford English Dictionary, Third Edition Revised, O.U.P., 1947, p.134.
7. Steen, J. (ed.), The Random House Dictionary of the English Language, Random House, New York, 1967, p.107.
8. British Council, Higher Education in the United Kingdom, Longmans Green, 1966, p.29.
9. Barnett, A.S., 'Teaching the Sociology of Developing/ Underdeveloped Societies in the U.K.', paper presented to the BSA Development Group, December, 1972, p.1.

CHAPTER II

BEFORE 1907; 1907 - 1918. THE BEGINNING OF SOCIOLOGY IN ENGLISH UNIVERSITIES

The first chairs of sociology.

In 1907 Leonard Hobhouse and Edward Westermarck were appointed to endowed chairs of sociology at London University. The subject of sociology, as it was introduced in the first examination papers, was identified with social evolution and the comparative study of social institutions, and the first students, studying at the London School of Economics, took the sociology option as part of their Honours BSc degree in Economics. This marked the beginning of sociology as a degree subject in England.

The events which led up to the endowment of the first chairs can helpfully be divided into three groups: first, the response to the work of Comte and Spencer on sociology in the nineteenth century; second, the institutions in which some of the subject-matter of sociology had been embodied in England in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries; and third, some account of the London School of Economics, and of the committees of London university which drew up the first syllabuses for a sociology course.

The influence of Comte.

Although Comte and Herbert Spencer are now generally acknowledged to have been two of the 'founding fathers' of

sociology, the chief evidence of interest in their work in 1907 was to be found outside the university courses, for no book by either of these authors was included in LSE calendars in the first printed lists of books recommended for early university students of sociology. Comte's theories were first introduced in England in 1853 when Harriet Martineau brought out a shortened English version of the Positive Philosophy; reaction followed in the objections of John Stuart Mill and Spencer, but after the second English edition of the Positive Philosophy in 1873 the Positivist movement in England gathered momentum. It has been argued¹ that the influence of Comte has been continuously felt, and that this influence proceeded through the sociology school of LSE to continue in modern British sociology. In 1907, however, Hobhouse, who was chiefly responsible for teaching what approximated to a 1970s course in sociological theory, was occupied with making his disagreements with the early theorists plain, rather than with establishing the continuity of his thought with theirs. Nevertheless there is no doubt that Comte's theories were being actively discussed at the time when the first chairs were being established. For instance, Hobhouse himself gave a lecture on 'The Law of the Three Stages' in 1904 to the Sociological Society, a body which was instrumental in getting university sociology degrees started. Several leading members of the Society were avowed Comtists. The teachers of sociology at London University were not, it is true, members of the London Positivist Society which followed Comte's 'Religion of Humanity' (although Patrick

Geddes, for whom one of the chairs was originally intended, had attended their meetings), but they were positivists in the broader sense, in their insistence that sociology must have a basis in scientific method, and both Hobhouse and Westermarck emphasised this in their inaugural lectures.

(Despite the importance, at this early time, of Comte and Spencer, who were often discussed in theoretical papers written by the group responsible for the founding of the university chairs, an examination of reading lists for courses in sociological theory in the 1960s, showed that other 'founding fathers', for example, Durkheim, Weber, Marx, Simmel, and Pareto, were, by then, given greater prominence.)

The influence of Spencer.

Herbert Spencer was, like Comte, chiefly important to British sociology in the 1900s for the controversy his ideas aroused. It has been suggested that it was in repudiating his ideas that modern British sociology was² built. Certainly there was violent dissension over his application of Darwin's theory of natural selection to the evolution of society. By his extension of the doctrine of the survival of the fittest from the animal world to society, he opposed the social ameliorists who, he contended,³ 'further the propagation of the unfit'. Although Spencer later modified these extreme views, he had instigated a controversy which was to have far-reaching implications for sociological theory. The work of Francis Galton and Karl Pearson in statistics, the formation of the Eugenics Society, the foundation of the chair of Social Biology at LSE in 1930, were, in their different ways, continuations

and investigations of the grounds of the argument he had discussed, while ameliorist social reformers looked elsewhere for guides to action. They began by questioning Spencer's account of social evolution. Hobhouse, himself by temperament a social reformer (he left philosophy at Oxford because he wanted to do 'some social and political work in a very small way'⁴; a student remarked that Hobhouse felt that 'not to care about the wrongs of the world was the unforgivable offence'⁵) searched for a different account of social evolution and a soundly based social philosophy from which social action could follow. Hobhouse, while agreeing that society had evolved and was in process of evolving, insisted that the development of self-consciousness and of purposive social action made social evolution different in kind from biological evolution, and that social action and intervention, far from upsetting the natural processes of the social order, were themselves part of the mechanism for maintaining and improving that order. But the investigation of the processes of social evolution had to go forward on a scientific basis, and for that reason the different stages of development reached by the different peoples of the world, and the comparison of their social institutions and moral ideas, were of great importance. The comparative method, outlined by Comte and utilised by Spencer, was used by Hobhouse and Westermarck in the early courses at LSE to teach their students to think of, for example, marriage (in 1891, Westermarck had published his massive History of Human Marriage), justice and property as institutions existing in different forms in different

societies, but as having common characteristics which could be discussed and analysed theoretically.

The position of sociology in England in 1900.

The position of sociology as an academic subject in England in 1900 was insecure. It was not represented in any university appointment, it had no learned society and no learned journal. There were two main reasons for this: first, sociological subjects were already being studied at universities in departments devoted to other specialisms, e.g. economics, geography, history and philosophy. (One process for the setting up of new departments was their branching off from parent subjects, for example, Psychology from Moral Philosophy; some sociologists wanted to reverse this process by forming a synthesis in which parts of other social sciences would be included.) The second main reason for the insecurity of the subject's position, academically, was that some parts of it had been institutionalised in Britain in groups concerned with practical social issues, notably the Statistical (later the Royal Statistical) Society, and the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science (NAPSS).

The Statistical Society.

The Statistical Society was founded in 1834, and provided a direct link with the instruction given to the first sociology students - they were taught statistics by A.L. Bowley, himself a member of the Society, and the originator of random sampling (which he introduced in 1906). The original constitution of the Statistical Society stated

that it was 'established for the purposes of procuring, arranging and publishing "Facts calculated to illustrate the Condition and Prospects of Society"⁶'. The members pledged themselves to exclude from their deliberations all expressions of opinion, and to confine themselves rigorously to facts. Nevertheless, the facts collected were closely involved with resolving the conflicts of political economy, and with helping the government to make political decisions, and the social statistics collected, considered as a group apart from the economic and trade statistics, were chiefly concerned with demography and with the 'condition of the people', which meant, principally, problems of crime, poverty, illiteracy and ill-health among the lower classes. While many papers presented to the Society in the 1840s and 1850s pointed to the differences in, for instance, the life expectations of the different social classes, controversy was still taking place as to the true implications of these findings for social policy, and as to whether statisticians should be involved in social policy at all. In the end, this led to a split between those who wanted to concentrate on the refinement of statistical method, and those, like Booth and Rowntree, who wished to use facts to challenge the assumptions of the laissez-faire political economists, that the free flow of individual self-interest was the rational basis for the proper working of the social order. The crucial issue, as far as Booth's work was concerned, was whether state assistance for the old and poor would be disastrous for the working of society.

Booth's Life and Labour of the People in London appeared in university courses at Leeds in 1909 and in

London in 1912; but although Booth worked from the offices of the Statistical Society, and presented his papers to that Society (one of them as a Presidential Address), and while he stated that he did not wish to be involved in questions of social theory, he was interested in the implications of his findings for the bettering of the moral condition of the poor, and in this he shared the over-riding interest of other social ameliorists.

The social ameliorists.

Social ameliorist groups constituted the second category of institutions in which ideas about society were embodied in the nineteenth century. From 1856 most ameliorist groups existing in England were attached to an umbrella organisation, the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science. Prominent among its member organisations was the Charity Organisation Society (COS), which had begun training social workers as early as 1869, when it set up a School of Almoners. A link between the NAPSS and sociology courses in universities, was provided by the London School of Sociology, founded by the COS in 1902, and incorporated in LSE in 1912 as the Department of Social Science.

The aim of the NAPSS was to identify social problems, investigate possible measures for solving them, arrive at the best possible solution agreeable to all its members, and draft proposals which, it was hoped, would eventually be embodied in Acts of Parliament or Orders in Council. The corporate bodies which belonged to the NAPSS included churches, chambers of commerce, cooperative societies, temperance societies, educational bodies, and bodies like

the COS. The emphasis in the NAPSS was on resolving differences and putting forward proposals for action by the state to mitigate the effects of, for example, drunkenness, illiteracy and poor sanitation; its members drew a distinction between the deserving and undeserving poor, and saw the latter as people in need of correction and moral regeneration by the custodial state; there was a conspicuous lack of analysis of the causes of poverty and of other social ills, in terms of interaction between social systems or social classes. Although by the 1880s the consensus on which the NAPSS had operated had ceased to be powerful enough to keep it together, and it disbanded, there is evidence that it had contributed to the stereotype of sociology (a stereotype which persisted in the twentieth century) as being concerned with 'drink, drainage and divorce'. The issues the NAPSS had dealt with, now becoming party political issues, reappeared for consideration in university examination papers on Social Economics, and Social Problems, set in the 1920s and 1930s, and the ameliorist tradition continued in university sociology in, for example, the work of T.H. Marshall in the forties and fifties, and that of Titmuss, Townsend, and Donnison, among others, continuing into the seventies. The Charity Organisation Society continued to be instrumental in the organisation of social work; but its assertions that 'character is nine-tenths of life' and that 'those who desire to help the poor are exhorted not to give money, still less food and raiment, but to give themselves, their time and brains', aroused opposition from

those who believed that poverty was one cause, as well as one result, of depravity.

The formation of the Sociological Society.

Social statisticians had the Statistical Society, social ameliorists the Charity Organisation Society (and Toynbee Hall had been founded, university settlements had begun to appear), but sociologists in the more general, and especially in the academic, sense, had no learned society, and it was to fill this gap that the Sociological Society was formed in 1903. In June 1903 a group of people interested in the formation of such a society met, and appointed a committee to draw up the scope, aims, and constitution. Hobhouse was a member of that committee, and Westermarck was one of the early members of the Society, but the prime movers in the setting up of the Society were Victor Branford, Patrick Geddes, and the J. Martin White who was to finance sociology at London University, and to endow the first chairs. Branford, a banker and railway company director and a keen reformer, had met James Martin White, the son of a wealthy Dundonian, while working in Dundee; Branford had also attended the Edinburgh Summer School organised by Patrick Geddes, founder of the Outlook Tower in Edinburgh, which has been called 'the first Sociological Laboratory'.⁷ This is not the place to discuss the enigmatic career of Geddes, for his influence on university sociology was limited at this time, but he was a key figure in the setting up of the Society. He was a friend of Martin White, having tutored him during educational visits to Germany and the Balkans, and it was Geddes who put Martin White in touch with Dr.

Roberts, Registrar of the Board for the Extension of University Teaching, at London University. Geddes was a charismatic figure, a disciple of Le Play, who, like Le Play, saw sociology as essentially concerned with environment, and was a pioneer of the regional survey.

8

Various authors have suggested that the first chair of sociology was intended for Geddes, and there has been conjecture as to whether, if Geddes had been appointed, the course of university sociology in England might have been very different. One of Geddes' biographers has asserted that 'it was an open secret that Branford used his money and influence to constitute the Sociological Society so that his Scottish friend might have a medium for the expression of his ideas'.⁹ In fact, Geddes expressed himself as anti-specialisation and even, on occasions, as anti-university, and this has been suggested as one reason why the Committee did not appoint him. Be that as it may, there was strong support for the founding of the Society and the university lectures. The consensus of opinion in 1903 was that sociology in England was lagging behind the progress made in other countries, notably Germany, France and America.¹⁰ A preliminary circular was sent to three groups of people: first, university teachers of Philosophy, History and Economics; second, 'a few selected representatives of relevant scientific groups'; and third, 'practical interests' (wardens of university settlements, the COS, and other bodies training social workers). Mackinder, Director of the London School of Economics, Hobhouse, Graham Wallas, also a lecturer at LSE, and Westermarck, were all original members of the Society.

J. Martin White, at the informal preliminary meeting in the rooms of the Royal Statistical Society, mentioned: 'when interested in a political contest a dozen years ago I was much struck by the great Sociological ignorance, not only of the public generally, but also of most Members of Parliament. I made some provisions to start a chair dealing with the customs, institutions and ideals of different people throughout the world, and their bearing on practical life'.¹¹ White went on to say that he had offered £1000 to start a preliminary course or courses of lectures at London University, at the same time cooperating with Branford's proposals to start a Society and a Journal of Sociology. At this meeting Beatrice Webb mentioned the various other societies to which people interested in social questions already belonged, for instance the Royal Statistical Society and the Royal Economic Society, and she hoped the Sociological Society would not be 'merely one more competing organisation'. She optimistically saw it as becoming a federal body enrolling the best brains of all the other social science societies. J.M. Robertson thought the late entry into the (sociological) field of British universities (i.e., in comparison with other European countries and America) might be beneficial, because in America the subject had tended, in universities, to become completely problem-oriented, so that the Sociology Department was sometimes called that of 'Drink, Drainage and Divorce', thereby approximating, in Robertson's opinion, to 'the old Social Science Association'. There were many early examples of the conflict between those who

saw sociology as primarily concerned with social policy, and those who saw it as primarily philosophical and theoretical.¹² In the event, the subjects of the papers given at the Society's meetings which began in 1904, were heterogeneous, ranging from comparative ethics to such subjects of practical social administration as the training¹³ of probation officers.

The introduction of sociology into London University.

The introduction of sociology into universities was seen as performing two functions: one, the improvement of the academic status (and, thereby, the social status) of the subject; and two, the promulgation of a knowledge of social issues among those who would eventually be responsible for the government and administration of the country. Which of these motivations was the more forceful it would be difficult to say, and, in the event, as will be indicated, the subject-matter taught by the two professors in their lectures was not centrally concerned with social administration, or contemporary social issues.

By 1904 the learned society was constituted, and meetings began; the learned journal (Sociological Papers, later to be re-named Sociological Review) started publication; the next step was to establish the university teaching. London University, from its origins in the nineteenth century as an alternative to Oxford and Cambridge for those who could not meet the theological demands of the older universities, had grown, had undergone reorganisation, and had now become a teaching institution as well as an examining body for its constituent colleges. In 1900, the

University admitted the London School of Economics to be a recognised school in the Faculty of Economics and admitted Economics as a subject for the BSc degree. LSE had been founded by Sidney and Beatrice Webb in 1895, financed largely by money from the will of an eccentric Derby solicitor. (The role of private wealth in giving impetus to early British sociology was an important one. Both Booth's and Rowntree's studies had been financed out of their private incomes; LSE had been founded largely by a private legacy; and the endowments of J. Martin White made possible the earliest lectures in sociology, the establishment of the chairs, and the later provision of scholarships. The Chair of Social Science at Liverpool was founded by money from Booth's company, after his death.)

The London School of Economics and Political Science.

LSE in the early 1900s had a somewhat informal atmosphere; all the lecturers and many of the students were part-time, and many of the students, even the full-time ones, were what would later have been called mature students. The lecturers pursued their full-time occupations in the daytime and lectured in the evening, or, for some of the year only. For example, Hobhouse was Political Editor of Tribune at the time when he gave his first lectures, and continued to lead an active life outside the university; Westermarck was Professor of Philosophy at the University of Helsingfors, where he lectured for two terms in each academic year, coming to England in the summer to give his courses of lectures at LSE; Bowley began his career at LSE while still a school maths master, and lectured at LSE on the school's half-holiday; he later combined his London

appointment with a chair in mathematics at Reading University. Alfred Marshall, Professor of Economics at Cambridge, is reported as saying, when he saw an early LSE programme, that it was compiled to suit the lecturers that were available, not on a systematic organisation of subjects.¹⁴ Lecturers were left a good deal of freedom to diverge from their original subjects. From 1902 onwards, more students were interested in degree-getting and the average student age fell, but it is evident from later remarks by Westermarck and Hobhouse about their students, that mature¹⁵ students continued to attend their lectures.

Sociology lectures at the London School of Economics.

In June 1903, Martin White wrote to Sir Arthur Rucker, Principal of the University of London, formally offering the University £1000 to be spent over several years in providing 'a Preliminary Course or Courses of lectures in Sociology'. In this letter, White went on to define what he meant by 'Sociology': 'the study of social organisation, development and ideals, past and present, over the world, from the lowest to the highest forms; with the object not only of constructing a scientific theory of society, but also of associating such theory with the highest philosophical thought, and of indicating the bearing of such knowledge on practical¹⁶ life'. He hoped the subject would soon become recognised for degrees.

The committee set up to consider the gift, meeting in October 1903, noted that there were already certain courses in London 'more or less connected with the study of sociology' and mentioned, as one of these, the scheme put

forward by C.S. Loch of the COS for the founding of a School of Sociology and Social Economics (later, as mentioned above, to become the Department of Social Science at LSE). The Committee decided that the lecturers they appointed should be eligible to be members of the Board of Studies in Economics (a Board of Studies in Sociology was not formed until 1912), should cover aspects of the subject not covered elsewhere, and should lecture in institutions where students were already studying what they called 'subjects cognate to Sociology'.¹⁷ (These were listed, in a subsequent LSE calendar, as Economics, Philosophy (particularly Ethics), History of Political Ideas, Statistics, Anthropology, Comparative Religion, and Comparative Law. A 'memorandum on the scope of the School' (LSE) states: the Senate 'makes us the centre for Sociology'.)¹⁸ Accordingly, in 1904/5, the University made Sociology an Honours Subject (optional) for the BSc in Economics and the BA in Philosophy. The three subjects covered in the Economics options were: 1. The Comparative Study of Social Institutions (referred to hereafter as CSI); 2. Ethnology; and 3. Psychology (which covered, during this period, chiefly comparative psychology and social psychology).

Twenty-three students enrolled for Hobhouse's eight lectures on Comparative Ethics in 1904, and the average attendance was 15, while the average attendance for Westermarck's forty lectures on Early Customs and Morals, was 8.¹⁹ (Westermarck wrote in his autobiography that the attendance was representative of as many different nations,

himself making yet another, an early indication of the cosmopolitan makeup of the student body at LSE which has persisted ever since.)²⁰ However, in making comparisons between attendance figures, it must be remembered that, at this time, people other than students registered for degrees, attended lectures at LSE. For example, Lady Simon of Wythenshawe wrote, of the period 1907-1912, that there were, as she phrased it, many hangers-on at the School, and people attended series after series of lectures open to the public. She herself 'went to the school in 1907 after Cambridge, ostensibly to do some research under Professor Hobhouse²¹ and Professor Graham Wallas'. She stayed several years - it became a habit - before leaving to be married in 1912.

In the three years which followed before the chairs were endowed, Hobhouse lectured on CSI, A.C. Haddon, the Cambridge anthropologist, on Ethnology, E.J. Urwick, Director of the COS's London School of Sociology, on 'The Economic Basis of Social Relations', and Beatrice Webb on 'Methods of Investigation'. The attendances were highest for Urwick's and Beatrice Webb's lectures, and lowest for Haddon's, and interest in Ethnology by students opting for sociology at LSE before 1918, even when the lecturers were as eminent as Haddon and later Seligman, was never so great as in the other sociological subjects. In 1905 the proposed absorption of the London School of Sociology had already been agreed upon, but did not become a fact until 1912.

The first Sociology finals papers were set in 1907, and Hobhouse and Westermarck both continued to lecture every year, with only brief interruptions, up to 1929 and 1930, the years of Hobhouse's death and Westermarck's retirement. However, as an option for the BSc Econ, sociology developed only slowly in popularity. In the eight years from 1907/8 to 1914/15, a total of only 15 candidates offered themselves.²² The University had attempted to interest a very varied audience. In the 1904 calendar they pointed out that 'Among those whom Sociological teaching is likely to interest are: - Borough Councillors, Poor Law Guardians, Members of Committees of Philanthropic Institutions and Societies, District Visitors, Trade Union Officials, Scripture Readers, Workers in Settlements, Rent Collectors, Workshop and Factory Inspectors, Friendly Society Workers, Officers of Benevolent Societies, and, for Ethnology, Civil Servants destined for the Tropical Portions of the Empire, and Missionaries'.²³ The reference to Civil Servants was echoed in Westermarck's inaugural lecture: he suggested that legislators, lawyers and colonial officials might benefit most from studying sociology, and that it might rid the colonial officials of their 'belief in the extreme superiority of Western civilization'.²⁴

Sociology in the London BSc Economics degree.

The organisation of the subject of sociology, in the university, was to be carried out at four levels:²⁵ first, the Faculty drew up the regulations for the examinations and prescribed which subjects were compulsory

and which optional, what papers were to be set, and their length; second, the Department or Board of Studies drew up a syllabus for the whole subject; third, the individual lecturers drew up the syllabuses for their individual courses of lectures (sometimes accompanied by reading lists); fourth, the Faculty set the examination papers and the lecturers marked them in conjunction with external examiners. The Faculty also decided whether course work should count or not.

Thus, in 1904, the outline regulations for Special Subjects for Honours, of which Sociology was one option, stated: 'Candidates will be expected to have made a thorough study of the subject they select, and to be acquainted with the principal works dealing with it in English, French and German'.²⁶ Passages for translation from French and German works were set for the early sociology honours papers, and in the early years of the subject, books in French and German appeared on reading lists (for example, in 1918/19, Hobhouse included Müller-Lyer's Phasen der Kultur in his reading list for lectures called 'Introduction to the Study of Society', and Rousseau's Contrat Social for a course on 'Social Philosophy', and Westermarck included E. Grosse's Die Formen der Familie²⁷ in a list for a course on 'The Family'). Gradually books in languages other than English disappeared from reading lists, either because English translations became available, or because new books on the subject by authors writing in English, were recommended instead. The foreign language requirement for the examination similarly diminished; in 1927, for the first time, students were

permitted to take dictionaries into the examination;²⁸
in 1939, a pass at Intermediate standard in French, German
or Italian gave exemption from the language paper, or part
of it, in the BSc;²⁹ in 1947, the LSE Student Union³⁰
recommended that the language paper should be abolished;
in 1949, University of London candidates who passed BSc
Economics in all but the language paper, could take it later,³¹
and still be awarded the degree; and eventually it was
removed from the regulations.

An early Sociology syllabus.

After the outline of the subject-matter of sociology
given in Martin White's original letter to Rucker, there
were further attempts to devise a scheme of instruction in
the subject. In 1905 the Martin White Benefaction
Committee drew up a 'General Scheme of Sociological Study'.³²
(They did not feel sociology should yet be made an Honours
Degree subject, but the University decided otherwise.)

The Benefaction Committee saw two main divisions of
the subject, the first being 'all the stages of social
development from the rudest savage tribe to the most
civilised European stage' - in other words, social
evolution. This was to be studied in two ways, first, as
Descriptive Sociology, 'the selection of representative
societies for detailed study, e.g. a group of savage tribes,
an ancient or modern or mediaeval civilisation', and, second,
as Comparative Sociology, studying 'the nature and
development of various classes of social phenomena, e.g.
law and custom, morals and religion, economic and
political institutions and ideas among different peoples
at different stages of their culture'.

The 'detailed study of a group of savage tribes' adumbrated the Ethnology paper; and the comparative study of law, customs, morals, etc., described the subject-matter of the CSI paper.

The Committee next stated that the ideal of modern sociology was to arrive, through the study of social phenomena, at a theory of social evolution. Hobhouse lectured under the title 'Social Evolution' in most years during this early period, but this theme was not incorporated in the title of an examination paper in the first option for the BSc Econ, and was only briefly mentioned in the outline syllabus in 1906 (for CSI).

The theme, although often implicit in examination questions, was seldom as explicitly phrased as in this question: 'What are the principal methods by which changes are brought about in social institutions?' (1916)

Having dealt with social evolution, the 'General Scheme' turned to Social Philosophy: 'studies of ethical and political philosophy, of the basis of moral and political obligation, the implications of social morality' (this subject-matter was included in the paper on 'Comparative Ethics and Social Philosophy' in the BA Philosophy option), and added, somewhat as an afterthought, 'and further, for advanced students, some knowledge of the more distinctly psychological treatment of these subjects by recent writers'. This is the only mention of social psychology, and it may be supposed that the inclusion of the Psychology paper in the first BSc Econ Sociology option papers owed something to Hobhouse's interest in the

subject (Mind in Evolution came out in 1901). Difficulties were encountered with the subject, so the Committee's implied prediction, that it would be beyond the scope of all but advanced students, was partially borne out.

Also as something of an afterthought, the Committee proposed that 'an adequate knowledge of the investigations of existing social conditions in civilised communities' should form part of the sociology course. No paper on this subject was set until 1925. The reasons for this were probably connected chiefly with the organisation of sociology teaching in the University of London. When the first lectures were proposed, the Committee specifically set out to avoid subjects on which instruction was already taking place. Lectures on Social Theory, Social Administration and Poor Law Administration were being given at the School of Sociology and elsewhere, so the emphasis at LSE fell on social evolution, CSI, social philosophy, social psychology, and ethnology. Also, at the time when the degree course was introduced, arrangements were already being proposed for the incorporation of the London School of Sociology into LSE, and the students in this school were intending social workers who took the Certificate in Social Science, so that social administration and the study of contemporary social conditions at LSE were first associated with the Certificate, not with the Degree (in 1913 the Board of Studies in Sociology agreed that Social Science and Administration, while a suitable subject for a Diploma, was not suitable for a degree).³³ It should also be noted that BSc. Econ students already had a compulsory paper on Public Administration and Finance, which, while

not dealing with social investigation, was in the general area of 'existing social conditions'.

The first official London syllabus.

The next stage in the delineation of a sociology syllabus was the University of London official syllabus of the Department of Sociology, first published in 1906 (not in 1909, as implied by Abrams).³⁴ In the University of London Calendar for 1906/7 the scope of the three³⁵ subjects for the Honours papers was given:

Sociology

As the subject of Sociology has been so recently introduced, it is thought desirable to indicate the scope of the subject as set forth in the following syllabus:

(a) Comparative Study of Social Institutions.

1. Sociology in its relations to Biology and Psychology. The principle of evolution applied to Social Phenomena.

2. Forms of Social Organisation.

(a) The Family - Maternal and Paternal Descent. Power of the Head of the Family. Joint and individual property. Regulation of marriage. Position of women.

(b) Society - The Clan and the Tribe. Monarchy. Feudalism, the City State. The Modern State. Federal Government.

3. The Maintenance of Social Order.

The Blood Feud. Retaliation. Compensation. Primitive Courts and Processes. The Oaths and the Ordeal. Growth of Public Justice and Rational Procedure. Responsibility, Punishment and the Prevention of Crime.

4. The Social Structure. Slavery, Serfdom, Free Labour, and Industrial Co-operation. Caste and Class Distinctions. Civil and Political Equality.

5. Religions and other beliefs in their bearing on Social Relations. Influence of magic, Animism, Ancestor Worship, Polytheism, the World Religions, on Social Morality. Antithesis of Temporal and Spiritual Powers.

(b) Psychology

1. The Psychological Standpoint.
2. Comparative Study of Mental Structure -
 - (a) in Animals and Man
 - (b) in Child and Adult
 - (c) in Primitive and Advanced Peoples
3. The Psychological Basis of Social Institutions.
 - (a) Ideas of Moral and Political Obligations.
 - (b) Nature and development of Moral Faculty, Psychology of Sympathy, Self-love, Moral Sense, Conscience. The idea of Personality.
 - (c) Psychology of Responsibility - Analysis of Will, Desire, Impulse, Motive, Intention.
4. Psychological element in
 - (a) Aesthetic
 - (b) Scientific
 - (c) ReligiousDevelopment

(c) Ethnology

The physical, mental, cultural and social characteristics of the main varieties of mankind.
The present geographical distribution of races and peoples, and their former wanderings.
The antiquity of man, the physical characteristics of prehistoric peoples and the evolution of their culture.
A detailed acquaintance with a selected continent, or area, comprising a knowledge of the main social groups in the region selected, their environment (physical and biological), occupation, property, culture, social structure, religion, expansion and their influence upon one another.

Of the areas of knowledge covered by the 'General Scheme', this syllabus from the University of London covered Comparative Sociology, Social Psychology and the part of Descriptive Sociology devoted to 'a group of savage tribes', but had no separate sections dealing with Social Philosophy, the Theory of Social Evolution, or (as has been mentioned already), Investigations of Social Conditions in Civilised Communities. There was also more of the subject of general Ethnology than had been explicitly

suggested by the original scheme.

This early syllabus has been given in full for two reasons. First, to illustrate the generality of syllabuses. No texts were prescribed, no historical periods suggested, no actual clans or tribes named. It was possible for the actual content of the course to change considerably and invisibly, inside the syllabus shell. For detailed knowledge of what the students were learning, it was necessary to move on to individual syllabuses provided by lecturers for their courses, and if they were also unspecific, to reading lists, and to examination papers. Here lies the second reason for giving the syllabus in full. By comparing the individual lecturers' outlines with the formal syllabus, one could trace, to some extent, the contribution made by different lecturers to the filling out of the various parts of the subject.

The comparisons will be fairly brief. The lecture syllabuses which appeared in the LSE calendars were also at a high level of generality, and some actually corresponded to the wording of the formal syllabuses. Few students took Sociology Honours between 1907 and 1918, examination papers were not set in every year, and booklists were only published after 1909, and then not for all lecture courses.

Hobhouse as a sociology lecturer.

In the years 1905 to 1918, to look at Hobhouse's contribution first, he lectured on Comparative Psychology, Social Evolution, Social (and Comparative) Ethics, and (in 1915 and thereafter) on Social Philosophy. His

syllabuses corresponded closely to the formal syllabus; for example, a course of lectures on CSI he gave in 1905/6 began with virtually the same syllabus as parts 1 and 2 of the CSI formal syllabus, before including theories of society, utilitarianism, metaphysical idealism, and evolution.³⁶ On the other hand, the subject-matter of his lectures on Social Evolution covered parts of both the CSI and Psychology papers. It is worth noting that, at one point during these years before the First Great War, Hobhouse was Chairman both of the Board of Studies in Sociology,³⁷ and of the Board of Studies in Psychology.

The attendance at Hobhouse's lectures, always high in comparison with most of the other courses of similar length in his department, reached its peak in 1914, after the Social Science Department at LSE began operating, and before the war began.³⁸ Hobhouse spoke without notes, and had an uninterrupted flow of language; his exposition tended sometimes to be over the heads of his audience, if one can believe a Social Science Certificate student who attended his lectures in 1913.³⁹ It was in the class he held afterward, even though the students were still rather awed and there were some long silences, that concrete social problems, and the way these problems fitted into the larger scheme of things Hobhouse had been outlining, were discussed. Hobhouse mentioned later that he noticed intellectual fashions among the students. When he began lecturing there was 'a wave of social idealism'. Then came women's suffrage, syndicalism, the war, Guild Socialism, Freud (for three or four years), and Elliott Smith and the Diffusion Theory. That these 'fashions' covered the

subject areas of social ameliorism, politics, psychology and anthropology is a reminder of the encyclopaedic nature of Hobhouse's interests and lecturing. As Sir Sidney Caine remarked in 1966, 'It is a sign of the great growth over the years in sociological studies that we in the London School of Economics now count on our establishment five professors of sociology, three of social anthropology, two of social administration, one of social psychology and one of logic and scientific method. It is at the same time a sign of the width of Hobhouse's interests that all of these are carrying on studies in fields at one time or another worked on⁴⁰ and illuminated by Hobhouse'.

In addition to these wide academic interests, Hobhouse, throughout this period of regular lecturing at LSE, was also engaged in writing books, editing and writing articles for political journals, and, during the war, sitting on Trade Boards. He also took over, for a time, the directorship of the Ratan Tata Fund for the relief of poverty, which, during the years 1912-18, financed the Social Science department. There were several attempts on the part of LSE to secure Hobhouse's services as a lecturer for the whole academic year, instead of for the Michaelmas and Lent terms only, with Westermarck lecturing in the Summer term. The School complained that, if Hobhouse were away, there was nobody to supervise any students who might wish to do the Psychology paper in Sociology Honours.^{41.}

Westermarck's lectures on sociology.

Westermarck's first set of lectures was called simply 'Sociology' (1906). From 1907 onward the title

was changed to 'Social Institutions', and from this time⁴² the attendance figures tended to rise (average 25 in 1909). In 1911, Westermarck added a series on 'Social Rights and Duties'; in 1912, LSE were writing to the Martin White Benefaction Committee to ask if they could have Westermarck to lecture for two terms in each year, instead of one. In 1918 Westermarck began a new series of lectures on 'The Family'. All these lectures were for the CSI paper, and his published syllabuses, though lengthy, were not specific as to peoples or periods studied. He did not have booklists published in the LSE calendar during this time. It is reasonable to suppose, however, that the subject-matter of his lectures approximated to some of the subject-matter of his books on Human Marriage and on The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas, the latter published in 1912.

Westermarck's influence on the structure of London University sociology (as distinct from the influence his ideas had on sociological theory in general) was necessarily limited by his part-time appointment. He seems to have enjoyed the atmosphere of lecturing at LSE. He found it a much less formal situation than that at Helsingfors, and seems to have taken a genuine interest in his students. His effect on the Social Science Certificate students, who began to attend his lectures after 1912, was satirised in 'Clare Market Seen Through', a parody on the LSE college magazine Clare Market Review, which described the social science girls retiring in horror to a nunnery after hearing Westermarck lecture on marriage customs among primitive⁴³ peoples.

Ethnology lectures.

The emphasis on primitive peoples in the LSE sociology courses was, of course, carried through in the lectures on Ethnology. A great expansion in anthropological field work was taking place at about this time; A.C. Haddon, who gave the first lectures on Ethnology at LSE, had led his successful expedition to the Torres Straits in 1898. Malinowski, who lectured on 'Primitive Religions' and 'Social Psychology' at LSE in 1912 and 1913, had his book, The Family Among the Australian Aborigines, published as Volume II of the University of London Monographs on Sociology, in 1913; in 1914 he left England to avoid internment as an alien (he was, of course, Polish) and spent four years studying the Trobriand Islanders and other Melanesian peoples. Malinowski had studied under Westernmarck, who himself made periodic field visits to Morocco, beginning in 1900. Radcliffe-Brown, who had been a student of Haddon's, began his expedition to study the Andaman Islanders in 1906. (The theories derived from these studies were to become extremely influential in British university sociology in the 1950s and thereafter; at this early stage there was less interest among sociological theorists in the theoretical and political implications of the works of the social anthropologists, and an examination question set in 1910 on 'the relation between social function and social structure' carried no ideological undertones.) A London Chair of Ethnology, of which Seligman was the first occupant, was founded in 1913, and LSE took seriously the question of the education of colonial administrators, and

even arranged a special course for Indian Civil Servants, with the cooperation of the government. Although Ethnology became a separate Department at LSE in 1917, social anthropology continued to be part of the BSc Econ sociology degree option. It was included as an optional paper in the BA Sociology and persisted, as Branch II of the London BA/BSc Sociology degree at LSE, until the late 1960s.

LSE reading lists.

Few LSE reading lists had appeared in print before 1918; the books relating to the CSI and Social Evolution courses tended to be primary texts written at a level appropriate to other authors in the field, rather than textbooks for students (with the exception of some books more specifically on social psychology, for instance MacDougall's Introduction to Social Psychology, and Stout's Manual of Psychology). There were also one or two textbooks in the Social Philosophy lists; for instance Mackenzie's Introduction to Social Philosophy and Manual of Ethics. The books recommended ranged from eighteenth and nineteenth century writers to recent or current works; but Hobhouse and Westermarck, for example, never included their own works in their lists, although they did recommend each other's.

The first finals examination papers in Sociology.

Finals papers for the Sociology option were set from 1907 onwards. It may be of interest to give a brief general description of these very first papers, before going on to discuss certain aspects of the papers set during the span of years up to 1918. The layout of the

first papers would have been familiar to a 1970s student; the traditional three-hour paper of essay-type questions with, for CSI in 1907, a choice of eight questions of which not more than six had to be attempted in the time allotted. One of the first questions was: 'Give a critical account of the main theories concerning the nature of a "society"' - a tall order for a 1970s university student in the time available. The rest of the paper was devoted to questions on what would have been defined, in the 1970s, chiefly as social anthropology (polyandry, female descent, the development of the right of property, the duties of chiefs, the origin and aim of punishment, the Hindu caste system and its differences from the class distinctions of Europe, the influence of religious beliefs on social relationships).⁴⁴

Psychology and Ethnology were covered in one examination paper divided into two sections. Three of the five questions on psychology were concerned with primitive psychology - subjects such as 'the investigation of mental process in races of low culture', the 'intellectual differences between primitive and advanced peoples', the 'savage's idea of personality' as compared with the fully developed concept; the other two questions were about the psychological factors in the development of pictorial art, and the psychological analysis of sympathy.⁴⁵

The external examiner for this paper was W.H.R. Rivers, the Cambridge social anthropologist, who originally lectured on psychology at Cambridge and had had Radcliffe-Brown as his first student in social anthropology in 1904. Both

Westermarck and Hobhouse shared an interest in psychology, and the impression given by this early examination paper is that, because of their interest in social evolution, the lecturers and examiners were interested in all aspects of primitive societies without necessarily making clear-cut distinctions between psychological, ethnological and sociological fields of study. Thus Rivers was equally able to examine the second part of the paper, which dealt with Malays, Basques, the cephalic index of the races of France, osteological factors in the study of European races, and 'the possibility and value of⁴⁶ classification of peoples according to occupation'.

A detailed discussion of the examination papers set from 1909 (there were none in 1908, 1916 and 1918) up to 1917 is not appropriate here, but three small categories of questions may be mentioned: first, occasionally there were 'self-conscious' questions about the nature or limits of the discipline the student was being examined in, for example: 'What would you conceive to be the peculiar field of "Social Psychology"?' (1910); 'What sciences are most nearly connected with sociology? What is the nature of the relation?' (1914). Second, questions about poverty were set several times, although there was no paper about poverty in contemporary British society as such: 'Compare the leading ideas which have guided the relief of the poor and helpless at different stages of civilization' (1909); 'Discuss the principles on which the relief of poverty has been organised. How does the principle affect the organisation?' (1913); 'Discuss the influence of religious teaching on the treatment of

destitution' (1916); and third, there were questions which showed the influence of contemporary events (in this case the war): 'Discuss the influences affecting the position of aliens' (1916). The last two questions were from the Sociology option papers in the BA Honours in Philosophy - as was indicated above, no papers were set in that year in the BSc Econ option.

Problems with the Sociology option in the BSc Economics.

The BSc Econ Sociology option was not yet highly organised. Up to 1921, students were asked to arrange their own timetables for this subject (i.e. from the existing lectures)⁴⁷. Although there were signs by 1912 that it was becoming a little more popular (five BSc Econ Honours candidates chose Sociology in 1912, the only option with a greater number being Economic History, with eleven)⁴⁸, it soon ran into difficulties again. At an early meeting (March 1913) of the Board of Studies in Sociology, it was reported that, while the few Arts students taking CSI as a sociology option in the BA Hons Philosophy, did fairly well, the Economics students, who also had to take Psychology or Ethnology as part of their Sociology option, seemed to be doing badly.⁴⁹ In June 1914, at a meeting chaired by Hobhouse, at which Westermarck, Bowley, Urwick and J. Martin White were also present, the Board discussed fully the working of the sociology papers up to that time. The trouble seemed to be, that BSc Econ candidates choosing the Sociology option were awarded low classes in finals as a whole (in 1907 the only BSc Econ candidate in Sociology was awarded a third, as were the two candidates in 1908, and subsequent classes tended to be similarly low. The students 'did up to their merits' in

the sociology papers as such, but¹to achieve this they had to spend a disproportionate amount of time and energy on sociology; the inference drawn was, that this accounted for their poor overall performance. The subject was felt to be too difficult, and the low classes awarded in degrees naturally discouraged future students from choosing the option.

The problem of the vastness of the subject had already been recognised, and had been, it was thought, partially solved by amending the 1906 syllabus so that (Social) Psychology and Ethnology were alternatives where previously students had had to take both. Despite this, Psychology in particular was proving a stumbling-block. It was difficult to link up with any of the students' previous work and it cost them 'time and mental energy, even to master its barest elements'.⁵⁰ (It will be remembered that the compilers of the 1905 General Scheme, as if foreseeing this difficulty, had suggested that psychology should be introduced only at a more advanced stage.)

The Board seemed somewhat at a loss as to what steps to take to make the option more popular. ('It is⁵¹ difficult to see what remedy could be adopted'.) They suggested that the root of the trouble was the position of sociology as part of an economics degree course. Logically, sociology, being 'an attempt to conceive the social problem as a whole', should have been the main degree subject, with economics as part of the sociology course. Since the historically prior position of economics as an organised academic discipline could not be reversed, the only solution was to make sociology a

degree subject in its own right, thus allowing prospective students to devote more time to the subject and, hopefully, to gain higher classes in finals.

(At a meeting in 1915, as an alternative to a full sociology degree, it was proposed that the whole BSc Econ course should be modified to allow candidates to concentrate either on sociology or on economics, after Inter; or to do a predominating amount of sociology or economics, with an agreed minimum of other subjects. This proposal was to bear fruit in 1927, when the BSc Econ regulations were changed, in very much this way, with regard to all the options, not only sociology.)⁵²

Proposals for a full sociology degree.

To return to the 1914 report, its authors pointed out, in support of their proposal for a distinct sociology degree, that there would be no difficulty in providing for teaching the subject - the two Professors of Sociology were already experienced after having lectured on the subject for seven years, and now a new Professor of Ethnology (Seligman) had been appointed. (It seems to have been taken for granted that Hobhouse would deal with the Psychology.)

The teachers were already available; finding students was evidently proving more difficult. The authors of the report suggested that some of the numerous Social Science Certificate students, from the enviably flourishing sister Department of Social Science and Social Administration, might be glad of the opportunity to take a degree. But the report gave no evidence that first-hand opinion on the subject had been canvassed, and in point of fact the war,

in any case, prevented the hoped-for recruitment. There was a high demand, during the war years, for students with the Certificate in Social Science and Administration to act as welfare workers (e.g. in munitions factories), so that they tended to go straight into work rather than stay on to take either the Advanced Diploma in Sociology and Social Science, or a degree.

53

The report proposed a syllabus for a BA and a BSc in Sociology (see Appendix II). Social Institutions; Social Philosophy and a new paper called 'Method' (the scope of sociology and its relation to other subjects) were the suggested compulsory core. The options were Graeco-Roman Civilisation (the 1905 Scheme's 'Ancient Civilization'), Simpler Societies (1905's 'Group of Savage Tribes'), some Oriental Civilisations, or Modern English Social Structure (approximating to the 1905 Scheme's 'Existing Social Conditions in Contemporary Communities').

As has been indicated, this corresponded fairly closely to the 1905 General Scheme; Graeco-Roman and Oriental Civilisations were, no doubt, specified because teaching for these could be covered by lecturers in the University of London already servicing Classics and Oriental History.

The 1914 scheme was submitted to other Boards of Studies for their approval; some of their comments are worthy of note. The Anthropology Board wanted the title 'Structure of some simple societies' changed to 'Social structure and relationship of less developed communities'.
54
An interesting reflection of the change in attitude towards what was, by the 1970s, called the 'Third World', was the change from the 'savage tribes' of the 1905 scheme to the

'developing countries' of 1970s syllabuses. (The Anthropology Board's suggestion was not accepted, 'simpler societies' reappearing in the re-drafted degree scheme in 1920.)⁵⁵

The History Board wanted the new degree to cater for students of English and Mediaeval History as well as for students of Classical and Oriental History, and proposed 'Mediaeval European Civilization' and 'Modern European Civilization' as additional options. Members of the Oriental Languages and Philosophy Boards thought sociology should be postgraduate. A conference of all Boards was arranged, but no further steps were taken to introduce or re-draft a scheme for a sociology degree, until after the war. Of the Boards consulted, Economics, Anthropology, Archaeology and Psychology could be said to have some scientific bias, however slight; the rest were all arts-oriented (Classics, Oriental Languages, Philosophy, History). At this stage, the degree-writers seemed to be looking at the subject very much as an arts subject; no economics or statistics were included.

Other lecturers at the London School of Economics.

Statistics, later to become a subject common to virtually all sociology degree courses, had had to be 'created' as a university subject at LSE. As Sidney Webb wrote in reminiscences of LSE: 'Bowley made that subject; we prescribed it for him'.⁵⁶ Bowley, in an address to the LSE Student Union in 1945, recalled, 'Having accepted the post . . . I set to work to find out what "Statistics" meant as a branch of economics or mathematics, studied the foreign works on the subject . . . and official statistics . . .'⁵⁷ Bowley lectured at LSE for one hour

a week for 38 years. A student remembered his handing round, at each lecture, 'foolscap sheets covered with masses of statistics he had worked out as illustrations',⁵⁸ and an MS copy of an early draft of his first syllabus shows how he tried to adapt the subject to the non-numerate students he was expecting (see Appendix III). In the next 30-odd years he developed both the subject and his courses, but statistics had to wait many years to be incorporated as part of the sociology degree syllabus and only in the 1960s achieved a more secure position as a core subject.

Other lecturers, not already mentioned, whom sociology students might have heard in the years before 1919, were Morris Ginsberg, who lectured at LSE on Social Philosophy as early as 1914 (he had come to LSE as a research student in 1910 after graduating in philosophy at King's College, and was working on The Material Culture of the Simpler Peoples), J.W. Slaughter, who lectured on Comparative Psychology before Hobhouse took over this course, Graham Wallas, on Political Psychology, A.J. Wolf on Logic and Scientific Method, and Sidney Webb, who alternated with his wife in delivering the 'How to Investigate' lectures.

Universities and the education of social workers.

The areas of study covered by sociology degrees at LSE at this time were heavily influenced by the fact that, from 1912 onwards, that part of the 1905 General Scheme which referred to 'existing social conditions' was taken over by the Department of Social Science and Administration. It will not be part of the central theme of the present work

to investigate in detail how courses for social work training came to be incorporated in universities in England, but the following brief survey of developments before 1918 will help to explain the relationship between the Department of Sociology and the Department of Social Science and Administration at LSE at the end of the First Great War.

The Charity Organisation Society, which had been active in the training of social workers, set up, in 1901, a Special Committee for Social Education. They wished to arrange courses for voluntary social workers on both theoretical and practical subjects, and proposed that, in large towns, university professors should join with wardens of settlements and COS members in giving lectures on 'the History of Charity, Social Economics and Statistics, Institutional Administration, the Administration of Relief in its various branches, and on many of the proposals for Social Progress'.⁵⁹ At a conference on the subject in 1902, some university professors (notably Chapman of Manchester) rejected the infiltration of such courses into universities on the ground that they were policy-oriented, and that it was not the place of the university to inculcate morals, but to study facts and theories. Nevertheless, at Liverpool, under Gonner, the Professor of Economics, a School of Social Science⁶⁰ was established in 1904; after a period of 'poor relation' treatment by the rest of the university, in 1917 it was fully incorporated, a Board of Social Studies was set up, and a Diploma had been introduced, the subjects

for which included Social Philosophy and Social
61
Psychology. This was the forerunner of the BA Honours
in Social Science which was to be introduced in the
twenties, after Carr-Saunders had been appointed to the
Chair of Social Science.

At Birmingham it was the Professor of Commerce,
William Ashley, who lent a sympathetic ear to a request
for practical instruction in social studies. Muirhead
(whose works on social philosophy Hobhouse included in
his LSE reading lists) also lectured for the Birmingham
course in his capacity as Professor of Philosophy. By
1910 a Diploma had been introduced, and the course for
this, like the one at Liverpool, included practical visits
by the students to 'workhouses, children's homes, courts,
62
reform schools, hospitals and factories'.

From 1912 onwards the Birmingham Diploma included a
paper called 'Theory and Practice of Social Life', with
questions (e.g. 'Is a science of society possible?' (1915);
'distinguish between a society, an association, a nationality,
a state and a government' (1917)) similar to some of
those set in the London sociology BSc Econ option.
Between 1909 and 1917, 88 women and 24 men were awarded
the Birmingham Diploma in Social Study, and in 1918 an
Honours School of Social and Political Science was
introduced in the Faculty of Arts; however, the courses
for this degree did not include any sociology as such.

Professor Macgregor, appointed to the Leeds chair of
Economics in 1908, was already interested in social
questions, and had introduced a course on Social Economy in
the Honours School of Social and Political Science in the

Faculty of Arts (Booth's Life and Labour and Rowntree's ⁶³
Poverty were both recommended books for this course).

A Diploma was introduced in 1912, but it was awarded to a total of only 23 candidates in the seven years 1912 to 1918. Candidates for the Testamur in Social Studies at Bristol, where Lloyd Morgan held the Chair of Psychology and Ethics, were even fewer.

At Manchester, Chapman, in the Chair of Political Economy, thought social study courses would threaten university impartiality: 'The part of the University is to inform and train the student's mind and give him the power of Judgment. Principles of action must be acquired ⁶⁴ elsewhere'. Manchester had had a University settlement since 1901 and a student Sociological Society since 1905, but the Certificate of Social Work set up in 1912 apparently attracted hardly any candidates.

At Oxford, a certificate course entered the University Regulations by way of the Diploma in Economic and Political Science; certificates were first granted in 1920. Barnett House, with its aim to become a centre for the study of social and economic questions, to house a library, to promote settlement work, and to provide tutorial ⁶⁵ classes, was incorporated in 1916; students at Barnett House attended university lectures, but it did not become part of the university until 1936.

To turn to the situation in London, as has already been mentioned, the London School of Sociology, begun in 1903 under Urwick, became the Department of Social Science and Administration at LSE in 1912. The first list of subjects illustrates the practical bias: 'Social Work and

Study'; 'State Assistance'; 'Social Movements'; 'Recent Social Reform'; 'A Descriptive Survey of Working Class Life and Conditions in London'.⁶⁶ This last title is an obvious reference to the survey work of Booth, begun in 1895 and continuing until 1903, when all 15 volumes of The Life and Labour of the People in London were published. Although LSE was to be the centre for the New Life and Labour project in the thirties, in the early years of the twentieth century Booth's work was not, apparently, emphasised in sociology courses, although Beatrice Webb, who had worked with Booth in collecting the London statistics, probably included some reference to him in the 'Methods of Investigation' lectures. It has been suggested that the reason for the neglect of Booth's work both by the early sociology courses, and by subsequent⁶⁷ textbooks, is his alleged lack of theoretical insight. To the social science students, primarily interested in practical problems, this would not have appeared as a disadvantage.

The respective positions of academic sociology and practical social work instruction at LSE were anomalous. On the one hand, the LSE Department of Sociology had two chairs, but few candidates for degrees. On the other hand, the Department of Social Science and Administration students attended a mixture of academic (e.g. Social Philosophy) and practical (e.g. Existing Methods of Dealing with Social Problems) courses, and its Certificate attracted large numbers of students, while the size of its lecture audiences was correspondingly larger than most of those in the Sociology Department. The Social Science Department

in the war years had the added satisfaction of being approached by the Ministry of Munitions and asked to arrange lectures for welfare workers in munitions factories. Social science students attended sociology lectures, although sociology was not included in their course. (During the First Great War, Hobhouse offered to give social philosophy lectures specially for them.) The LSE Social Science Department was accepted as the leading social work department in the country. This position was reinforced, not only by its being situated in the capital, but also by the presence of the British Library of Political and Economic Science which was established at LSE, and which was to continue as the leading social science library in the country. The prestige of the Department has been seen as having the effect of attracting away from sociology, men who might have become professional sociologists, but who wanted to combine an academic role with social action.⁶⁸ The subject of social administration was gaining in status, and in 1917 a Joint University Council for Social Studies prophesied that some of the social studies subject-matter would soon be incorporated⁶⁹ in degree courses.

The place of university sociology.

As a conclusion to the present chapter, it may be profitable to look at two early discussions of the place of university sociology, and at their relevance to the lack of progress in establishing the subject at Oxford and Cambridge. First, in 1906, Professor R.M. Wenley, who held the Chair of Philosophy at the University of

Michigan, lectured to the Sociological Society in London on 'Sociology as an Academic Subject'. Second, Westermarck, in 1907, gave his inaugural lecture on 'Sociology as a University Study'.

Wenley mentioned the shortage of people qualified to teach sociology. 'Suppose the sixteen universities of Great Britain were to adopt sociology as a subject for study, would it be possible to fill the sixteen vacant chairs with professors?'⁷⁰ In the nature of things, the first chairs had to be filled by people whose own first degree had been in another subject.

In 1906, Wenley said, 'the men have to make the new subject and they have to make themselves'.⁷¹ The student was similarly ill-prepared. Wenley's suggested strategy was to introduce sociology as a subsidiary to fill gaps in ethics or economics courses, and to allow sociology to 'grow out of' anthropology,^{psychology,} philosophy and statistics.

In England, before 1919, this was, to a certain extent, what was happening. At LSE, sociology was a subsidiary subject for the psychology and philosophy degrees (and, of course, an option in the economics degree). But the strategy was failing to produce enough student interest in sociology, and progress was not fast enough to satisfy those who lectured in it.

At Oxford and Cambridge, sociological elements were appearing unobtrusively in other subject areas. The Certificate course at Oxford, already mentioned, did not, it is true, include any sociology, but the Diploma in Anthropology included a sub-section, 'Sociological', in its

section on 'Cultural Anthropology', and the syllabus corresponded closely to the CSI course at LSE.

At Cambridge, the word 'sociology' had appeared in tripos regulations as early as 1889,⁷² in the Moral Sciences Tripos under Ethics, and in 1904, Social Psychology was included in the new regulations for the same tripos (in 1906, the Ethics paper in this tripos included a question on the function of the individual as 'an organ in the social organism'). Traces of sociology were also beginning to appear in the teaching of anthropology, and of economics, at Cambridge. Yet these small infiltrations, contrary to Wenley's thesis, did not result in the growth and acceptance of sociology in the ancient universities.

Somewhat in contradiction to his statement that sociology must begin by fulfilling a small experimental role in degree courses, Wenley continued with the suggestion that sociology, being a difficult subject requiring students of a high standard (in contrast to the later view of the subject as a 'soft option') might be better left to postgraduate students, and Mackinder, LSE's Director, in the discussion which followed, said that, since large sociological syntheses took nearly all knowledge for their scope, no man was really fit to deal with them until he was forty years of age. Yet Mackinder did not feel that the 'training of relieving officers' (i.e. social workers) was quite the sphere of the university.⁷³

If theoretical sociology was too 'difficult', practical issues of social administration were not

sufficiently prestigious. Adopting for the moment Riesman's prototype of the university as offering products to consumers,⁷⁴ in 1914 the purveyors of sociology could be said to have had packaging problems, and there was some confusion over their product image, and over the market at which they were aiming.

Turning briefly to the second early discussion of the place of university sociology, Westermarck, in his inaugural lecture on 'Sociology as a University Study' in 1907, was certain that sociology could only achieve academic status if it became value-free (Mackinder's second point) and also stopped generalising (Mackinder's first point), became more specialised. Westermarck saw CSI and social anthropology as the two branches of sociology, not yet represented in any university, which could be introduced under the subject title 'sociology', and he saw the name itself as a 'great gain', since, under it, could be co-ordinated various courses from other subjects (e.g. social economics) which really dealt with sociological issues.⁷⁵ He would, perhaps, have agreed with Edward Shils, who maintained later that it was not until sociology became a university subject that it was able to mature.⁷⁶

In 1903, the complaint had been made that sociology had, in England, no university appointments, no learned society, and no learned journal. By 1918, it had all three, and in the inter-war years a beginning was made at the difficult task of establishing a distinct sociology degree.

REFERENCES
CHAPTER II.

1. Fletcher, Ronald, Auguste Comte and the Making of Sociology, (Auguste Comte Memorial Trust Lecture 7), University of London, The Athlone Press, 1966, p.21.
2. Abrams, Philip, The Origins of British Sociology, 1834-1914, University of Chicago Press, 1968, p.67.
3. Spencer, Herbert, The Study of Sociology, Kegan Paul, 1908, p.406.
4. Hobson, J.A., and Ginsberg, Morris, L.T. Hobhouse, His Life and Work, Allen and Unwin, 1931, p.26.
5. Ibid., p.35.
6. Quoted by Abrams, Philip, op.cit., pp.14,15.
7. Mumford, Lewis, 'Patrick Geddes, Victor Branford and Applied Sociology in England', in Barnes, Harry E., (ed.), An Introduction to the History of Sociology, University of Chicago Press, 1948, p.680.
8. Farmer, Mary, 'The Positivist Movement and the Development of English Sociology', Sociological Review, NS, Vol. XV, 1967, p.14; Mitchell, G.D., A Hundred Years of Sociology, Duckworth, 1968, p.221; Mumford, Lewis, op.cit., p.681.
9. Boardman, Philip, Patrick Geddes, University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 1944, p.239.
10. Branford, Victor, 'On the Origin and Use of the Word Sociology', Sociological Papers, Vol.I, 1905, p.8.
11. 'Preliminaries', in The Sociological Society (pamphlet), London School of Economics, Archives, n.d., p.21.
12. Simey, T.S., Social Science and Social Purpose, Constable, 1968, Ch.2.
13. Sociological Papers, Vols. I-III, 1905-1907; Sociological Review, Vol.I, 1908, onwards.
14. Bowley, A.L., 'Early Days at LSE' (typescript), 1945, in London School of Economics: LSE: Reminiscences of former students, members of staff and governors, 1922-1947 (unpublished MS collection), p.39.
15. Westermarck, E., trans. Barwell, Anna, Memories of My Life, Allen and Unwin, 1929, pp.199,200.
16. London School of Economics, Archives, Martin White Benefaction Committee, File 320/17, Document 1, Letter from J. Martin White to Sir Arthur W. Rucker, June 29, 1903.

17. Ibid, Document 5, Meeting on October 27, 1903, Minutes.
18. London School of Economics, Archives, Faculty of Economics, 1901-1904, 'Memorandum on the Scope of the School', n.d.
19. London School of Economics, Archives, Professorial Council Agenda and Minutes, 1902-1914, pp.21,22.
20. Westermarck, E., op.cit., p.199.
21. Simon of Wythenshawe, Lady (Shena D. Simon), in London School of Economics, LSE: Reminiscences (above), p.155.
22. London School of Economics, Archives, Professorial Council Agenda and Minutes, 1902-1914, passim.
23. London School of Economics, Calendar, 1904/5, p.56.
24. Westermarck, e., 'Sociology as a University Subject', in Inauguration of the Martin White Professorships in Sociology, University of London, John Murray, 1908, p.28.
25. London School of Economics, Archives, Professorial Council Agenda and Minutes, 1902-1914, p.204 ('extracts from Report of Royal Commission on University Education in London which directly affect the Faculty of Economics').
26. University of London, Calendar, 1902-3, Vol.II,, p.191.
27. London School of Economics, Calendar, 1918/19, pp.60,61.
28. University of London, Regulations for Internal Students, 1927/8, p.481.
29. University of London, Regulations for Internal Students, 1939-40, p.606.
30. LSE Student Union, Interdepartmental Committee Report on Degree Reform, Replies to Questions Asked by Staff, 7.8.47. University of London, Board of Studies in Economics, Senate House, File 500A.
31. University of London, Regulations for Internal Students, 1949, p.704.
32. Sociological Society, 'Report of the Martin White Benefaction Committee', in Sociological Society, Second Annual Report of the Council for the Year 1905, 1906, Section III, pp.6 et seq.
33. University of London, Board of Studies in Sociology, Meeting October 24, 1913, Minutes, p.7.
34. Abrams, Philip, op.cit., p. 110.
35. University of London, Calendar, 1906/7, Vol.II, pp. 816,817.
36. London School of Economics, Calendar, 1905/6, p.53.

37. University of London, Calendar, 1913/14, pp.136,137.
38. London School of Economics, Archives, Professorial Council, Minutes 1914-1918, Set 1, p.34.
39. Hobson, J.H., and Ginsberg, Morris, op.cit., p.79.
40. Caine, Sir Sidney, Preface to Ginsberg, Morris (ed.), Sociology and Philosophy, A Centenary Collection of Essays and Articles by L.T. Hobhouse, London School of Economics and G. Bell and Sons, 1966, pp.ix,x.
41. London School of Economics, Archives, Martin White Benefaction Committee (above), Document 12a, Letter to the President of the Board of Education from the London School of Economics, December, 1918.
42. London School of Economics, Archives, Professorial Council Agenda and Minutes, 1902-1914, p.132.
43. 'Clare Market Seen Through', May, 1914, p.19, quoted by Bowley, A.L., op.cit., p.52.
44. University of London, Faculty of Economics, Examination Papers, BSc (Honours) Examination, October, 1907 (Internal Students), p.20.
45. Ibid., p.21.
46. Ibid.
47. London School of Economics, Calendar, 1905/6, p.77.
48. London School of Economics, Archives, Professorial Council Agenda and Minutes, 1902-1914, p.215.
49. University of London, Board of Studies in Sociology, Minutes of Meeting Held on March 11, 1913, p.2.
50. University of London, Board of Studies in Sociology, 'Memorandum on Proposed Degree in Sociology', June 8, 1914, Senate House, File 500A.
51. Ibid.
52. University of London, Regulations for Internal Students, 1927/8, pp.476, 477, 481.
53. London School of Economics, Archives, Professorial Council, Minutes 1917-1918, p.108.
54. University of London, Board of Studies in Sociology, 'Memorandum on Proposed Degree in Sociology' (above), October 16, 1914.
55. University of London, Regulations for Internal Students, 1920/21, p.146.

56. Webb, Sidney, in London School of Economics, LSE; Reminiscences (above), p.14.
57. Bowley, A.L., op.cit., p.34.
58. Mare, Florence (typescript) in London School of Economics, LSE; Reminiscences (above), p.120.
59. Charity Organisation Society, 'Annual Report of the Council', Reports, 1901, p.31.
60. University of Liverpool, Calendar, 1906, pp.229,230.
61. University of Liverpool, Calendar, 1919/20, p.228.
62. University of Birmingham, Calendar, 1908/9, p.383.
63. University of Leeds, Calendar, 1909/10, p.195.
64. Quoted by Smith, Marjorie, Professional Education for Social Work in Britain, Allen and Unwin, 1952, p.38.
65. Barnett House Papers, No.1, 1916 (note on cover).
66. London School of Economics, Calendar, 1912/13, p.225.
67. Simey, T.S., and Simey, M.B., Charles Booth, Social Scientist, O.U.P., 1960, p.246.
68. Abrams, Philip, op.cit., p.111.
69. Joint Universities Council for Social Studies, Report: Social Study and Training at the Universities, 1918, p.11.
70. Wenley, R.M., 'Sociology as an Academic Subject', Sociological Papers, Vol. III, 1907, p.290.
71. Ibid.
72. University of Cambridge, Calendar, 1889, p. xiii.
73. Discussion on Wenley, R.M., 'Sociology as an Academic Subject' (above), p.296.
74. Riesman, David, Constraint and Variety in American Education, Doubleday Anchor Books, New York, 1958, pp. 1 et seq.
75. Westermarck, E., op.cit., p.27.
76. Shils, Edward, 'The Calling of Sociology', in Parsons, T. et al. (eds.), Theories of Society, Free Press, New York, 1961, p. 1405.

CHAPTER III

1919 - 1945. LSE, BEDFORD COLLEGE,
AND THE FIRST SPECIALIST SOCIOLOGY DEGREE

Gradual development after 1919.

Surveys of the development of university sociology in England, tend to begin in a hopeful vein in 1907, with the setting up of the first chairs, and then to dismiss the years before 1946 as a somewhat fallow period, in which the early promise of the subject was not fulfilled.¹ It is true that no new departments of sociology were set up during the years 1919-45, and that London University was still, at the end of the Second Great War, the only English university offering a sociology degree (although some university colleges entered students for the London External degrees). For this reason, the present chapter covers a long span of 27 years, ending just prior to the publication of the Clapham Report. This report, on the provision for social and economic research, was followed by the gradual expansion of university sociology in the fifties, and the very rapid expansion of the sixties and seventies which carried sociology into every university in the country.

It must not be supposed, however, that university sociology, in the inter-war years and the years of the Second Great War, was stagnant. At London University, a new degree, the BA (Hons) Sociology, was established in 1920, and the shape of the BSc Econ sociology option was radically altered in 1927. Bedford College for Women joined in teaching candidates for the BA Sociology from

1925 onwards, and a Social Science degree with some sociology in its papers, was introduced at Liverpool University in 1926. Morris Ginsberg was appointed to the Martin White chair of sociology after Hobhouse's death in 1929, and was joined in teaching sociology at LSE by T.H. Marshall, who became a Reader in Sociology in 1930, and by Karl Mannheim, who came to LSE in 1933 after being forced, by the political situation, to leave his chair of sociology at Frankfurt, and to seek exile in England. (In 1935 he was joined by Herbert Mannheim, the criminologist.) Other names which appeared on the lists of lecturers to sociology students at LSE and Bedford, and which appeared at the head of examination papers for the London sociology degrees, included Harold Laski, R.H. Tawney, Hugh Gaitskell, Hector Hetherington, Alexander Carr-Saunders (appointed Director of LSE in succession to Beveridge in 1937), A.L. Bowley, Susan Stebbing, Gertrude Williams and Barbara Wootton.

Hostility to sociology.

This list included philosophers (who lectured on Social Philosophy), economists (who lectured on Social Economics), and political scientists (who lectured on Social and Political Theories). Sociologists were still trying to find an identity in the social sciences, and in the academic world in general, and opinions continued to be divided both as to the nature of their subject, and as to its place in the university. Two factors need to be stressed here. The first is, that sociologists were then, as they continued to be in the fifties and sixties, very conscious of a hostile attitude

towards them. This is brought out in remarks by lecturers themselves, and by other sociologists, at varying dates throughout the period,² and also in accounts by outside observers, chiefly academic visitors to Britain from American universities,³ who also noticed the lack of welcome by English universities for sociological study.

It is possible that this hostility, and the lack of security and status for their discipline which sociologists felt, may have been an underlying additional reason for the second factor, namely the emphasis laid on the importance of establishing sociology as a synthetic subject embracing all the specialist social sciences.

The synthetic approach.

In the nineteenth century this synthetic approach had been chiefly applied to the way in which the discipline was to develop per se. The original Comtean idea of the pyramid of the sciences with sociology at the apex, had been modified in response to detailed criticism, but it was still considered of vital importance that the study of society should not splinter off (more than it had already done) into isolated specialisms, none of which would be imbued with the sociological and empirical approach. Economics, in particular, was, at this time, seen as tending to ignore social factors on the one hand, and as relying too much on a priori reasoning, as opposed to empirical investigation, on the other.

Possibly deriving from, and yet also distinct from, this theoretical position that sociology should be, in the fields of the academic disciplines, the over-arching

synthesizing social science, was the practical idea of transferring this theoretical disciplinary pattern to an institutional pattern in the universities. Since it was historically impossible to establish departments or faculties of sociology which would include as sub-disciplines all the other social sciences (because, obviously, some of them, such as economics, already mentioned, and political science, social anthropology, and social history, to name others, were already established in departments or faculties of their own, or attached to other faculties), the emphasis was laid, particularly in the inter-war period by such lecturers as T.H. Marshall, on synthesis in teaching the social sciences, on the integration of subjects and departments, on what was later called the inter-disciplinary approach. Conferences held in 1933, 1936, and 1937, the first on 'The Correlation of the Social Sciences', and the second and third on 'The Social Sciences: Their Relations in Theory and in Teaching', gave teachers of social science subjects an opportunity to put forward views about the ways in which their subjects should develop as university disciplines. By the 1970s, sociology had come to occupy, at one and the same time, the theoretical position of applying to 'all aspects of society', and the practical position of being studied on a par with economics, politics, or other social science subjects in joint honours degrees, and of being given equal weighting with these, in finals papers.

It should also be noted in passing that, in drawing together teachers of many social science subjects at universities, the conference organisers were able to

include members of Oxbridge faculties (economics and political science were being taught at Oxford in the Honours School of Philosophy, Politics and Economics (PPE), and at Cambridge in the Economics trips, and anthropology was also represented), although Oxbridge had so far proved unwilling to admit sociology as such.

Possible reasons for the slow development of university sociology in England.

Other factors which have been seen as militating against the more rapid development of university sociology in the 1919-1945 period, fall into roughly four categories.

a) Factors common to all university subjects.

In the first place, there were factors common to all university subjects, for example, the deaths of large numbers of young men in the First Great War, some of whom were potential or actual students or lecturers; the lowering of the birth rate during the years 1917-1919, on account of the war, which led to a lowering of student numbers in the years 1935-1937;⁴ and the economic depression of the twenties and thirties, leading on the one hand to a lack of money for student expansion, and on the other hand to unemployment, including graduate unemployment.

b) Factors common to new university subjects.

In the second place, there were factors common to all new university subjects, for example, the natural resistance by existing members of university faculties to the allocation of resources to new and untried subjects⁵ when their own were in need of support (and the economic

situation mentioned above, naturally exacerbated this resistance).

c) Factors common to new social science subjects.

In the third place, there were factors common to the new social science subjects as distinct from those in other academic fields, for example, the fact that the social sciences did not fit tidily into existing faculties or groups of disciplines, their component subjects tending⁶ to be found, some under Arts, and some under Science. (At Birmingham, when social studies were begun there, they suffered from being held partly in the Faculty of Arts and partly in the Faculty of Commerce, the geographical distance between which was some 2½ miles.)⁷ This practical difficulty in allocating a place to the new subjects was reflected in official reports; in its survey of Facilities Available at University Institutions of Great Britain and Ireland in 1936, the Universities Bureau of the British Empire listed the 'chief faculties' as 'Theology, Arts, Law, Science and Medicine' and even the list of 'rogue' subjects (Agriculture, Commerce, Education, Forestry, Technology)⁸ did not include any social science or social studies. It was 1959 before the University Grants Committee gave separately grouped statistics for⁹ the 'Social Studies' subjects, as distinct from Arts.

d) Factors particularly affecting sociology.

In the fourth place, there were factors from which sociology in particular, as a university subject, seems to¹⁰ have suffered, for example, objections to the word ('The mixed Latin and Greek derivation of the word was distasteful to scholars with a classical background'; 'a neologism of

barbarous origin'); misconceptions about its meaning¹¹
(it was equated with socialism, social ameliorism, civics);¹²
and the accusation that it had a messianic approach.
Another explanation frequently put forward, that English
society did not want sociology because sociology would
reveal the intimacies of individual life or turn a
clinical eye on inner mysteries, is more difficult to¹³
substantiate for the period under review. Nevertheless
it is reasonable to suppose that some administrators who,
for example, found it quite natural and acceptable that
poor people should be asked questions about the detailed
nature of their poverty, would have been less willing to
give over their own life-styles to the scrutiny of the
social survey. (In the Report of the Mental Deficiency
Committee in 1929, the results, according to Ginsberg,
were unreliable because the greater proportion of the
'homes not visited' tended to be the 'superior, good or¹⁴
average' homes.) A change in the climate of opinion
did take place - Beveridge, for one, attributed this to
the effect of the war, which had meant that a 'whole series
of experiments in administration' could be carried out
without the need of obtaining public assent on questions¹⁵
of policy - this public assent could be assumed in wartime.
The effect on the collection of social data was even more
marked in the Second Great War, and it was early in those
war years (1941) that the Government Social Survey was
established.

In addition to hostility from outside, there were
vying factions within the community of sociologists. These
factions have been grouped in various ways, for example

as statisticians, social ameliorists, eugenicists, town-
planners, and social evolutionists,¹⁶ or alternatively as
ethical sociologists, racial sociologists, and civics
sociologists.¹⁷ Another problem was the proliferation
of social science schools, and departments in universities,
specifically for the training of social workers; these
departments taught only a modicum of general or theoretical
sociology, yet it caused further confusion in the academic
world when it came to categorising diplomas, certificates
and degrees as being 'sociology' or not. Much time was
spent, in the period under review, both in refuting the
claims of the rival sociological interests (for example,
Ginsberg's article on 'The Claims of Eugenics' written in
1932),¹⁸ and in discussing whether sociology should be
taught to social work students, and if so, how.¹⁹

Changes in intellectual background.

The whole intellectual background of this period was
one of ferment, change, and re-evaluation.²⁰ As Hughes
and others have emphasised, the publication of the works
of Freud and the introduction of the concept of the
unconscious, led to a consideration of the irrational bases
of decision-making; this was a challenge which every
sociologist had to face, and undermined the whole basis of
rationalist ethics. Hobhouse was inclined to dismiss
Freudian psychology as an intellectual fashion which would
not be lasting - as he wrote on a student's essay, 'Why
drag in the unconscious?'²¹ Ginsberg, on the other hand,
in a conference paper in 1937,²² eight years after Hobhouse's
death, attempted to outline the influence of Freudian ideas

on moral psychology, and stressed the importance of studying the origins of moral judgments, in view of events in Europe at that time. This he saw as an urgent task for social psychology. Graham Wallas had earlier faced the problem of the way in which Freud's postulate of the unconscious seemed at first sight to turn upside down the social order based on rational choice and rational social behaviour, which Comte had confidently predicted, and which Hobhouse, from a rather different standpoint, also hoped for. Wallas, in his Human Nature in Politics, and in his LSE lectures to sociology students, had questioned the working of the democratic process on the grounds that voters do not make rational choices in elections - a point of view to be reinforced by later work in political sociology and in psephology.

The First Great War had put an end to facile generalisations about 'progress' in the Tennysonian manner. Logical positivism (Wittgenstein's Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus was first published in Vienna in 1921, and in England in 1922) was challenging the views of the idealist philosophers; the theory of functionalism was being re-stated and elaborated in social anthropology, by Malinowski and Radcliffe-Brown, and Parsons' Structure of Social Action was published in 1937; while in social administration, the debate continued as to how far, and in what ways, the state should be allowed to intervene in the lives of individuals. Ginsberg did his best, in a series of lucid and cogently-argued lectures and articles, to disentangle sociology from attacks and re-evaluations on

all sides, and to show that the ideas of Durkheim, Weber and Hobhouse were valid and fruitful starting-points. His devotion, methodologically, to the comparative method, has been seen as a stumbling-block to progress; he saw it as essential to the development of sociology. Yet, as Znaniecki pointed out in his preface to The Polish Peasant in 1936, this was not the only, nor necessarily the most productive, way of researching and writing sociology, and the importance of the comparative method declined in use in the fifties as statistically more refined survey methods, and the techniques of attitude measurement, began to gain adherents in England.

Social surveys did, it is true, multiply in Britain in the inter-war years. Some, like Carr-Saunders' The Professions, and the work of Caradog Jones at Liverpool, were praised; many were later blamed for being, like Booth's London survey, insufficiently theoretical. Under the impetus of Geddes, Le Play House, and the regional survey movement, they tended to be collections of 'facts, facts, and still more facts', not presented in such a way as to further sociological insight. As John Madge has indicated, ²³ 'the integration of empirical theory, of sophisticated techniques of enquiry, and of the capacity to throw light on practical sociological problems' flourished more strongly in Europe and the United States than it did in England at this time.

'Value-freedom' and changes in social events.

The debate about value-freedom in social science continued in the inter-war years, was further heightened

by the war, and has continued ever since. The Webbs had contended that purpose was not part of social science, and that the 'ought' must be determined by man's own internal values and conscience.²⁴ The rise of Nazism left this view open to the accusation that, taken to its logical conclusion, it could allow the existence of a regime like that of Hitler's Germany.²⁵ The rise of Hitler had another, unlooked-for, effect on sociology in England. Exiled from their native countries in Europe, some scholars came to England to continue their academic careers. It has been argued that, on the one hand, they provided a theoretical stimulus to enliven the 'social book-keeping'²⁶ tradition of British sociology; and on the other hand, that their work and teaching were inimical to radical change because, in their capacity as refugees, they cherished the stability and traditions of the country in which they had made new homes.²⁷ Both views seem to have been based on somewhat selective evidence. Certainly, Karl Mannheim himself felt that once a refugee had achieved 'a very far-reaching assimilation of the traditions of the adopting country', his constructive task did not consist in being a yes-man to everything, but rather (even at the risk of unpopularity) in being a pointer to such developments 'as had been bypassed by the prevailing tradition but which might become relevant in the next phase of development'.²⁸

Some of the effects of the social conditions and events in England and Europe, which formed a background to

the years 1919-1945, have already been mentioned. The depression, for example, led to more emphasis on Social Economics (a paper with this title was introduced in the London BSc Econ sociology option in 1922). Diploma and certificate courses multiplied with the expansion of the social services, brought about both by the special needs of the wars (e.g. special courses for welfare workers in munitions factories)²⁹ and by the government's greater involvement in social problems generally (e.g. courses³⁰ for probation officers). The other major way in which sociological subjects, in particular, mirrored the events in the world, was in their preoccupation with the moral, psychological and sociological problems posed by the rise of Nazism and by the Second Great War. As has already been indicated, social psychology, sociology, and comparative ethics were compelled to grapple with the causes of war, the use of propaganda, and the effects of irrational elements in individual and group behaviour.

Sociology degrees at London University.

It was against this background, then, of intellectual and social upheaval, that an account of the progress of sociology degrees had to be set. Sociology in 1919 at London University still consisted of an option in the London BSc Econ degree; the typical student chose to take the papers in Comparative Social Institutions (CSI), and in (Comparative and Social) Psychology, and also had to take the translations paper. Such a student's study of sociology was confined largely to social evolution, and his

study of social psychology to the somewhat outdated theories of McDougall on the instincts (Hobhouse, for example, recommended McDougall's book on Social Psychology for his students).³¹

By 1939, the last year in this period in which normal degree regulations were in force, a student wishing to study sociology at London University was confronted with a somewhat different situation. In the first place, for women there was a choice of college, Bedford or LSE. In the second place, there was a choice of degree, BA Hons. in Sociology, or BSc Econ with Sociology as the Honours Special Subject. In the third place, the subjects covered (originally three, Sociology, Social Psychology, and Ethnology) had increased in number. The BA now included Social Philosophy, Principles of Method, and options in Social Anthropology, Graeco-Roman or Oriental Civilization, or Modern England (Social and Industrial Development, Contemporary Social Conditions, and Social and Political Theories). The BSc Econ now included Social Economics, and a paper called 'General Sociology' which was more like the 1960s 'Theories and Methods' papers. As many as six finals papers could be on sociology subjects and as few as three on economics. However, neither degree course included compulsory statistics, and the student taking the BA could not offer papers in economics or statistics, even as options.

³²
The BSc Econ was still the more popular degree; it had undergone certain radical changes in the twenty years in question. In 1922, an optional paper on Social

Economics (wages, housing, welfare, unemployment, trade unionism, etc., in contemporary Britain) was added, as has been mentioned, and papers for this subject were first set in 1927. This subject was also to form part of the completely revised scheme for BSc Econ introduced in 1927, and as such it was set every year for which data are available, until 1945. Contemporary Social Conditions in the BA were also part of the finals papers, and together they represented a widening of the scope of London university sociology to include practical contemporary issues.

Proposed changes in the London BSc Economics degree.

In 1926 the Economics Committee of LSE's Professorial Council considered a new proposal for the BSc Econ degree. The curriculum as it stood was felt to be too heavy and too varied; second year economics students typically had an annual load of 242 lecture-hours in compulsory subjects and 69 hours in special subjects, 311 in all (the average minimum for sociology students was about 290).³³ It was proposed that only Principles of Economics, Banking and Currency, Economic History, and an Essay paper, should be compulsory in future, and that all other papers should be chosen from a very wide range of options (Sociology being one). It was decided to retain the language paper, but to allow dictionaries, and to add Italian as one of the permitted languages.

A further discussion took place in 1926. Students, it was alleged, were forced to cram instead of studying their special subject in depth; there was no time to go

to original sources or to read at all widely; the system³⁴ was inadvertently encouraging superficiality. A letter³⁵ in Clare Market Review in 1921 had deplored the lack of tutorials at LSE, and Beveridge had set himself to cure this, though the influx of students after the war had led to over-crowding and made things more difficult - for instance in the lack of room space for private interviews. An increase in the number of tutorials had been suggested; what, it was asked by the Economics Committee, was the point of arranging these, if students had such a heavy lecture load that they had no time to prepare for them? Some of the individual subjects being studied (Political and Social Theory and Economic History were given as³⁶ examples) were expanding very rapidly.

The new regulations, introduced in 1927, allowed a BSc Econ student specialising in Sociology to take six papers in sociological subjects, the compulsory three in economics, and the essay paper. In the second year (i.e. the first year devoted to his special subject) he had to take CSI and either Statistical and Scientific Method, or Political and Social Theory. For the rest, he had to take a new paper, 'Theories and Methods of Sociology', the syllabus for which was roughly divided between the history of sociology, sociological theory, and methods, including the comparative method and 'methods employed in investigating contemporary social conditions'.

(The phrase 'theories of social development, arrest and³⁷ decay' which first occurred in this syllabus, was perhaps symptomatic of the decline in the belief in the

inevitability of social progress.)

Two more sociology papers were to be chosen from Social Psychology, Social Economics, Ethnology, and Social Institutions, as before, and the translation paper remained.

The first papers under the new regulations were set in 1930, and in the ten years up to 1939, Ethnology was set only once, Social Psychology five times, the other subjects, every year.

The numbers of students awarded the BSc Econ with Sociology Special Subject are not recorded, since the statistics group all BSc Econ passes together. However, from the data on the numbers of students choosing the sociology option, one can assume that it grew in popularity during the inter-war years. T.H. Marshall stated in 1935 that it drew more sociology students than the BA.

The fact that a timetable of lectures for the BSc Econ sociology option began to be drawn up officially in 1921 must not be taken as too strong an indication that the formal organisation of the degree was a result of growing demand. In spite of the third year attempts at timetabling, in 1925, LSE's Secretary, W.C. Dickinson, wrote to Dr. Eileen Power at Bedford College that printing a timetable for first year and second year students would be, as he put it, a waste of time; 'In view of the fact that the school is so dynamic, and one never knows from one day to another what is going to happen, it is rather impossible a task'.³⁸ The pace at Bedford was apparently slower then, for meticulous timetables were worked out for the BA and the Certificate courses, and the BA courses were timetabled separately.³⁹ If the courses in fact took place as

scheduled, the classes, in some of the early years of the degree, must have been extremely small.

London BA Honours degree in Sociology.

The BA Hons Sociology, first proposed in 1914, delayed by the war, at last appeared in regulations in 1920, and papers were first set in 1925. (The structure appears in Appendix IV.) The most obvious differences between this degree and the BSc Econ were, that no economics or statistical method were included. The 'Principles of Method' paper was, at first, of a philosophical nature, requiring non-numerate answers in continuous prose to such questions as 'Are analogical arguments in social science useful or dangerous?' (1929). However, by 1941 one question, 'Give an account of the methods and findings of one of the major social surveys', foreshadowed the introduction of a more technical statistical approach.

The majority of students who took the BA up to 1945 were women at Bedford; the Modern England option was set every year. The attempt by the Board of Studies to include in the degree, subjects taught by members of the other areas of study represented in the London University Faculty of Arts, failed to attract many students. After an early isolated appearance in 1930 (under Option B(i), An Oriental Civilization), of papers on Ancient Chinese Civilization and Modern Hinduism, Modern England was the only option set until, in 1943, the Ethnology option, 'Some of the Simpler Societies', made a brief appearance. By this time both Bedford and LSE had been evacuated to

Cambridge; the fact that students had the opportunity⁴⁰ of attending Cambridge anthropology lectures, may possibly have influenced some of them in their choice of option.

T.H. Marshall spoke rather disparagingly of the BA in a survey of social science degrees in 1935 - not many students were interested, and they were mostly women who⁴¹ wanted to take up social work. In fact, the BA seems to have been linked with social work or social administration subjects - appointments lists for ex-LSE students, which were published in LSE calendars for a few years during this period, mentioned several holders of the BA Sociology; one became a visitor for the London Mentally Deficients Aid Society; another became Head of the Department of Hygiene and Public Health of Battersea Polytechnic; while⁴² a third taught in a Girls' Trade School in Shoreditch.

The highest number of students to be awarded the BA in Sociology in any one year was nine (in 1941),⁴³ but the yearly average for the 19 years, 1927-1945, was only four, even taking the numbers for LSE and Bedford together.

Marshall mentioned the lack of a paper in the BA like the 'General Sociology' in the BSc Econ, but in fact the 'Principles of Methods' paper for the BA covered rather similar ground, without, however, including the history of sociology. Ginsberg mentioned that they had not had a free hand in the designing of the BA degree.⁴⁴ This was partly due to the administrative structure of London University at this time, which may be partially illustrated by a correspondence which took place when Miss Tuke,

Principal of Bedford College, in 1925 first proposed that Bedford lecturers should participate in the teaching for the degree. Although, in the early days, the Senate had made LSE the centre for sociology, students of degrees which included academic subjects not covered by LSE's lectures, had to go to other London colleges for lectures, by 'intercollegiate arrangements'. These arrangements operated, to a greater or lesser extent, between all constituent colleges of London University, for some time, and meant that, for example, UCL or King's would agree to teach LSE students classical history, and LSE in turn would teach their students economic history. The Senate asked the constituent colleges not to duplicate courses unnecessarily, so that each could develop special areas of teaching. (Naturally, there had to be some financial adjustment of students' fees to take account of the intercollegiate arrangements.)

Miss Tuke's suggestion was that Bedford's lecturers in Psychology, Philosophy and Economic History should, between them, cover most of the BA papers, and that her⁴⁵ students should come to LSE for the remaining courses. King's College was brought into the discussion, and in 1925 a meeting took place between representatives of the three colleges. King's went so far as to send a timetable⁴⁶ of lectures, chiefly in history and philosophy, which they could provide for the Sociology BA, but, in the event, their teaching for this degree did not develop. At Bedford, on the other hand, sociology developed more strongly, and H.A. Mess was appointed Reader in Sociology

in 1935. Bedford's and LSE's lecturers jointly formed the University of London Board of Studies in Sociology, and shared the lecturing and examining, and in the 1960s they were still the two main centres for sociology at London University, with Goldsmith's College beginning to emerge as a third centre, and Regent Street Polytechnic for the external degree.

Bedford and LSE organised their BA Sociology lecture courses differently: at LSE, the 'professional' sociologists provided the core lectures, and students went for other subjects to specialist lectures primarily intended for students reading for other degrees. At Bedford, there were no sociologists as such, but the specialists lectured on the sociological aspects of their subjects in courses specifically designed for the BA papers. In T.H. Marshall's opinion, the latter situation was more conducive to an integration of the various areas of knowledge included in the degree.⁴⁷

(The LSE situation where the audience for many of the lectures was composed of students reading for different degrees, or for different branches of the same degree, continued into the 1970s, when the introduction of the course-unit degree structure for sociology somewhat altered the basis of the distribution of students at lectures according to degree subjects.)

There were now three categories of subjects for the London sociology degrees: first, those common to both degrees, and with identical titles; second, those whose subject-matter was common to both degrees, but which had

different titles; and third, those which appeared in one degree or the other, but not in both.

1. Subjects common to both BA and BSc Econ degrees.

1a) Social Institutions.

In the first category, Social Institutions was still a core subject for both degrees. It was, in effect, allotted two papers both in the BA and in the BSc Econ. The BA course included a discussion of the theories of social evolution (Hobhouse had drafted a new paper under the heading 'Theory of Social Development' in about 1926,⁴⁸ but it never appeared in regulations). It has been suggested that, after Hobhouse's death in 1929, the study of social evolution became very much less influential⁴⁹ in British sociology, but the fact that it continued at LSE is obvious, from the examination questions set in the ten years after Hobhouse's death, and the emphasis in this course remained very much the same, Ginsberg continuing the Hobhouse tradition. T.H. Marshall was a key figure in the development of one subject which was to become a universal component of Social Institutions courses, namely social class and social stratification. He approached the subject in the first place, as his academic training dictated, as a historian (Citizenship and Social Class), but he brought to it a closely analytical treatment, and with the further elaboration of the subject, history tended to give way to theoretical analysis; in 1946 it formed a separate lecture course with⁵⁰ a reading list of 37 items, ranging from de Tocqueville, to American surveys such as those by Warner and Lunt, and

Dollard's Class and Caste in a Southern Town.

A conference under the auspices of Le Play House had been held on the subject in 1937, and a report on it, published in 1938, was included in Marshall's booklist along with Veblen's Leisure Class and Sorokin's Social⁵¹ Mobility.

The swing of emphasis in the LSE Social Institutions courses in the thirties was away from primitive societies to a wider spectrum; the inclusion of more American works in booklists was noticeable. Marshall wrote in 1962 that he could not remember what had led him to choose social stratification, as it was not so popular at the time when he began developing his interest as it had since become;⁵² however, it was one of the key areas of the study of society which was not covered by any of the established social science disciplines.

1b) Social Psychology.

A second subject shared by the two degrees was Social Psychology. Here, Ginsberg had contributed fundamentally to the development of the subject, and students had to take the course in general psychology before proceeding to Ginsberg's more advanced and specialised class. While McDougall's Introduction to Social Psychology was still prescribed, it was accompanied on the booklists by Freud (Group Psychology and Analysis of the Ego), Flugel (Man, Morals and Society), and Ginsberg's⁵³ own The psychology of Society. Robert Thouless had produced a textbook specifically for the Psychology paper in the BSc Econ Sociology option, published in 1925; in⁵⁴ 1937 this was revised and extended. Ginsberg had continued Hobhouse's coverage of both sociology and psychology, but the Psychology Department had been strengthened by the appointment of D.W. Harding in 1933 (at first as Assistant

in the Sociology Department); J.W. Blackburn, in the Psychology Department, also lectured to sociology students. Hilde Himmelweit, later to hold the first chair of Social Psychology in England (at LSE), lectured at LSE about this time, after having studied psychology at Cambridge (and 'found it boring').⁵⁵ In 1936 Sir Ernest Barker, at the second conference on 'The Social Sciences: Their Relations in Theory and in Teaching', said that social psychology founded on the 'tabulation of instincts' theory (i.e. McDougall), without considering interaction, was now considered jejune.⁵⁶ Social psychology was beginning to find itself as a subject during the inter-war period, and received stimulus from the enquiries undertaken both in England and in the USA during the war (e.g. the American Soldier series).

2. Subjects named differently in BA and BSc Econ but having subject-matter in common.

The second group of subjects, although not similarly titled in examination papers in the two sociology degrees, nevertheless covered areas of knowledge common to both.

2a) Political and Social Theory, and Social and Political Theories in the Modern Britain option.

First, the Political and Social Theory of the BSc Econ was matched by the BA Modern England option paper on Social and Political Theories. A comparison of the examination questions and booklists reveals that the students had been studying the theories of, among others, Bentham, Mill, Locke and T.H. Green, and questions on socialism and communism were also set. Of the many lectures given at LSE on various aspects of political

theory, Laski's on Political and Social Theory were recommended both for BSc Econ and for BA Sociology students. The lecture syllabus stated: 'This course deals with the place of the state and power in modern society, and the relationship between the individual citizen and the social and political processes in which he is involved'.⁵⁷ Laski, whose name also appears at the head of the examination papers for this subject, in the sociology degrees, in the majority of the years in which they were set, prescribed two books by sociologists for his students, Hobhouse's Elements of Social Justice and MacIver's The Modern State (in addition to his own Grammar of Politics and Hayek's The Road to Serfdom.⁵⁸

However, the specific way in which the subjects of politics and sociology were to develop in relation to each other had yet to be defined. In 1918, the Martin White Benefaction Committee, in asking the President of the Board of Education to finance a part-time Assistant in Sociology, had suggested that it was in this area that he might work, developing the subject of the history of political ideas by 'eliciting inductively from the institutions of an age the ideas implicitly ruling man's mind', and that his lectures would be expected to 'apply this method to recent and contemporary history, disentangling for students the main problems they will have to face as citizens and the main approaches to them.'⁵⁹

This somewhat ill-defined area of study did not materialise in the twenties as a bridging subject between sociology and political science, and, in the event, it was partly in studies of voting behaviour that political

sociology began to make a new contribution in the fifties, while, as early as 1946, D.G. MacRae was lecturing to LSE students on 'An Introduction to the Sociology of Political Parties' with a booklist which included Michels, Ostrogorsky, and Schumpeter's Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy, and with the promised suggestions, for further reading, of studies of particular parties.⁶⁰ The more psychological approach, foreshadowed by Lasswell's Psychopathology and Politics in 1930, and treated with greatly more sophisticated methodological technique in Adorno's Authoritarian Personality, which appeared in 1950 and aroused great attention, did not, however, lead to further development of this aspect of political sociology in London sociology courses, and between 1919 and 1945, the more philosophical and economic aspects of political theory were emphasised.

2b) Social Economics, and Contemporary Social Conditions.

A second subject common to both London sociology degrees, although named differently, was the subject called Social Economics in the BSc Econ, which covered much the same ground as Contemporary Social Conditions under the Modern Britain option in the BA Sociology; and the same lectures were recommended for both courses. The examination questions corresponded closely to those set in papers in other universities during this period, for example, papers such as 'Labour and Social Conditions and Problems of Social Welfare' (Cambridge Ordinary BA); 'Social Problems' (Cambridge Economics Tripos); 'Existing Methods of Dealing with Social Problems' (London Academic Diploma in Sociology); 'The History and Treatment of Pauperism' (Oxford Diploma in Economics and Political Science);

'Population, Poverty and Unemployment' (Liverpool BA in Social Science); 'Social Economics' (Manchester BA Administration and BA Commerce). In the years of the depression it was impossible for students of these subjects not to be involved in social policy, and many of the questions were asking for the student's opinion on what were partly political decisions: 'How far can the problem of poverty be successfully dealt with by schemes of social insurance?' (Cambridge 1929); 'What are the various senses in which it has been suggested that industry should be made more democratic? How far do you consider any such change to be desirable?' (Cambridge 1935); 'Would the introduction of a 40-hour week diminish unemployment?' (London 1935); and 'How is the Ministry of Labour's cost of living index constructed? Does it need revising?' (London 1931). Sociology students who took the Social Economics paper were obviously not expected to adhere to defining the facts and keeping aloof from questions of policy. Marshall was critical of the subject of Social Economics at Cambridge for this very reason. He did not feel that students should be called upon to evaluate policies, and described the subject as 'an unorganised combination of descriptions with both economic and social analysis and a dash of ethical judgment'. His criticism might with equal justice have been levelled at the London BSc Econ paper, for some of the examination questions were virtually identical.

Hugh Gaitskell, who lectured in, and examined for, Social Economics at LSE, blamed the deficiencies of the paper (which he apparently accepted at Marshall's evaluation)

on the underdeveloped state of sociology. Social economics, it seemed to him, should have dealt with the relationship between economic and other social phenomena, but it could not be taught in that way, because the development of economics and sociology as disciplines was so unevenly balanced.⁶² There was some validity in this criticism, and it may explain why the subject fell back on emphatic problem-orientation; there was so severe a lack of analytical social theory which could suitably be applied to these issues, that one was more or less forced to approach them from the social problem angle. This is not to say that other lecturers would not have been prepared to defend this approach in any case; but it was open to the accusation that Chapman of Manchester had made, about courses which purported to teach students what to think, rather than how to think.

2c) Principles of Methods, and Theories and Methods.

A third subject differently named in BSc and BA courses was sociological theory, which was studied, in London university courses, parallel to the study of method. (In 1967, when the British Sociological Association Teachers' Section conducted a survey of university Theory and Methods courses, of the 24 English universities which replied, five, including LSE, still combined Theories and Methods⁶³ under one heading in a course title, and a case had been made out for not separating them - methods were of no use without a sound basis in theory, while theories were barren without some knowledge of techniques by which they could be verified.)

Principles of Methods (in the BA Sociology) began by concentrating on the area of abstract logic behind the

formation of theory and the application of method. 'In what ways,' students were asked in the first paper, 'does the pursuit of sociological enquiry necessarily raise philosophical questions?' (1925). There were references to Comte, but no other sociologist's name appeared on an examination paper until 1941, when a question referred to Durkheim's methods in his investigation of the social results of the division of labour. In 1933, students were asked to 'discuss the nature of statistical correlations', but this seems to have been an isolated instance of a reference to a specific statistical method. Interestingly, in 1942 the students were asked to 'suggest ways in which legislators and administrators might use the knowledge and services of sociologists'.

The Theories and Methods paper for the BSc Econ had a somewhat different emphasis, although Ginsberg examined for both papers after Hobhouse's death, and for many years Hector Hetherington, Professor in Social Philosophy at the University of Glasgow, acted as external examiner, also for both papers. In the first year in which the Theories and Methods paper was set, students were asked, for example, to assess the adequacy of Comte's Law of the Three Stages, and also to 'outline the method by which Hobhouse sought to establish the correlation between mental and social development' (1930) - a rapid and irrevocable way of having one's memory assigned to posterity, by being mentioned, a year after one's death, in the past tense in an examination paper. In 1931, students were asked to comment on the scope and methods of Social Biology, and one or two questions on some aspect of eugenics occurred, on average, in each paper in the BA Principles of Method,

and a specific question on the Eugenics Movement was set every few years in the Theories and Methods paper. More detailed statistical questions now began to appear in the BSc Econ paper: 'Discuss the dangers which may arise from the use of crude mortality figures in sociological enquiries' (1933); 'How far can quantitative methods be used in studying the relation between economic conditions and social and political institutions?' (1934). In 1935, Simmel and Pareto were first mentioned, while Weber's name appeared in 1940. The impression was that non-quantitative subjects predominated, and that theory took precedence over method in the syllabus.

2a) Ethnology (Social Anthropology).

Anthropology (still called Ethnology on the examination paper headings) occupied a small place in both sociology degrees. It was seldom set as an option, but, as has been indicated, its development was affecting sociology fundamentally, although the full implications of these developments did not become apparent and widely discussed until the 1950s. The anthropology team at LSE consisted of Seligman and later Malinowski, and they were joined by Audrey Richards, who had begun lecturing at LSE in 1934.

3. Subjects included in the BSc Econ but not in the BA Sociology.

The third category of subjects was those which occurred in one degree or the other but not in both.

3a) Translation paper.

In the BSc Econ, sociology students had to complete the translation paper. The strangest fact about this

paper was that it occurred in the BSc and not in the BA, the one respect in which the BSc was more like an arts degree than the degree in the Arts Faculty.

3b) Economics papers and the Essay paper, and the optional statistics paper.

In the BSc Econ, sociology students also had to take the three compulsory economics papers, which had no counterpart in the BA, although some of the Economic History ground was covered by the Social and Industrial Development paper in the BA Modern England option. The essay was on general subjects, and need not be discussed here. However, it was possible, although not essential, for BSc Econ students to take Statistics and Scientific Method as one of their alternative subjects in the second year. No comparable paper appeared in the BA.

4. Subjects included in the BA Sociology but not in the BSc Economics.

In the BA, on the other hand, there were six subject areas not covered in the BSc Econ. The first four of these were derived from the category 'Descriptive Sociology' in the 1905 scheme (An Oriental Civilization, Graeco-Roman Civilization, Civilization of the Middle Ages, A Modern Community), and since they were seldom, if ever, set, will not be discussed in more detail here.

4a) Social and Industrial Development.

The fifth was Social and Industrial Development under the Modern England option. An idea of the scope of this paper can best be given by the following list of subjects from the first examination paper set (in 1925): the

industrial revolution, enclosures, the Poor Law in 1834, nineteenth century factory legislation, capitalism 1860-1890, trade unions 1880-1914, protection, public health and public education in 1848 and in 1900-1920, and a question on 'the influence on social thought, movements or policy of one of the following: Adam Smith, Robert Owen, Karl Marx, J.S. Mill, Thomas Carlyle, John Ruskin'. Subsequent papers included questions on subsidised housing (1927), cooperatives (1941), and the history of the women's movement (1941).

The paper was set every year from 1925-1945 except in 1928, and the examiners included, at various times, Laski, Tawney, Carr-Saunders, Marshall, and C.S. Lloyd, from LSE, and Helena Reid, Gertrude Williams and Ivy Pinchbeck from Bedford, and, during the war years, H.L. Beales (appointed Reader at London University in Social Developments in Modern England, in 1937) and Ellinor Black, lecturer in Social Science at the University of Liverpool.

4b) Social Philosophy.

The sixth subject taught in the BA Sociology but not in the BSc Econ Sociology special option, was Social Philosophy. There had been some attempt to allow sociology specialists to take this as an Alternative Subject in the BSc Econ (students specialising in certain other subjects could take it), but it was decided that it was too much like the Social Institutions paper. In the BA, on the other hand, it was a common core subject and was allotted extra examination time (two papers, one on Ethics, and one on Social Philosophy in general). The

changes which took place in the teaching of this subject up to 1945, are difficult to define. It had the oldest history of all the subjects in the degree, as a university discipline, and the subject area had already been covered at LSE by the paper called 'Comparative Ethics and Social Philosophy', which had been compulsory for the BA Hons Philosophy since as early as 1910. The questions ranged from freedom of will to the 'group mind', from Aristotle to Kant and J.S. Mill, from evolution and intuitionism, to ethical universalism (1929) and Fascism (1941). Ginsberg, in 1946, included Urwick's Social Good, Lairhead and Hetherington's Social Purpose, and Hobhouse's Elements of Social Justice, in his list of recommended books, and he had himself, of course, written a number of articles on social philosophy (including one on its place as a university subject) which were eventually collected and published in volume form in the 1950s. In an paper to Section L of the British Association in 1937, Ginsberg had urged the inclusion of courses in social philosophy, and more particularly in ethics, in social science university courses. He felt that students lacked the powers of philosophical analysis to deal with the problems of ends and means in economics and in political science, and that their lack of training in ethics meant that they were confused by problems such as the relation between the good of the nation and the good of its constituent members, or, in economics, which ends should be chosen, towards the attainment of which, efficient economic means should be devised? Ginsberg recognised that philosophy was taught in PPE at Oxford, but

could not find any evidence that the relations between the three subjects were investigated in the Oxford course. Ginsberg's view was, that fact and value should by all means be kept distinct, but that the relationship between them should form part of the subject-matter of social science degree courses.

Ginsberg was one examiner for the Social Philosophy papers; the other was Susan Stebbing, who had been Reader in Philosophy at London University since 1924, and had been given a chair in 1933. Her special area was logical analysis, and she had written on logic, semantics, and the philosophy of science (including Thinking to Some Purpose, published in 1939). Her lectures were probably, therefore, particularly useful in Ginsberg's first area of concern, that of the ability of students adequately to distinguish between questions of fact and questions of value. In addition to lecturing for the Social Philosophy and Principles of Method papers at Bedford, Professor Stebbing was also a member of the London University Board of Studies in Sociology.

Other subject areas. a) Social Biology.

Other areas of sociology were being developed at LSE up to 1945 without being included as separately titled papers in degree courses. One of these was Social Biology; the establishment of this chair was the brain-child of Beveridge, and there is evidence of disagreement as to the desirability of introducing and emphasising this subject area. Hobhouse, in particular, was at pains to correct the impression, which he felt had been given, that the

sociology teaching at the school had been somehow inadequate up to 1929, when the appointment of Hogben to the newly-⁶⁵ established chair of Social Biology was proposed.

Beveridge's underlying aim was to link sociology more strongly to its bases in the natural sciences; it was, however, in its links with statistical probability and sampling theory in general, rather than with genetic statistics in particular, that the 'scientific' emphasis in sociology was to develop in universities. In the event, Hogben left London in 1937 to occupy the Chair of Zoology in the University of Birmingham, and the London chair was allowed to lapse.

b) Demography.

Demography was developing at LSE during the latter inter-war years, particularly after the appointment of Alexander Carr-Saunders as Director in 1937. Demography was included in the BA Sociology degree from the 1950s onwards, and the development of the subject was largely due to the appointment of David Glass to the Population Research Unit, which was financed by a grant from the Laura Speller Rockefeller Memorial Trust. In fact it was during the inter-war period that the social sciences at LSE began to attract US financial backing, and it was a trust-inspired report in 1937, on the progress made in the previous seven years, which revealed the extent of expansion at LSE in terms of staff and other facilities.⁶⁶

Sociology at the University of Liverpool.

Sociology had made little headway outside London. The BA Honours degree in Social Science at Liverpool University first appeared in regulations in 1926. The School of Social Science had been established in 1917,

and the Charles Booth Chair of Social Science was founded in 1922, endowed by Messrs Alfred Booth and Company Limited, in Booth's memory. Carr-Saunders first occupied the chair, Caradog Jones lectured on Social Statistics, and Ellinor Black lectured in Social Science. The papers included Social and Industrial Structure and Problems, CSI, Social Philosophy and Psychology (in one paper), and Statistical Methods; one woman graduated in 1928, two in 1929, two in 1930. In 1931 more economics was added; in 1937 the subjects were altered again. Carr-Saunders had left to become Director of LSE, and T.S. Simey, whose Principles of Social Administration had first appeared in 1937, was made Senior Lecturer in Public Administration in 1938, and appointed to the chair vacated by Carr-Saunders, in 1939.

In the preface to his 1937 book, Simey admitted that one fruitful way of looking at social administration was to approach it from the point of view of 'general sociology', with an investigation into the effects of the operation of the social services on social institutions such as the family. Simey, however, confined himself, in this book, to a study of the social services from the administrative or institutional point of view, and, while admitting that this left the subject incompletely treated, did not think that any one person could approach it from all its complex aspects in any reasonable period of time.⁶⁷ The Institute of Public Administration financed the book, but it was later included in sociology courses, and represented an important attempt to investigate the problems of compatibility between state assistance and the democratic principle of

free choice by the individual, and between state policy and individual decisions by local authority administrative officers.

The 1937 structure of the Liverpool degree (see Appendix V) permitted students to specialise either in Social Science (Labour Problems, Social Statistics, Population Problems), or in Political Science (Public Administration, International Relations, British Constitutional History), and some philosophy was introduced. In 1941/2, a paper called 'General Sociology' was first introduced in regulations, and CSI was reinstated as part of the social science option. Throughout the period 1919-1945, languages had to be studied in the first year.

The numbers of candidates awarded the degree continued to be small, although the Liverpool Department was gradually enlarged, and Caradog Jones was made a Reader.

Sociology in the training of social workers.

Sociology continued to occupy a role of varying importance in the training of social workers. Since this training did not then include degree courses, it developed along different lines from the degrees, and the role of sociology became, if anything, progressively less important as social administration began to acquire more status as an academic discipline. Nevertheless, MacIver's Sociology in the Training of Social Workers (1931) was much discussed; the consensus of opinion seemed to be, that sociology could show the social worker a wider perspective against which to set her (or his) case-histories,

and furnish her with theoretical guide-lines for the classification of the many individual situations she encountered in the course of her work. Some social work tutors and lecturers still, however, saw the study of classical sociological theory as a waste of time, as being too remote from everyday problems to be appropriate in a course of social work training, and this view found forceful expression in the fifties.⁶⁸

The Clapham Report described the holders of the few social science chairs in England as being 'chiefly engaged in the training of social workers',⁶⁹ and it was in these social work courses, and (for the university colleges) in preparing students for the external degrees of London University, that the universities of Birmingham, Leeds, Manchester and Bristol, and the University Colleges of Southampton, Exeter, Leicester, and Hull, began, or continued, social science teaching during all or part of the 1919-1945 period. There is little evidence that much teaching of sociology was being carried out, but lecturers such as Southampton's P.J. Ford were achieving basic social survey work.

Conferences and learned journals for social scientists.

The chief actions by which university social scientists began to establish themselves as an academic community in the inter-war years, were the holding of conferences and the publication of two new learned journals, at LSE, Politica and Economica. These, while not, of course, specialising in sociology, afforded an alternative outlet for authors such as Ginsberg and Karl Mannheim, and achieved a respectable intellectual reputation (The Sociological Review,

under the editorial guidance of Alexander Farquharson, did not succeed in maintaining rigorous intellectual standards during this period, and the Eugenics Review, which began publication in 1908, was, from the nature of its field of enquiry, open from the first to a charge of bias and partisanship). Politica ceased publication at the start of the Second Great War, but Economica was re-started in 1946 and continued to be published.

The Institute of Sociology at Le Play House sponsored three conferences on the teaching of the social sciences. The first, although held at Oxford, was shunned by Oxford lecturers, and seems to have been a failure. The second and third, however, in 1935 and 1936 respectively, were attended by members of Oxbridge faculties. The general impression was still, however, one of a struggle to achieve recognition and popularity, and to establish a respectable order of things concerning internal organization of the disciplines in university departments. T.H. Marshall attempted what was probably the first survey of the university teaching of sociology, inter alia, in preparation for the 1935 conference, and with his customary thoroughness attempted to classify the whole bewildering situation. The picture which emerged was, in outline, substantially that described in this chapter so far. The conference came to no very clear conclusions about the action which should be taken in the future, and the second conference, in 1936, while well attended, was not more definite in its plans. The members seemed to be content to follow Wenley's tactics and to allow sociology to infiltrate through subsidiary positions in other departments or degree structures.

Criticisms of the state of social science teaching in England.

The criticisms of the state of social science teaching and research, made by American visitors to England, have already been briefly mentioned. These ranged from Flexner's criticism in 1930 that there were inadequate facilities at Oxford for studying economics, and that LSE students were 'a miscellaneous collection, not, for the most part, students in the university sense',⁷⁰ to Harry Barnes' observation that, apart from London and the provincial universities, English university education aimed 'to prepare one to move easily and urbanelly in formal social circles rather than actually to understand the processes of human society'.⁷¹ Other American observers noted 'an aversion to thinking about human nature in mechanistic terms',⁷² and that sociology in England appeared 'underdeveloped', 'moribund', 'definitely weak'.⁷³ Flexner himself used the term 'frail' of social theory teaching in England in 1930, and felt it should not be asked to bear the practical strain of having to provide guidelines for social policy.⁷⁴ He saw the challenge of social change from the industrial revolution as placing upon the university the duty to 'shelter and develop thinkers, experimenters, inventors, teachers and students, who, without responsibility for action, will explore the phenomena of social life and endeavour to understand them'.⁷⁵ But he did not consider that universities should teach undergraduates the techniques of 'unlearned vocations'⁷⁶ (e.g. social studies for social workers).

Re-thinking about higher education.

The years of the Second Great War saw a re-thinking of the whole purpose of universities and university teaching, to which discussion Flexner had already made his important contribution. The publication, in swift succession, of Sir Richard Livingstone's The Future of Education, the two Redbrick volumes by 'Bruce Truscot', Brian Simon's Student's View of the Universities, and Ortega Y Gasset's The Mission of the University, indicated what seemed to be a growing dissatisfaction with university life (reports such as the 1936 University of Birmingham enquiry into the working of the lecture system,⁷⁷ and the 1921 complaint of LSE students about the inadequacy of provision for tutorials, being seen as straws in the wind). The basic re-thinking of the purpose and structure of higher education, which lay behind these books and reports, was both a symptom of a more sociological approach to higher education, and, in the event, a stimulus toward more provision for the study of the social sciences. The demands of the Second Great War had revealed that the facilities for social research in the country were inadequate. The setting up of the Clapham Committee was one result; the next chapter will examine the increased provision of sociology teaching at universities, and will investigate the period of gradual expansion which ended with the Robbins Committee report in 1963.

Sociology in literature.

Before leaving the period 1919-1945, it may be worth remarking that it was in 1936 that Aldous Huxley published

Eyeless in Gaza, whose central character, Antony Beavis, was, throughout the contemporary sections of the novel, engaged in writing a book entitled Elements of Sociology, and even spent part of the novel writing and discussing chapters of this work; and A.L. Bowley, in 1945, had suggested that 'a method of tracing the growing importance of the School [LSE] would be to find when it became customary in a work of fiction to include a hero or heroine who had studied there'.⁷⁸ There might be some rewards to be gained from an investigation of the relationship between the amount of notice taken of 'sociologist' or 'social science student' as a recognisable role in literature, and the amount of recognition accorded that role in the academic world. There seems to be some ground, at least, for the assumption that 'sociology' was associated with modernity, with breaking with tradition - and these attributes were not those which would have recommended the subject to the academic establishment.

REFERENCES
CHAPTER III.

1. MacRae, D.G., 'The Development of Sociology in Britain', in Ideology and Society, Heinemann, 1961, pp.21-23; Mitchell, D.G., A Hundred Years of Sociology, Duckworth, 1968, pp.220-223; Shils, E., 'The Calling of Sociology', in Parson, T. et al., (eds.), Theories of Society, Free Press, New York, 1961, p. 1407.
2. Beveridge, W., 'The Place of the Social Sciences in Human Knowledge', Politica, Vol.II, 1936/7, pp.461,468; Committee on the Provision for Social and Economic Research, Report, Cmd. 6868 (The Clapham Report), HMSO, 1946, p.8 (quoting 'the holder of one of the chairs of social science'); Shils, E., op.cit., p.1407; Address to the meeting of the British Federation of University Women, Sociological Review, Vol. XXII, 1930, p.144.
3. Barnes, Harry E., 'The Fate of Sociology in England', Publications of the American Sociological Society, Vol. XXI, 1927, p.46; Flexner, Abraham, Universities, English, American, German, O.U.P., New York, 1930, p.14; Harper, Ernest B., 'Sociology in England', Social Forces, Vol.XI, no.3, 1933, pp.335-342.
4. London School of Economics, 'Director's Report for the Year 1936/7, in Calendar 1937/8, p.12.
5. Beveridge, W., The London School of Economics and its Problems, 1919-1937, Allen and Unwin, 1960, p.81.
6. Fawcett, C.W., 'Faculty Organisation and First Degrees', University Bulletin, Vol. III, no.3, 1924, p.25.
7. Marshall, T.H., 'Report on the Teaching of the Social Sciences at British Universities', in Institute of Sociology, The Social Sciences: Their Relations in Theory and in Teaching, Report of a Conference held under the joint auspices of the Institute of Sociology and the International Student Service (British Committee), London, September 1935, Le Play House Press, 1936, p.35.
8. Universities Bureau of the British Empire, Facilities Available at University Institutions of Great Britain and Ireland, London, 1936, p.10.
9. Universities Grants Committee, Returns from Universities and University Colleges in receipt of Treasury Grant, Academic Year 1959/60, Cmd. 1489, HMSO, 1961.
10. Palmer, Vivien M., 'An American's Impression of Sociology in Great Britain', Sociological Review, Vol XIX, 1927, p.359; Address to British Federation of University Women, Sociological Review, Vol. XXII, 1930, p.144.
11. Branford, Victor, Interpretations and Forecasts, Duckworth, 1914, p.34; MacRae, D.G., 'Between Science and the Arts', in Ideology and Society (above), pp.3,4.

12. Barnes, Harry E., op.cit., p.46.
13. See, however, Andreski, S., Social Sciences as Sorcery, Andre Deutsch, 1972, pp.210,211.
14. Ginsberg, Morris, 'The Claims of Eugenics' (1932), in Essays in Sociology and Social Philosophy, Vol.I, On the Diversity of Morals, Heinemann, 1956, p.292.
15. Beveridge, W., 'Economics as a Liberal Education', Economica, Vol.I, 1920, p.2.
16. Abrams, Philip, The Origins of British Sociology, 1834-1914, University of Chicago Press, 1968.
17. Halliday, R.J., 'The Sociological Movement, the Sociological Society and the Genesis of Academic Sociology in Britain', Sociological Review, NS, Vol. XVI, 1968, pp.3 et seq.
18. Ginsberg, Morris, op.cit.
19. Marshall, T.H., 'The Basic Training for all Types of Social Work', in Leubuscher, Charlotte, (ed.), Training for Social Work, Papers given at the Nuffield College Conference on the Training of Social Workers, Oxford, September 1945, O.U.P., 1946, pp.5-19.
20. Hughes, C.S., Consciousness and Society. The Reorientation of European Social Thought 1890-1930, MacGibbon and Kee, 1959, pp.125 et seq.; Shils, E., op.cit., p.1405.
21. Hobson, J.H., and Ginsberg, Morris, L.T. Hobhouse. His Life and Work, Allen and Unwin, 1931, pp.68,82.
22. Ginsberg, Morris, 'Psychology and Sociology', in Dugdale, J.E., (ed.), Further Papers on the Social Sciences: Their Relations in Theory and in Teaching, Report of a Conference under the auspices of the Institute of Sociology, London, September, 1936, Le Play House Press, 1937, pp.116 et seq.
23. Madge, John, The Origins of Scientific Sociology, Tavistock Publications, 1963, foreword.
24. Webb, Sidney, and Webb, Beatrice, Methods of Social Study, Longmans, 1932, pp.255-9.
25. Simey, T.S., Social Science and Social Purpose, Constable, 1968, p.32.
26. Rex, John, 'Which Path for Sociology?', New Society, no. 210, October 6, 1966, p.530.
27. Anderson, Perry, 'Components of the National Culture', in Cockburn, A., and Blackburn, R., (eds.), Student Power, Penguin Books, 1969.

28. Mannheim, Karl, 'The Function of the Refugee', The New English Weekly, April 19, 1945, p.6.
29. London School of Economics, Archives, Professorial Council Minutes, 1914/18, Set 1, p.68.
30. University of Leeds, Annual Report, 1937/8, p.101.
31. London School of Economics, Calendar, 1918/19, p.60.
32. Marshall, T.H., 'Report on the Teaching of the Social Sciences at British Universities' (above), p.31.
33. London School of Economics, Archives, Economics Committee 1925-1927, Memorandum, 'Curriculum for the Final B.Sc. Economics', February 19, 1925.
34. Ibid., 'Report of Economics Sub-Committee on the Amendment of the Curriculum for the B.Sc. Economics Degree', December 13, 1926, p.2.
35. Clare Market Review, Vol.I, no.3, 1921, p.17.
36. London School of Economics, Archives, Economics Committee 1925-27, Report of Economics Sub-Committee (above), 1926, p.5.
37. University of London, Regulations for Internal Students, 1938/9, p.561.
38. London School of Economics, Archives, Sociology (B.A. with Honours in Sociology) 18 May 1925 - 28 July 1925, File 876, Letter from W.C. Dickinson, Secretary of the London School of Economics, to Dr. Eileen Power, July 29, 1925.
39. Ibid., Letter from E.M. Hayden, Registrar of Bedford College for Women, to W.C. Dickinson, Secretary of the London School of Economics, listing 'B.A. Hons. in Sociology Courses Provided at Bedford College for Women', July 21, 1925.
40. London School of Economics, Prospectus, 1943.
41. Marshall, T.H., op.cit., p.31.
42. London School of Economics, Calendar 1928/9, pp.391, 392; Calendar 1932/3, p.381.
43. Bedford College, Calendar 1939-40, pp.132-152.
44. Ginsberg, Morris, discussion in Marshall, T.H., op.cit., p.55.
45. London School of Economics, Archives, Sociology (B.A. with Honours in Sociology) 18 May 1925 - 28 July 1925, (above), Letter from Miss Tuke, Principal of Bedford College for Women, to Sir William Beveridge, May 18th, 1925.

46. Ibid., Hearnshaw, Professor, King's College, 'Tables of Classes' sent to London School of Economics, June 25, 1925.
47. Marshall, T.H., op.cit., p.32.
48. London School of Economics, Archives, Economics Committee of Professorial Council 1925-1927, (undated duplicated sheet bound with 1926 material).
49. Jobling, R.G., 'The Sociology of Education: A Traditional Theme in General Sociology and Its Relevance for the Study of Universities', paper presented at the British Sociological Association Conference, Durham, April 1970.
50. London School of Economics, Calendar 1946/7, Course No. 506.
51. Ibid.
52. Marshall, T.H., Sociology at the Crossroads and Other Essays, Heinemann, 1963, p.vii.
53. London School of Economics, Calendar 1946/7, Course No. 446.
54. Thouless, R.H., General and Social Psychology, University Tutorial Press, 2nd edn., 1937.
55. Himmelweit, Hilde, 'Teaching Social Psychology to Students of Education and Social Work', in Halmos, P., (ed.), The Teaching of Sociology to Students of Education and Social Work, Sociological Review Monograph No. 4, 1961, p.78.
56. Barker, Sir E., 'Foreword', in Dugdale, J.E., (ed.), op.cit., p.18.
57. London School of Economics, Calendar 1946/7, Course No. 409.
58. Ibid.
59. London School of Economics, Archives, Martin White Benefaction Committee, File 320/17, Letter from the London School of Economics to the President of the Board of Education, December, 1918.
60. London School of Economics, Calendar 1946/7, Course No. 504.
61. Marshall, T.H., 'Report on the Teaching of the Social Sciences at British Universities', (above), p.50.
62. Gaitskell, H., discussion in Marshall, T.H., 'Summary of the Discussion of the Report on the Teaching of the Social Sciences at British Universities' (above), p.57.

63. Peel, J., (ed.), 'Details of Courses Mainly Concerned with Sociological Theory and Methods in 29 British Universities' (duplicated), 15th Conference of Sociology Teachers' Section, British Sociological Association, London, 1968.
64. Ginsberg, Morris, 'Social Science and Philosophy in the Universities', reprinted in Reason and Unreason in Society, Longmans, 1947, pp.122,126.
65. London School of Economics, Archives, Professorial Council, Minutes of Meeting on December 1, 1926.
66. London School of Economics, Review of the Activities and Development of the London School of Economics, 1923-1937, LSE, 1937.
67. Simey, T.S., Principles of Social Administration, O.U.P., 1937, pp.v,vi.
68. Klein, Josephine, 'The Teaching of Sociology', Universities Quarterly, Vol. VII, 1952/3, p.284.
69. Committee on the Provision of Social and Economic Research, Report (above), p.8.
70. Flexner, Abraham, op.cit., pp.241,288.
71. Barnes, Harry E., op.cit., p.46.
72. Palmer, Vivien M., op.cit., p.360.
73. Harper, Ernest B., op.cit., pp.335-342.
74. Flexner, Abraham, op.cit., p.15.
75. Ibid., p.10.
76. Ibid., p.29.
77. University of Birmingham Guild of Undergraduates, Lecture System Enquiry Report, 1936.
78. Bowley, A.L., 'Early Days at LSE' (typescript), 1945, in London School of Economics, LSE: Reminiscences of former students, members of staff and governors, 1922-1947, (unpublished MS collection), p.41.

CHAPTER IV

1946 - 1962. POST-WAR PROGRESS, THE LONDON DEGREES, AND SOCIOLOGY AT THE CIVIC UNIVERSITIES

Post-war expansion.

The years 1946-1962 in England were increasingly affluent, increasingly expansionist. Immediately after the war, there was a sense of making a fresh start, of re-thinking and re-building. In the universities, this was reflected in the return of some staff from their wartime occupations, in new appointments, and in the setting up of committees to reform existing degrees, and to enquire into gaps in the university system which needed filling. Expansion at first took the form of larger numbers of students at existing universities; then the six university colleges were progressively granted charters and became full universities. The establishment of a new university college, North Staffordshire (later Keele University), and, in the early sixties, the appearance on the downs near Brighton of the skeleton of the buildings for the first fully-fledged new university, Sussex, gave a foretaste of the greater post-Robbins expansion.

More money was available for university expenditure, so this restriction on the university progress of newer subjects, like sociology, partially disappeared. Indeed, following the Clapham Report in 1946, the University Grants Committee (UGC) provided earmarked grants for the establishment of lecturing posts and research facilities

specifically in the social sciences. The growing social awareness which followed the war, and the greater participation by government in social provision and social research, might have been expected to stimulate interest in sociology as an academic and career subject. But its expansion in universities was gradual.

The status of sociology.

By 1962 the status of sociology as an academic subject had improved overall. The following statements by sociologists and others, about the status of the subject between 1946 and 1962, although sometimes contradictory, and at first showing awareness of hostility and suspicion, indicated a general feeling, as the period proceeded, that attitudes to sociology were becoming more favourable:

G.D.H. Cole, 1946: 'many of the arts representatives . . . still look down their classical or historical noses at the social studies.'¹

T.H. Marshall, 1946: 'Sociology has not enjoyed too good a reputation in this country and . . . even now . . . is still regarded in some quarters with a certain amount of suspicion.'²

G.D.H. Cole, 1947: 'Great Britain, hitherto, has been the most resistant of all the leading countries to the acceptance of Sociology in any form.'³

Times Literary Supplement reviewer, 1950:

'Sociology is a relatively new discipline and therefore surrounded by an atmosphere of benevolent suspicion, if not of outright disregard.'⁴

Barbara Wootton, 1967, referring to events about 1951: 'In the Sociology Department it was our hope and intention that this investigation Mobility in the Labour Market, Margot Jeffreys, 1954/ should be the first of a series. But we reckoned without the hostility, jealousy and ignorance of our academic colleagues . . . in the end, after a 5 bitter struggle, the research unit was disbanded.'

D.G. MacRae, 1951: 'The three disciplines about which I write [sociology, social anthropology and social psychology] have all suffered from neglect, suspicion, and indeed, opposition It is improbable that their time of troubles is yet over.'⁶

Asher Tropp, 1956: 'There was concern at the suspicion of sociology and sociologists, still to be found in certain academic quarters.'⁷

D.G. MacRae, 1957: 'sociology has become a magic word. To all sorts of people, some of them eminently respectable, others shady and bogus enough, we are thought of as thaumaturgists, possessors of an arcane wisdom. The name of sociology, if not always its content, is in fashion.'⁸

D.G. MacRae, 1957: 'We are in too many institutions [i.e. universities] marginal men, and even where we are accepted we are not, I think, necessarily loved. Our prestige - and I speak now of pure sociologists - is neither as high as that of our anthropological colleagues nor, in many cases, as that of the social administrators.'⁸

K. Kelsall, 1960: 'the warden of an Oxford college remarked "I suppose you call yourself a sociologist." [I realised] the enormity of the crime I had committed in leaving the safe haven of the established disciplines of history and economics for the uncharted and disreputable waters of sociology.'⁹

D.G. MacRae, 1960: 'It seems as though sociology has arrived. What was a few years ago a term of abuse, ridicule or contempt is now a word of virtue and of power.'¹⁰

A.H. Halsey, 1961: 'In our own day the appeal of sociology is transformed. Well entrenched in the universities and prominently treated in the quality newspapers, sociology has become a major form of intellectual excitement since World War II.'¹¹

D.V. Donnison, 1962: 'Are we [lecturers in social administration] merely a bunch of ex-economists, political scientists and historians, would-be psychologists, philosophers and sociologists, who could be better employed in the purer atmosphere of these major disciplines?'¹²

Alan Little, 1963: 'Two things stand out in British sociology over the past two decades; it has become "accepted" and it has expanded.'¹³

Government measures, and the setting up of other organisations, affecting social science education.

In 1944 the Education Act had brought secondary education within reach of a larger number of children. The substitution of the General Certificate of Education 'O' and 'A' levels, for School Certificate, proposed in 1948, became effective in 1951. The post-war 'bulge' of students, and the continuance of National Service, increased both the numbers and the average age of the student body. Entrance to university was regularised by the setting up of the Universities Central Council on Admissions (UCCA) in 1961, and the Robbins Committee on Higher Education, formed in that year, began to gather evidence.

These were events affecting all university education. Others specifically affected the status of the social sciences. In 1946 the Scarborough Report recommended the setting up in British universities of Centres for the study of Slav, African and Asian peoples (e.g. the Centre for African Studies at Leeds). 'The universities,' advised the report, 'should interpret to the British people the whole way of life of these people, not only their languages but their history, geography, economic development and sociology.'¹⁴

In the same year the Devonshire Committee recommended a special course of training for recruits to the Colonial Service. The Colonial Office had already, in 1944, set up a Colonial Social Science Research Council. This mainly influenced the development of social anthropology, and it seems likely that the Devonshire recommendations were taken into consideration when the proposal was made

that a social anthropology branch be included in the London BA/BSc Sociology degree in 1951.

The number of social science research institutes and research organisations increased by 1962. The National Institute for Economic and Social Research had been set up in 1938 (their secretary complained in 1948 that even first¹⁵ class honours sociology graduates had no idea of research methods). In 1941 the Government Social Survey was established; in 1943 the Nuffield Foundation began to function in Oxford, following the endowment of Nuffield College in 1937 for postgraduate research in Social Studies. Ten years later the Tavistock Institute for Human Relations began work; the Medical Research Council had already been in existence since 1920, and the National Institute of Industrial Psychology since 1925, but the setting up of the Schuster Panel on Human Relations affecting Industrial Productivity, in 1948, under the aegis of the Department of Scientific and Industrial Research (DSIR), reflected an increased interest in industrial psychology and sociology. Industrial sociology became the most frequently offered option in English university degree courses in the 1960s. Such organisations as Political and Economic Planning (PEP), BBC Listener Research, the market research organisations and the opinion polls, were all applying methods of sampling and attitude measurement, which became part of the stuff of research methods courses in sociology which developed between 1946 and 1962.

Centres for Urban Studies and Urban Sociology were founded, e.g. at Birmingham and Liverpool universities, respectively, in 1950 and 1955. In 1954 the Institute

of Community Studies began a long series of research projects on aspects of urban living and other, more general projects. In 1960, the Cambridge Institute of Criminology began teaching and research. These research centres represented disciplines included in sociology degree courses as core subjects or as options.

The United Nations Educational, Social and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) held its first conference in 1946. The university teaching of the social sciences in general formed the subject of its 1951 Conference, and prompted a survey of the progress made in this teaching, in the UK.

Social science journals.

One new, and one resuscitated, sociology journal began publication in the years 1946-1962. The commencement of publication of the Sociological Review in 1904 was, as has been noted, followed by a decline in its intellectual standards in the inter-war years; its difficulties were not at first solved after the war, when the Institute of Sociology (which had replaced the Sociological Society, and had concentrated chiefly on small local surveys, with headquarters at Le Play House, first in London, and then, during the war, in Herefordshire) found itself in difficulties over carrying on publication of the journal. In 1947 Tom Harrisson, co-founder of Mass-Observation, described the Institute as an 'antiquated organisation . . . overdue for overhaul'.¹⁶ In 1953, the Sociological Review was taken over by an editorial board composed of seven professors at the University College of North Staffordshire, who attempted

to restore it to academic respectability. They so far succeeded, that the authors of an analysis of the contributors and contributions to the three main British sociology journals in the years 1950 to 1970 (the third being Sociology, the Journal of the British Sociological Association, which began publication in 1967) could find few striking differences in subject-matter, outlook or origin.¹⁷

In 1950, three professors at LSE, Ginsberg, Glass and Marshall, formed the editorial board for the newly-launched British Journal of Sociology, of which Donald MacRae, then Reader in Sociology at LSE, became first, Review Editor, and later, Managing Editor.

Other subjects which were either core subjects or options in sociology degree courses by 1962, found themselves sufficiently developed as autonomous disciplines to sustain journals after 1946. Population Studies, which began publication in 1946, reflected the influence of the Centre for Population Studies at LSE, and the subject of Demography was given impetus and subject-matter by the publication of the Family Census in 1946 and the Report of the Royal Commission on the Population in 1949. Demography was included as a subject in the London BA/BSc sociology courses from 1951 onwards.

Social Psychology, which had always been a core subject for the London sociology degree, was represented from 1947 onwards by Human Relations, and, from 1962, also by the British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology. The British Journal of Criminology began publication in 1949.

The British Sociological Association.

In addition to research institutes and learned journals, there was a new learned association. In 1953 a group of academics founded the British Sociological Association (BSA) and thus sparked off a controversy, which was to have long-term repercussions, over the nature of the institutionalisation of sociologists as a group of professionals or academicians. The 'search for a role' was becoming more widespread and more articulate as greater numbers of sociology graduates and of sociologists with postgraduate qualifications, emerged from LSE, and from Liverpool and other universities, as the fifties proceeded. Should the BSA be an eclectic organisation like the old Sociological Society? Or should it be a professional, even a qualifying association? All kinds of repercussions stemmed from this: for example, qualified sociologists, anxious that research posts might not be available for them, asked the BSA to set up an enquiry into the employment of sociology graduates. By the end of the first two quinquennia after the war (1956), posts were again scarce as research funds lapsed. David Glass and Max Gluckman, compiling a report in 1961, for the Robbins Committee, on behalf of the recently-formed Sociology Section N of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, appealed for more Clapham-type earmarked grants for social science.¹⁸

Developments in sociological theory.

The BSA, the new journals, the research institutes for positivist research, the progress being made in

fieldwork investigation, and in social psychology, all made their impact on sociology courses. In addition, an inevitable affect on courses in sociological theory was made by the controversy between structural-functionalism and conflict theory, which began to develop during 1946-1962. Merton's and Parsons' work was beginning to be prescribed in courses, and David Lockwood's rejoinder¹⁹ to Parsons in the BJS, in 1956, that the Parsonian theory of social action did not leave room for the emergence of conflict in society, was also put into reading lists. Two other controversies which continued were the one on value-freedom and problem-oriented courses, and the one on strict empiricism in research as opposed to research based on the verstehen approach of Weber and Dilthey. These foreshadowed the appearance, in post-1962 sociology course lists, of topic headings in ethnomethodology and phenomenology. It must also be remembered that Daniel Bell's The End of Ideology, published in 1960, raised issues for sociological theory courses. Marxism, Popper's Poverty of Historicism, neo-Marxism, were all ingredients of the make-up of sociological theory courses in the years 1946-1962.

During the fifties sociology had become more systematic. For the purposes of undergraduate teaching, however, sociology remained an arts subject; discussions about the value of this approach as opposed to the teaching of sociology as though it were a natural science, were heated between 1946 and 1962.

Sociology and social anthropology.

The positions of sociology and social anthropology were

changing in university courses. They had tended to be separated into two distinct specialisms (if, indeed, sociology were considered a specialism) in the years between the wars. The post-war years saw a rapprochement in terms of subject-matter and approach, which was to be embodied in the courses (e.g. at Manchester and Hull) in the sixties, where sociology and social anthropology were taught as one degree subject.

Sociology in English universities in the post-war period.

There was a major difference between the post-war development of sociology, and the progress sociology had made as a university subject from 1907 until 1946.

20
'The old lonely eminence' of LSE had disappeared. By 1962, ten universities in England were teaching sociology for first degrees. For this reason it is not possible, in the space afforded by the length of the present work, to follow in detail the deliberations of all Boards of Studies, or the numerous professorial discussions, which led to the setting-up of the degrees; from this (1946-1962) transitional period onwards, there must be a longer focus, leading to a broader view.

Since there were no major developments in sociology at Oxbridge until the appointments at Cambridge in the sixties, London must be discussed first. The 'snake-like procession' of universities, with the highest in the ranking order at the head and the lowliest university college at the tip of the tail, so graphically described 21 by Riesman for the colleges of the USA, was headed, mutatis mutandis, in England in 1946 for sociology, by LSE, not by Oxford and Cambridge, and developments at

other universities were measured by the isomorphism or otherwise displayed by the degrees at these universities to the archetypal London degree.

The archetypal degrees themselves were undergoing metamorphoses. Some of the reasoning behind these changes is described in a review, later in this chapter, of the discussions on the university teaching of sociology which took place in meetings of Boards of Studies, in lectures, in books and articles, at conferences, between 1946 and 1962. Let it suffice now to describe the bare bones of the changes, and then to pass in review the developments at other English universities, which led to the moderate increase in sociology degree provision which existed by the academic year 1961/2.

English universities already existing in 1946.

The universities fell into two groupings, partly chronological and partly categorical. The first group was composed of English universities, already in existence in 1946, which were providing sociology degree courses by 1961/2. Table IV.1 indicates when these universities first offered degrees in sociology during this period, with the names of the degrees.

English universities granted charters between 1946 and 1962.

The second group consisted of English university colleges which were granted charters between 1946 and 1962, and which taught sociology for a first degree in 1961/2. These are shown in Table IV.2, in the order in which charters were granted.

Table IV.1

English universities already in existence in 1946 which were providing sociology degree courses by 1961/2

University	Date degree first offered 1946-1962	Name of degree
1. London	1946 1951	BSc Economics BA/BSc Sociology
2. Liverpool	1946	BA Social Science
3. Leeds	1956	BA Special in Sociology
4. Birmingham	1946 1949 1953	B Com Hons Social Science B Com (Economics Politics and Sociology) Bachelor of Social Science (Economics Politics and Sociology)
5. Manchester	1946 1957	BA (Admin) BA Econ (Hons Sociology and Social Anthropology)
6. Sheffield	1961	BA Econ (Sociology)

Table IV.2

English university colleges granted charters 1946 - 1962

University	Date charter granted	Name of degree
1. Nottingham	1948	BA Sociology
2. Southampton	1952	BSc Econ (Special Subject Sociology)
3. Hull	1954	BA (Joint Hons.) Sociology/
4. Exeter	1955	BA Hons Social Studies (Sociology)
5. Leicester	1957	BA Special Social Sciences
6. North Staffordshire (Keele)	1962	(Keele was officially a university for only part of the academic year 1961/2)
7. Sussex (plans for the Sussex degrees were being discussed in 1962, but the university was only beginning to admit its first students at about this time)		

English universities already existing in 1946.

1. University of London.

Sociology was still being taught at LSE and at Bedford College for Women. The first degree to be reformed was the BA Sociology. It became BA/BSc Sociology - applicants with no Greek or Latin could not be accepted for the degree under the Arts Faculty regulations, but under those of the Science Faculty, this was now possible. The courses for the two degrees were then, and remained, identical.

The main objections to the old degree course, which had not been changed for thirty years, were that it had no economics and no statistics, and that the courses on Modern England (Social and Industrial Development, Contemporary Social Conditions, and Social and Political Theories) were insufficiently integrated with the rest of the course. The new degree had a three-branched shape (a pattern later copied by other universities). Branch I was mainly pure sociology; Branch II emphasised social anthropology; Branch III emphasised social administration. This shape had been dictated partly by vocational aims. More teachers of sociology were needed in universities, university colleges, and colleges of education and technical colleges, and more people were needed to carry out academic research; Branch I was partly intended to cater for them. Entrants to the Colonial Service with training in Social Anthropology were needed; Branch II was partly intended to cater for them. Branch III, while still satisfying the educational needs of prospective social workers, was also aimed at students who might later want to become social administrators. Branch III, in order to satisfy the professional bodies

employing social workers, also had to include some practical work to make the degree acceptable as a social work qualification.

The students for the new degree had to take subsidiary economics. Completely new papers in Statistical Methods in Social Investigation, Demography, Criminology, and Social Anthropology, were introduced; there were now two papers on Theories and Methods of Sociology, and the title of the Modern England papers was changed to Modern Britain.

In 1950/51, 45 students were studying for the BA at LSE, and 24 for the BSc - a total of 69, slightly more than the 66 studying for the BSc Econ with Sociology as Special Subject, which had previously been by far the more popular degree at LSE.²² In the following year, 61 students were studying for the BSc Soc, 17 men and 19 women in the first year, and 15 men and 10 women in the second year.²³ (The BA had previously been taken by more women than men.)

At Bedford College for Women, there were 6 graduates in Sociology in 1951; but by 1958 there were 23 BSc Sociology graduates, and 2 BA Sociology graduates (total, 25).²⁴ In 1961, there were 16 BA's and 4 BSc's (total, 20).²⁵

The London BSc Economics had also been revised. Now, Elements of Social Structure was compulsory in the first year. In the new Sociology Part II, the papers were: General Sociology (approximating to Theories and Methods); Social Structure; Morals and Religion; Marriage and the Family; Property and Social Class; Political Sociology; Urban Sociology; Social Psychology;

Criminology; Social Philosophy; and Statistics.

(Social Economics was no longer included.)

Many of these subjects were options. Some members of the London Board of Studies in Sociology did not think that the BSc Economics (Special Subject Sociology) was a truly specialist degree in sociology. But of a group of 15 men and women with first degrees at LSE who were lecturing in sociology at English universities in 1962, nine had taken BSc Economics, and six the BA/BSc Sociology.

The departmental structure - a Department of Sociology and a Department of Social Administration - remained the same at LSE. New appointments were made and the number of chairs increased. Ginsberg was still leader of the Department of Sociology in the senior chair, providing a direct link with Hobhouse, the founder. His was a chair of Sociology by name. T.H. Marshall, who returned to LSE in 1946 after service in the Foreign Office during the war, became Professor of Social Institutions, and it was the demographer, D.V. Glass, who took the second chair named Sociology in England, in 1949 (Westermarck's chair, being a personal one, had lapsed with his retirement).

One difficulty in gathering statistics about chairs of sociology was that the naming of the chairs followed no rules. A chair called sociology might in fact be a chair of social anthropology, while a chair of social institutions (e.g. Marshall's at London) might be indistinguishable from a chair of sociology. (In 1967, there were 46 chairs in departments in English universities mainly concerned with courses for sociology

degrees, and there were 14 different names for them.) So it came as no surprise to find that Marshall's inaugural for his chair of social institutions, entitled Sociology at the Crossroads, was an analysis of sociology as a whole. It was in this inaugural that Marshall's often-quoted 'middle way'²⁶ for sociology, between the 'way to the stars'²⁷ of the armchair global theorists and the 'way into the sand'²⁸ of the pin-eyed statisticians, was advocated.

David Glass, in his inaugural, made a plea for better training in research. As the guiding light of the group of postgraduate students at LSE he detected a new wave of enthusiasm. Hogben, working on the development of Social Biology, had been pessimistic; 'A university is a good house for an accredited science. It is not a good lying-in hospital'.²⁹ Glass, who had worked under Hogben and Kuczynski, made demography a successful subject at LSE and it was still a principal option in the BA/BSc and the BSc Econ in the early seventies.

An important newcomer to sociology in London University was Edward Shils, who came over from the University of Chicago and took courses on Research Methods, and on Issues in Contemporary Sociological Theory. His advent marked the introduction of Parsonian theory and of Merton's functionalism into English degree courses, but a few years later, in 1949, when he returned to the USA on leave of absence, discussion of recent American theoretical work lapsed somewhat, at least, it appears, for postgraduates. In 1951, Ronald Fletcher

remembered later, a group of postgraduate students at LSE, of which he was one, complained that they had no instruction in, or discussion of, Parsons' and Shils's work.³⁰

Parsons had had a mixed reception in England. In 1950 W.J.H. Sprott, the Nottingham University Professor of Philosophy who was described as 'a distinguished sociologist'³¹ in the UNESCO 1951 survey, in a review in the British Journal of Sociology, called Parsons'

The Structure of Social Action 'a great dark cavern of a book'.³²

Parsons' lectures as visiting professor at Cambridge in 1953 mystified his audience, which grew smaller in numbers as the term progressed.³³ Yet his books began to appear in England on reading lists for sociology degrees, and, as early as 1953, a Birmingham examination paper, for example, contained the question:³⁴ 'What is a theory of social action?'

Karl Popper's lectures as Professor of Logic and Scientific Method at LSE from 1948 onwards, were recommended for sociology students, and the increasing academic stature of social administration as a discipline, was marked by the appointment of Richard Titmuss and David Donnison to chairs of Social Administration at LSE in 1951 and 1962.

Bedford College, contributing, as it did, women members to the London University Board of Studies in Sociology, had had its say in the reform of the degrees. While the emphasis on social administration at Bedford remained, a strong team was building up, including Barbara Wootton as Professor of Social Studies. O.R. MacGregor, also later to be appointed to a chair, became

a lecturer at Bedford in 1947 and delivered his first course of lectures under the title 'The Structure of Society' (his first degree had been the London BSc Economics). Gertrude Williams was Reader in Social Economics, while H.B. Acton¹ lectured on Social Philosophy and D.H. Harding on Social Psychology. The Bedford records showed a steady rise in the demand for sociology, and an increase in the proportion of degree students to Social Study Diploma students. In 1952 A.R. Ilersic, later to occupy a London University chair of Statistics, was appointed as a lecturer at Bedford, while another future sociology professor, Ronald Fletcher, joined the staff after his postgraduate years at LSE.

London University external degrees in sociology.

From 1946 to 1962 the structure of the external London degrees in sociology closely matched the structure of the internal degrees. The University Colleges of Nottingham, Leicester, Exeter and Hull entered students for these degrees and lectured for them. Indeed, it was in advising a student on his course for the London external examinations that Professor Sprott became aware³⁵ of the ramifications of sociology. However, since the external degrees were not basically different in content from the internal degrees, it has not been considered appropriate to make a separate study of them.

A comparison of the degrees set up, first, in universities which existed independently alongside London, and second, in those universities which only achieved charters after a period of affiliation with London through the external degree system, might have been

expected to show that those universities which had previously taught for external degrees followed London's degree structure more closely in setting up their own. There is no firm evidence of this. It is possible that the staffs of the newly chartered universities felt the need of a break away from the London yoke, while some departments of civic universities independent of London felt secure enough to be justified in emulating the London tradition. All this is conjecture, and would need detailed analysis to prove the point one way or the other, since even examination papers with identical titles could cover different areas of knowledge, and some titles were bureaucratic camouflage (for example, Birmingham's 1946 Philosophy Course III Paper I, was actually a paper on social institutions, the questions on which would have fitted unnoticed into the sociology finals paper on social institutions at London university).

2. University of Liverpool.

To turn now to those universities, other than London, already existing in 1946, Liverpool University had, of course, a Social Science Department dating back some years. T.S. Simey still held the chair of Social Science, but Ellinor Black, one of the pioneers of social work training, left Liverpool in 1949 to become Head of the newly formed Department of Social Studies at Sheffield. The Liverpool department had always had a strong 'social work and social policy' emphasis, with the more theoretical sociology papers never established in the syllabus in the calendars, for long. In 1946, the

BA Hons in Social Science had only optional sociology. In the years 1947 to 1962, however, there was a steady increase in the number of sociology papers in the final examination, until by 1961 the introductory course in Sociology was compulsory for first year students; in Year 2, four sociological subjects formed the compulsory core, and in Year 3 the course on Sociology and Social Policy was compulsory, with one philosophically and theoretically oriented option, and a more empirical option which included criminology.

3. University of Leeds.

The University of Leeds set up a Department of Social Studies in 1946; at first there was only an Ordinary Degree, but in 1948 it became a BA Special (i.e. Honours) and in 1956/7 the degree was re-named BA Special Studies in Sociology 'to give,' as the Annual Report put it, 'outward recognition to the change in emphasis in the course from a pre-vocational course for social workers to an academic course in the social sciences with sociology as its main unifying component'.³⁶

John Rex, who had come with a first degree from South Africa to take a PhD at Leeds, became a lecturer in sociology there in the fifties, and in 1961 published Key Problems in Sociological Theory, a book frequently included in courses on Theory and Methods in the sixties and seventies.

The degree at Leeds was shaped somewhat like the London BA/BSc. In the first year students took a 'mixed bag' of social sciences (economics, sociology, politics, and philosophy or mathematics); after that, the degree could become a sociology degree, with four 'Groups' to

choose from in the Third Year: Social Administration, Political Sociology, Social Anthropology, or Sociological Studies (cf. London's Branch I), respectively. In the first year students had to do a course on 'investigation and assessment of social phenomena'. In the second year, Mathematical Statistics was a compulsory course. There was also a course on Sociology of the Colonies (later re-named Sociology of Developing Countries) organised in conjunction with the Leeds University Centre for African Studies.

4. University of Birmingham.

Birmingham University had instituted a Bachelor of Commerce Honours degree in Social Science, but in 1946 this contained no sociology. The name of the new degree, Bachelor of Social Science (Economics, Politics and Sociology), introduced in 1953, indicated that in the first year, sociology was shared with two other subjects. In the second year the students still had to continue economics, but also had an opportunity to study sociological subjects.

Charles Madge, co-founder with Tom Harrisson of Mass-Observation, had been appointed Professor of Sociology at Birmingham in 1950, and began a course called Ideas in Society (sociology of knowledge) which alternated each year with a course by A.H. Halsey, under the same title, on sociology of education. Charles Madge had not studied sociology as a first degree subject, he had been a poet and journalist, and his sociological experience had been gained as a Research Worker for the NIESR, and PEP, by running Mass-Observation from 1937 onwards, and as Social Development Officer for Stevenage

New Town Corporation from 1947-1949.

Halsey, one of the students who had been in Fletcher's group of sociology London postgraduates, and who was awarded a PhD at LSE in 1954, spent 1956 at the Centre for Advanced Study of Behavioural Sciences in California, before joining the staff at Birmingham as a lecturer in 1957. (Later a senior lecturer, he then moved to Liverpool, before taking up a post as Head of the Department of Social and Administrative Studies at Oxford and becoming a Fellow of Nuffield College, in the sixties.) His book list for a first year course on Sociology in 1959/60 included Kingsley Davis, Merton, Gerth and Mills, Durkheim's Division of Labour, and Radcliffe Brown's Structure and Function in Primitive Society - an early example of a course which drew on American works in emphasising the functionalist approach. There were also, at Birmingham, courses on urban sociology, by Norman Dennis, economic sociology, by W. Baldamus, and a sociology seminar on research methods.

5. University of Manchester.

Manchester had no undergraduate sociology teaching in 1946/7, but the degrees already existing there posed an unusual situation. The BA Administration emphasised public and social administration, and the BA Economics, economics. However, the third vocational branch, social anthropology, developed strongly in the 1950s with the appointment of Max Gluckman, with a first degree from the University of the Witwatersrand, to the chair of anthropology. Where, then, was sociology to be introduced?

Clapham grant appointments went to economics, industrial relations and Polyani's chair of Social Studies (Polyani, Professor of Physical Chemistry, has asked to have his chair converted to Social Studies, and this was achieved in 1948) - there was not enough Clapham money for sociology as well. Eventually a BA Econ in Sociology and Social Anthropology was introduced.

There was also a strong psychology department chaired by T.H. Pear, an early exponent in England of social psychology, who had helped in the writing and editing of The Study of Society,³⁷ a 1939 portmanteau manual of research methods in social psychology, social anthropology and sociology. (This was reprinted many times and used by, for example, Shils, in his booklist for research methods.) Four future professors were at Manchester in the fifties: Donnison, lecturing on social administration; Watson, lecturing on sociology, later to hold a sociology chair at the University of Oklahoma; and Peters and Cunnison in the Social Anthropology Department. Peters was appointed to a second chair in social anthropology at Manchester in 1968; Cunnison became Professor at Hull, where social anthropology and sociology were taught together as an indivisible combination for a single degree.

6. University of Sheffield.

Sheffield University had no social science for degrees in 1946. In 1949 a Faculty of Economic and Social Studies was set up, and in 1960 Keith Kelsall was appointed to the newly founded chair of Sociological Studies. Kelsall's first degree was in History and Political Economy (he had graduated at Glasgow, where no

sociology was then being taught). He had been a lecturer at Hull in the Department of Economics and Commerce, a Senior Research Fellow at LSE, and Director of Studies at Sheffield, before being appointed to the chair. The common first year course of the Sheffield degree was followed by sociology papers which were very like London's, including Sociological Theory and Methods (although in two separate papers), Social Structure of Modern Britain, Comparative Social Structures, Social Statistics, Social Administration, and Applied Sociology.

University of Cambridge.

There was no sociology at Cambridge in 1946, for undergraduates, except as scattered marginal topics in the Economics, Moral Philosophy and Archaeology and Anthropology triposes. During the fifties, however, Cambridge began to invite visiting lecturers in sociology, and to recruit sociology lecturers (John H. Goldthorpe and David Lockwood, who were to publish the Affluent Worker series on the embourgeoisement of the working class, were appointed to Cambridge university lectureships in 1960). In 1961, for the first time, two or three papers on sociological subjects were introduced as options in the Economics tripos. Part II of this tripos normally took two years, and a Preliminary examination at the end of the first year, the results of which were not classed, was recommended. This included an introductory paper to sociology called Concepts and Methods in the Study of Society. In the Final Part II examination, the paper on Economic and Social Relationships was introduced, as the student handbook indicated, to provide

'a bridge between the disciplines of economics and sociology'.³⁸ In 1962 no-one had yet taken the sociology papers in finals (the other two were Social Structure of Advanced Societies, and Political Sociology), but provision had been made in the regulations for the addition of other optional papers in the field of sociology or of politics, after 1962.

This was the beginning of the building up of undergraduate sociology at Cambridge which culminated in the Social and Political Sciences tripos, the introduction of which in 1969 sparked off such a controversy, and revealed a wave of hostility to the subject among Cambridge dons.

University of Oxford.

Although sociology as such was still not taught for undergraduate degrees at Oxford in 1962, the possibility of its introduction had been discussed as early as 1946 by G.D.H. Cole in his inaugural for the chair of Social and Political Theory, and several lecturers were appointed to the Department of Social and Administrative Studies, while Oxford graduates in PPE furnished other universities with sociology lecturers in the sixties.

University colleges granted charters, 1946-1962.

In the established universities, then, sociology was making modest headway. Of the university colleges chartered by 1962, all but one had introduced sociology degrees in some form, and a brief survey of these developments will now be undertaken, in the chronological order in which the charters were granted, as a preliminary

to a summing-up of the general position of core subjects, options, and course content in 1961/2.

1. University of Nottingham.

Nottingham University was chartered in 1948. A degree, BA in Sociology, was then introduced. Part I, taken at the end of the second year, consisted of Theories and Methods, and Social Institutions and Social Structure, in addition to two other social science subjects. Part II, at the end of the third year, included Ethics, Social Philosophy and Social Psychology. W.J.H. Sprott, the Nottingham Professor of Philosophy, had written textbooks both on sociology and on social psychology, and had been an external examiner for the Theories and Methods of Sociology paper of the London BSc Econ examination.

2. University of Southampton.

In Southampton there was a Diploma in Social Studies and a Certificate in Social Work in 1950/51, and there were two lecturers in sociology, but there was no degree course until the sixties; in 1961 it was possible to take sociology as a special subject in the BSc Economics at Southampton, and in 1961/2 a BSc Social Science was introduced in the Department of Sociology and Social Administration. This degree had a general first year, and a Part II in which students studied two subjects for a joint degree. One of the sociology lecturers at Southampton, Maurice Broady, had been awarded a first degree in Social Science at Liverpool in 1952.

3. University of Hull.

Hull university, chartered in 1954, had prepared students for external degrees in sociology as a university college. Sociology was, at first, introduced into the courses for the BSc Economics, and could be taken in three papers out of eight in finals, only a small proportion. Before 1961, these three subjects were: Social Institutions, Sociological Theory and Analysis, and either General or Social Psychology, which were taught in the Psychology Department, or Industrial Relations. In 1961, however, the subjects were changed, psychology and industrial relations were not offered, and instead of the Social Institutions paper, there were two papers called Social Structure of Advanced Societies, and Comparative Social Structures.

It was also possible, in the Hull BA Honours degree, to take Honours in Sociology jointly with another Arts subject. The same courses were taken as for the sociology component of the BSc Econ, but Social Psychology was retained, and Social and Political Philosophy was also taken. Péter Worsley, who had read Social Anthropology at Cambridge, and R.L.C. Chester, who had taken a Certificate in Social Studies at Southampton, and, in 1959, a BSc Econ, were lecturers in Sociology from 1960 onwards (Worsley became senior lecturer in 1961/2). Sociology could also be taken as a special option in the BA Social Studies.

4. University of Exeter.

Exeter's charter was granted in 1955. As a university college Exeter, also, had prepared students for the London

external degree. G. Duncan Mitchell was the Senior Lecturer in charge of Sociology. BA Honours in Sociology could be taken in the Faculty of Social Studies; Part I was common to all courses, but in Part II there were courses on The History of Sociological Thought (Mitchell, who published A Hundred Years of Sociology in 1968, gave the lectures on this subject), Social Psychology, Sociological Development of Modern Britain, Social Administration, Capitalism, Marriage and the Family, and the Institution of Property. All the lecturers in Sociology had first degrees from London.

In 1960/1, when Mitchell was on leave of absence, Professor R. O'Brien was visiting Professor, and was to take courses on Recent Developments in Sociological Method, and Race Relations. More options were offered at Exeter at this time, than at the other younger civic universities. These options included, in 1962, Social Anthropology, Sociology of Education, Social Stratification, Sociology of Religion, Social Mobility, and Demography, with Urban Sociology in alternate years.

5. University of Leicester.

Leicester was granted a charter in 1957. The Sociology Department was, by 1961/2, the largest of any younger civic university, with Ilya Neustadt, with doctorates from Liège and London, as Head of Department, and Norbert Elias, writer of an influential article on ³⁹ 'Problems of Involvement and Detachment' (in social science) as Reader in Sociology. Of the twelve lecturers mentioned in the 1961/2 Calendar, four had first degrees from London, two each from Cambridge and Hull, and one

each from Liverpool, Nottingham, Edinburgh, and the University of the Witwatersrand (Percy Cohen).

The Leicester degree (BA Special in Social Sciences) did not follow the titles of the London papers. The first year was common to all social science subject specialisms, with courses in Economics, Principles of Human Geography, Politics, and Economic and Social History. The Sociology course for Part I, consisted of General Sociology, and Economics or Economic and Social History, or Politics. Part II, taken in the third year, consisted of Theoretical Sociology, Empirical Sociology, or Applied Sociology (two papers each); Social Psychology; and a General Paper. The two papers on either Theoretical or Applied Sociology formed the compulsory core; these were very roughly equivalent to London's Branches I and III of the BA/BSc.

6. University of Keele.

Keele occupied a special position both in the history of English universities, and in the history of sociology courses. Although initially a university college, Keele from the outset devised its own degrees, which were monitored by a panel of external examiners from the universities of Oxford, Manchester and Birmingham.

In addition, also from the outset, Keele students had to take the Foundation Year, common to the whole student body, and compulsorily including both arts and science subjects. After this first year, they were able to take, in the following three years, what amounted to joint degrees. Initially Lindsay of Balliol, the first vice-chancellor of Keele, had planned that sociology should

be a focal subject around which all the others were
grouped.⁴⁰ Somehow this never happened, and, in fact,
sociology did not occupy a prominent place in the design
of the first degrees.

Apart from this, Keele fell, strictly speaking,
outside the scope of the years covered in this section,
since her charter was granted during the academic year
1961/2. In the University College prospectus for
1961/2, there was no separate listing of staff under
sociology; Paul Halmos, for example, who was editing
the Sociological Review Monographs, was listed under
Psychology.

There was a 'Degree with a Diploma in Social Studies'
which was a combination of a degree course with a social
work qualification, and Mary Glover was Director of
Social Service Training.

7. University of Sussex.

Before summing up the state of sociology courses in
1962, mention should be made of plans already in progress
for the degree courses at Sussex. Asa Briggs wrote that
sociology would be introduced in a contextual system of
subject groupings, and social studies would be made the
lynch-pin on which some degree courses would turn.⁴¹
However, actual courses did not begin at Sussex until
1962/3.

Compulsory Core Subjects in Sociology degrees, 1962.

In 1962, the most common compulsory core subjects
for sociology at English universities were:

1. Sociological Theory and Methods.
2. Statistical Methods in Social Investigation.
3. (Comparative) Social Institutions.

4. Social Structure of Modern Britain.

5. Social Psychology.

Economics was nearly always studied by sociology degree students, either as an integral part of their degree course, or as a subsidiary subject. Social Philosophy was compulsory in the BA/BSc at London, and in some other degrees.

Optional subjects in sociology degrees, 1962.

The options most commonly offered were Social Administration, Social Anthropology, Social Stratification, Industrial Sociology, Demography, and Criminology, but others, including Sociology of the Family, Sociology of Religion, Sociology of Education, Political Sociology and Urban Sociology, were beginning to be introduced.

Movements of sociology teaching staff.

Certain general trends can be discerned in movements of sociology teaching staff between 1946 and 1962. Graduates of LSE who became university lecturers in sociology tended to obtain appointments either at their own college, or at civic universities. The latter, and the newly chartered younger civic universities, continued to recruit some Oxbridge graduates who, by the nature of things, had not studied for a first degree in sociology, although it became more the rule than the exception that lecturers in sociology should have a PhD or other higher degree. There was a further intake of lecturers from the Commonwealth (e.g. John Rex, Max Gluckman, Percy Cohen) and from Europe (e.g. Ilya Neustadt, Karl Popper, Stanislaw Andreski).

Many of the lecturers of this time were to be

appointed to chairs in the next decade, when the most noticeable change was in the first degree subjects of the holders of sociology chairs. There was a difference here between social anthropology and sociology. Holders of chairs in social anthropology tended to have first degrees in that subject, whereas of the professors of sociology already existing or appointed between 1946 and 1962, none had a first degree called sociology. Kelsall and Marshall were historians; Glass had a BSc Econ from LSE; Ginsberg was a philosopher; Madge's first degree was at Cambridge in the thirties; Polanyi was a chemist. Yet, like Bowley with statistics in the 1910s, they were 'making the subject'.

Methods of teaching sociology.

During the years from 1946-1962, arguments continued on how sociology should be taught at university. First, how were new degrees in sociology to be introduced? G.D.H. Cole thought sociology should only be introduced, if at all, at English universities, slowly and tentatively, because there was hardly anyone available, or being trained, to teach it'⁴² (he was writing in 1948) except under Ginsberg at LSE. If it were to be introduced at Oxford, where he then held the chair of Social and Political Institutions, it should be as an option for Modern Greats (PPE).

Second, if sociology were, nevertheless, taught for first degrees, should it be as a science or as an arts subject? Beveridge, paraphrasing William Harvey, suggested that sociology should be taught 'not from books, but from observations, not from the positions of philosophers, but from the conduct of mankind'.⁴³

Barbara Wootton complained in 1950 that whether or not sociology was considered a science, it was being taught in the manner of an arts subject. In an arts degree, study of the classics of the subject was respectable; in a science degree, one was unlikely to study the works of scientists of an earlier generation - they were out of date. Why were obsolete and outdated classics kept in the sociology curriculum? Barbara Wootton declared that it must be to fill out the course, because the amount of 'real knowledge' in sociology was then too small to do this adequately. 'If the student of sociology,' she suggested, 'did not have to wade through the biological monstrosities of Herbert Spencer, there might not be enough to occupy his time'.⁴⁴ (Yet when she spoke at a BSA conference six years later, at which it was proposed that undergraduates ought to spend more time learning research methods, it was objected that this could not be fitted into an undergraduate course already taken up with comparative social institutions, social philosophy, social history, and economic and political aspects of sociology).⁴⁵

The point about the outdated classics was taken up by Josephine Klein, then (in 1952) lecturing in Social Studies at Birmingham. She criticised the teaching of 'history of sociology' and 'history of ideas' because it compelled the student to learn views which he was afterward told were no longer tenable. The study of classification and abstract theory as ends in themselves (Parsons, perhaps, was being referred to here) should be ended; students should be taught classification, if at

all, in relation to the concrete findings of their own or others' empirical research.

The framework recommended by Josephine Klein for a sociology syllabus consisted of introductions to social history (to give background to the evolution of the economic, legal and family systems); to anthropology, for comparative data in other cultures; and to present-day social institutions, such as family and child rearing, education, propaganda and advertisement, war, town planning, and religion. A basic course would be followed by optional specialisation for third year students (and, like the UGC, she thought universities ought themselves to specialise in different areas for advanced courses). Obviously, methods of classification would have to be discussed, when teaching the factual subjects, and psychology and statistics would also be compulsory. Seminars would be profitable if they could have as their topics actual pieces of 'social engineering' or concrete problem-solving - topics such as factory morale, prejudice, army leadership, race riots. This sort of seminar would be just as stimulating as those on 'the destruction of outgrown systems of thought and the construction of ambitious abstractions', and theoretical discussion would be enabled to grow out of empirical research into practical problems in the area in which the university was situated.

Edward Shils disagreed with the rejection of the 'founding fathers'. He thought that the study of the sociological classics would 'remain, for the foreseeable future, among the chief conditions of the progress of the subject that does so much to render them antiquated and,

at the same time, to give evidence of their continued indispensability'. He based this on his opinion that modern sociological theories were not mature enough to⁴⁷ dispense with older ones.

Sociology degrees - vocational or liberal education?

The science/arts controversy involved other issues. Should a sociology degree be thought of as a liberal education? MacRae thought it made a good one, with theoretical classics 'as difficult, as bracing and as⁴⁸ rewarding as those of modern philosophy'. If sociology were taught as a liberal education, it would fall into the category in which Carr-Saunders had placed true degree courses, as having as their aim 'to provide a grasp of principles and an acquaintance with fundamental knowledge', as opposed to the aims of a course leading to a licence to practise an art ('to ensure that the public has competent practitioners at its disposal'. Carr-Saunders saw it as a 'profound misfortune' that the aims of a degree course and of a course for a licence⁴⁹ were sometimes joined, as in medicine. Yet Ginsberg and Marshall, in proposing the changes for the London degrees in sociology, both mentioned the vocational aspect. 'The Board [of Studies in Sociology] has . . . become convinced,' wrote Ginsberg, 'of the desirability of providing a degree in sociology which would be suitable for those who desire to take up social work It is understood that if the degree is to be acceptable to the professional bodies and employers of social workers, students would have to complete a programme of practical

work The needs of the Colonial Service are met by the option in social anthropology and by the choice of a specified area in the simpler cultures.⁵⁰

Marshall, also, saw the purpose of the revised sociology degree as, first, to make teachers of sociology and specialists in sociology to be administrators, and, to this end, to keep up with developments in the subject; second, to provide qualifications for social work; and⁵¹ third, to provide training for the colonial service.

At the BSA conference in 1956, A.H. Halsey, T.B. Bottomore, then lecturing at LSE, and Barbara Wootton, had generally agreed that the sociology degrees should be broad and humane and not narrowly vocational, but Marshall made the point, during discussion, that sociology could not⁵² ignore the vocational aspect.

'Value-Free' and 'Policy-Oriented' courses.

A third topic discussed between 1946 and 1962 concerned the choice between value-freedom, ethical neutrality, on the one hand, and policy-oriented, value-loaded courses, on the other. G.D.H. Cole thought it his duty, as Professor of Social Theory and Institutions, to suggest 'to anyone I can influence, and above all to the society to which I belong, what is the right pattern of social thought to guide social action in the⁵³ circumstances of here and now'. Titmuss agreed.

A student at his lectures in 1956, wrote, 'he stressed that the social sciences can never be "value free" or give a final answer to the question whether any given policy is "right". His students were left in no doubt as to where he stood. He presented a point of view,

supported it with facts and arguments, and challenged⁵⁴ his audience to exercise their judgment'. The BSA conference, in the same year, also discussed the question of value-freedom; underlying the discussion was the agreed fact that 'sociology stemmed originally from a criticism of existing society - a desire to investigate its problems and to make reasoned suggestions for its betterment. It appeared essential to many of those present at the conference to maintain this definition of the function of sociology. There was a feeling that this would be endangered if the main task of the university departments was seen as the direct training of students for immediate employment in industrial, commercial, or even governmental agencies'.⁵⁵

Yet Marshall had castigated the do-gooders as having created a false, damaging stereotype of the sociologist as an earnest person who came 'with heart wide open and brain half closed, inspired equally by a deep faith in the fundamental goodness of things and a firm determination to make them very much better'.⁵⁶ The desire, which did exist, for greater ethical neutrality, was linked with a desire that sociology should be more professional, expert and scientific - a continuation of the move away from the messianic towards the objective.

Training in research methods.

Fourth, in an attempt to improve the professional image and usefulness of sociologists, and also to guarantee them employment (the BSA surveys by Olive and

J.A. Banks had shown that a large majority of recent graduates in sociology had not become professional sociologists), it was suggested that training in research methods should be included in the undergraduate course. The increasing inclusion of statistics in courses in the post-1946 period, had been only partially helpful in remedying the lack of training for research. Yet Cole, in 1948, felt doubtful if statistics should be made compulsory 'because it is highly deterrent to a few good students who have wholly failed to learn even elementary

Mathematics at school'. Sir Sidney Caine, Director of LSE, speaking to sixth formers in 1961, said that mathematics was not nearly so important for sociology as it was for economics 'unless you want to branch off into a lot of statistics', although he did go on, 'You will find you need maths for research in sociology'.

The employers who spoke at the 1956 BSA Conference, Mark Abrams, of Research Services Ltd. (later to become the Director of the Survey Unit of the Social Science Research Council), and John Madge and R.G. Stansfield, of the DSIR, expressed their dissatisfaction with the graduates they were getting. They would have liked research methods taught at undergraduate level; if this were left to postgraduate training, the majority, who left university without a higher degree, would be denied training in methods. A large proportion of the people who had good first degrees and went on to postgraduate training, became lecturers. Some methods teaching for undergraduates was being offered (for example, at

Birmingham, where a research methods seminar was organised); but the three sociology lecturers who led the discussion on the organisation of courses, at the conference, did not agree that undergraduate courses in research methods were desirable; a 'broad consensus' among the participants was reported, that details of research techniques should be left to the graduate stage. 60

The problem was not resolved. The employers needed research workers with a sense of craftsmanship and knowledge of how to ask and answer significant questions. They would have liked a two-stage preparation for research: after the normal methods of instruction at undergraduate level, they suggested, some system of apprenticeship to experienced research workers, or attachment to a research team, should be provided at postgraduate level. 61

The Comparative Method.

A fifth topic discussed during the years under review, concerned the use of the comparative method in sociology courses. Ginsberg had defended the method in his essays and lectures, and T.H. Marshall pointed out its educational value in helping 'the student to clear his mind of assumptions implicit in his judgment of familiar social phenomena', 62 since 'unconscious assumptions and prejudices must be brought into the open and subjected to the impersonal test of scientific comparison'. 63 The BSA conference members agreed, in general, that the basic core of sociology degrees should include the study of comparative social institutions.

The academic quality of applicants for sociology degrees.

As a sixth and final topic for discussion, there were

the usual complaints that the quality of sixth formers entering for sociology courses was not high enough, and this was credited to two causes - first, the schools did not teach sociology, and bright sixth formers tended, it was supposed, to stay with subjects they had excelled in at school; and second, the little that was known about sociology at schools, associated it closely with careers in social work, so that students who were 'interested in people', would-be hospital almoners and personnel managers 'who found it difficult to interest themselves⁶⁴ in either empirical research or sociological theory', tended to appear on sociology courses. This dissatisfaction continued to be expressed in the sixties and seventies, despite strong disclaimers in university calendars and prospectuses that sociology courses were of this nature.

Sociology in UGC statistics.

Important indications of the academic status of sociology were contained in changes in the presentation of the UGC statistics. In 1959, Social Studies statistics were, for the first time, listed separately from those for Arts subjects. (The phrase 'Social Studies' came to have two distinct connotations in material on university curricula; originally describing the department or course designed for social workers, it was adopted by the UGC for the Social Science group of subjects, in their statistical returns, and it was similarly used by Oxford. G.D.H. Cole began an article in 1948: 'Social Studies (or Social Sciences as they are called in a number of British universities)⁶⁵' and elsewhere explained that he

considered these subjects 'too difficult to be called
sciences'.⁶⁶ 'Social Studies' continued to be used in
both the senses outlined above.)

Sociology was first listed separately in UGC statistics
in 1961, with a consequent drop in the number of graduates
previously entered under 'Social Science' as a separate
degree subject. However, even after 1961, there were
anomalies. In a subject where the university provision
was so diverse, one could not hope for strict comparability
between course and graduate statistics, and course content.
Pride and comfort was taken in the fact that English
universities had retained their diversity, but Banks's
despair, when he was trying to survey sociology degrees
for the BSA Guide for Intending Students, at the
conflicting and inadequate information given in⁶⁷
university prospectuses and calendars, was echoed by
many researchers after him. The situation was further
confused, between 1948 and 1962, by the increase in the
teaching of sociology to social work and teacher training
students.

General overview, 1946-1962.

Thus, in the period 1946-1962, sociology shared to
some extent in the general post-war expansion in the social
sciences, and in the increased organisation, by government
agencies and otherwise, of social research. Hostility
towards the subject of sociology in academic circles began
to diminish, two learned journals on sociology, and a
number of journals on other subjects included in sociology
degrees, were being published by 1962, and the British

Sociological Association had been formed and had increased its membership.

By 1962, sociology was introduced as a degree subject both in some older civic universities, and in some of the new civic universities granted charters from 1946 onwards; the London degrees were re-structured; optional sociology papers appeared in the Economics tripos at Cambridge, and the place of sociology in the courses to be offered at the new university of Sussex was being decided. More students were taking sociology, and separate statistics concerning graduates in this subject began to appear; several new chairs were founded.

Changes in emphasis in sociological theory courses, particularly a concern with structural-functionalism and the work of Parsons and Merton, were matched by the proliferation of empirical research and the inclusion of more statistical methods teaching in sociology degrees. The basic structure of these degrees, though varying widely from one English university to another, consisted of a core of compulsory subjects (often after a general first year including several social science subjects) with optional subjects in the third year, from which students could make a choice - and this choice grew as the number of areas of study given sociological treatment, increased.

There was controversy over methods of teaching, value-freedom, the vocational and liberal educational elements in sociology degrees, and the amount of training in research methods which should be given in undergraduate courses. However, the general change in university

sociology was that it had become more professional, that it had more empirical data to draw on, and that its popularity was increasing.

Proliferation of sociology degrees in the sixties.

Although, in 1962, new sociology courses were being introduced and existing ones were changing, it was still just possible to look at the situation in some detail in terms of individual universities. In the ten years following the publication of the Robbins Report, this was no longer the case. By 1972, virtually every university in England had a sociology course. In the next chapter, after a discussion of the general background to the period, the structure of sociology degrees in the years 1963-1972 will be outlined for six groups of English universities, while in Chapter VI, the subject-matter taught in those degrees will be examined in more detail.

REFERENCES
CHAPTER IV.

1. Cole, G.D.H., 'Review of the Report of the Committee on the Provision for Social and Economic Research, Cmd. 6868 (The Clapham Report)', Universities Quarterly, Vol.I, 1946/7, p.98.
2. Marshall, T.H., 'Sociology at the Crossroads', (Inaugural Lecture), in Sociology at the Crossroads and Other Essays, Heinemann, 1963, p.4.
3. Cole, G.D.H., 'Sociology and Politics in the Twentieth Century', in Essays in Social Theory, Macmillan, 1950, p.24.
4. Times Literary Supplement, Review article, 'Sociological Studies', August 25, 1950, p.xxix.
5. Wootton, Barbara, In a World I Never Made, Allen and Unwin, 1967, pp.102,103.
6. MacRae, D.G., 'The Teaching of Sociology, Social Anthropology and Social Psychology', in UNESCO, The Teaching of the Social Sciences in the United Kingdom, UNESCO, Paris, 1953 (based on report prepared in 1951), p.92.
7. Tropp, Asher, 'The Present State and Development of Professional Sociology', Report of a Conference of the British Sociological Association, London, 1956, BSA Bulletin, No.1, October, 1956, p.5.
8. MacRae, D.G., 'Social Theory: Retrospect and Prospect', British Journal of Sociology, Vol.VIII, 1957, reprinted in Ideology and Society, Heinemann, 1961, p.39.
9. Kelsall, K., Sociological Research in Britain (Inaugural Lecture), Sheffield University Press, 1960, p.2.
10. MacRae, D.G., 'Between Science and the Arts', The Twentieth Century, 1960, reprinted in Ideology and Society, (above), p.3.
11. Halsey, A.H., 'Sources for the Teaching of Sociology of Education', in Halmos, P., (ed.), The Teaching of Sociology to Students of Education and Social Work, Sociological Review Monograph No.4, 1961, p.115.
12. Donnison, D.V., The Development of Social Administration, (Inaugural Lecture), London School of Economics and G.Bell and Sons, 1962, p.21.
13. Little, Alan, 'Sociology in Britain since 1945', Social Sciences Information, Vol.II, 2, July 1963, p.64.

14. Universities Quarterly, Editorial Notes, 'The Scarborough Report', Vol.I, 3, May 1947, p.232.
15. Stone, F.S., 'Research in the Social Sciences', Universities Quarterly, Vol.II, 1947/8, p.280.
16. Harrisson, Tom, The Future of Sociology, Pilot Papers No.4, March 1947, p.13.
17. Collison, P., and Webber, Susan, 'British Sociology 1950-1970: A Journal Analysis', Sociological Review, Vol.XIX, 4, 1971, pp.521-542.
18. Glass, D.V., and Gluckman, M., 'The Social Sciences in the British Universities', Advancement of Science, July, 1962, pp.159,160.
19. Lockwood, D., 'Some Remarks on the Social System', British Journal of Sociology, Vol.VII, 2, June 1956, p.134.
20. MacRae, D.G., 'The Crisis in Sociology', in Plumb, J.H., (ed.), Crisis in the Humanities, Penguin Books, 1964, p.134.
21. Riesman, David, Constraint and Variety in American Education, Doubleday Anchor Books, New York, 1958, p.35.
22. UNESCO, The Teaching of the Social Sciences in the United Kingdom (above), p.86.
23. London School of Economics, Archives, Academic Board, 1951-1952, Agenda for Meeting November 28, 1951, Statistics for Sociology Degrees.
24. Bedford College, Calendar 1951-52.
25. Bedford College, Calendar 1961-62.
26. Marshall, op.cit., p.13.
27. Ibid., p.15.
28. Ibid., p.21.
29. Hogben, L., Political Arithmetic, Allen and Unwin, 1938, p.46.
30. Fletcher, Ronald, The Making of Sociology, Vol.II, Developments, Michael Joseph, 1971, p.250, f.n.
31. UNESCO, op.cit., p.86.
32. Sprott, W.J.H., Review of Parsons, T., The Structure of Social Action, British Journal of Sociology, Vol.I, 1950.

33. Boston, Richard, 'Cambridge and Sociology', New Society, June 12, 1967, p. 607.
34. University of Birmingham, Faculty of Commerce and Social Science, Examination Papers 1953, Sociology III, Social Structure, Qu. 5.
35. Sprott, W.J.H., Sociology at the Seven Dials, L.T. Hobhouse Memorial Lecture No. 32, London School of Economics, Athlone Press, 1967, p. 3.
36. University of Leeds, Annual Report, 1956/7, p. 24.
37. Bartlett, F., Ginsberg, M., Lindgren, E.J., and Thouless, R.H., (eds.), The Study of Society, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1939.
38. University of Cambridge, Student's Handbook, 1960/1.
39. Elias, Norbert, 'Problems of Involvement and Detachment', British Journal of Sociology, Vol. VII, No. 3, September 1956, pp. 226-252.
40. Lindsay, A.D., 'Proposed University in North Staffordshire. Note for the Meeting Between the Exploratory Committee and the Representatives of Oxford, Manchester and Birmingham Universities on June 10th, 1947, at Stoke-on-Trent', p. 36, quoted in Campbell, Malcolm B., Non-Specialist Study in the Undergraduate Curricula of the New Universities and Colleges of Advanced Technology in England, University of Michigan School of Education, 1966, p. 27.
41. Briggs, Asa, 'University Social Studies: The Sussex Idea', New Society, (No. 3), October 18, 1962, p. 20.
42. Cole, G.D.H., 'The Teaching of the Social Studies in British Universities', Universities Quarterly, 1947/8, p. 267, reprinted in Essays in Social Theory, (above), p. 37.
43. Beveridge, W., 'Science and the Social Sciences', Universities Quarterly, Vol. II, 1947/8, p. 237.
44. Wootton, Barbara, Testament for Social Science, Allen and Unwin, 1950, p. 30.
45. Tropp, Asher, op.cit., p. 4.
46. Klein, Josephine, 'The Teaching of Sociology', Universities Quarterly, Vol. VII, 1952/3, p. 291.
47. Shils, Edward, 'The Calling of Sociology', in Parsons, T., et al., (eds.), Theories of Society, Free Press, New York, 1961, p. 1448.
48. MacRae, D.G., 'Between Science and the Arts' (above), p. 13.

49. University of London, Board of Studies in Economics, 1939-June 1948, Notes on the Reform of the Degrees: Carr-Saunders, A.M., 'General Nature of a Degree Course', 28.1.47, Senate House, File 500A.
50. University of London, Board of Studies in Economics, June 1949-December 1950, Ginsberg, M., 'Proposal for the Revision of the B.A. Degree in Sociology and the Institution of a B.Sc. in Sociology', November 17, 1949, Senate House, File 500B.
51. University of London, Board of Studies in Economics, January 1950-September 1951, Letter from Professor T.H. Marshall to Professor L.G. Robbins, 26 December 1949, (duplicated), Board of Studies in Economics, Document L.
52. Tropp, Asher, op.cit., p.4.
53. Cole, G.D.H., 'Scope and Method in Social and Political Theory', (Inaugural Lecture), in Essays in Social Theory, (above), p.7.
54. Lynes, Tony, 'Personal Service', (review of Titmuss, Richard M., Social Policy: an Introduction), New Society, Vol.31, No.640, 1975, p.80.
55. Tropp, Asher, op.cit., p.6.
56. Marshall, T.H., Sociology at the Crossroads and Other Essays, (above), p.4.
57. Banks, J.A., 'The Employment of Sociologist Graduates, 1952 and 1953', British Journal of Sociology, Vol.V, 2, 1954, pp.161, 162; Banks, J.A., and Banks, O.L., 'Employment of Sociology and Anthropology Graduates, 1952 and 1954', British Journal of Sociology, Vol.VI, 1956, pp.46-51; Banks, J.A., 'Employment of Sociology and Anthropology Graduates, Final Report', British Journal of Sociology, Vol.IX, 3, September 1958, pp.271-283.
58. Cole, G.D.H., 'The Teaching of Social Studies in British Universities', in Essays in Social Theory (above), p.43.
59. Caine, Sir Sidney, 'Economics and Social Science', in Advisory Centre for Education, After the Vith - Where?, ACE, Cambridge, 1962, p.110.
60. Tropp, Asher, op.cit., p.6.
61. Ibid., p.4.
62. Marshall, T.H., Sociology at the Crossroads and Other Essays, (above), pp.21,22.

63. Marshall, T.H., 'The Basic Training for all Types of Social Work', in Leubuscher, Charlotte, (ed.), Training for Social Work, Papers given at the Nuffield College Conference on the Training of Social Workers, Oxford, September 1945, Oxford University Press, 1946, p.15.
64. Tropp, Asher, op.cit., p.5.
65. Cole, G.D.H., 'The Teaching of Social Studies in British Universities', in Essays in Social Theory (above), p.31.
66. Cole, G.D.H., 'The Social Sciences - A Symposium', Universities Quarterly, Vol.II, 1947/8, p.255.
67. British Sociological Association, Annual General Meeting, 1959, Summary of Proceedings, p.6.

CHAPTER V

1963 - 1972 (I). UNIVERSITY DEVELOPMENT AND THE SETTING UP OF NEW SOCIOLOGY DEGREES

Introduction.

In the period 1963-1972 the number of English universities, and the number of such universities offering sociology degrees, rapidly increased. The main focus of the present work is on what was being taught to and learned by undergraduates studying sociology, and this emphasis applies no less to the more complex situation of the sixties and early seventies than to the years already reviewed. In Chapter VI, therefore, there will be found some discussion of the subjects studied by sociology undergraduate students in the late sixties. However, numerous events took place in the sixties which had a direct bearing on the circumstances in which new courses for sociology degrees emerged, and those already existing, continued; the present chapter is concerned with a consideration of these events.

The Robbins Report.

The Report of the Robbins Committee on Higher Education was published in 1963. 'The post-Robbins era' is a not inapt description of the period covered by the present chapter, so frequently has Robbins been cited as a turning point or watershed in the course of British university development.

For the first time, and with the expert help of Claus Moser, the LSE statistician, a numerate survey was

taken of the whole range of British universities and other institutions of higher education, and of their place in British society. The Robbins Committee concluded that, if the UK were to maintain 'an adequate position in the fiercely competitive world of the future',¹ there would be a rise in the number of postgraduates (the Committee's estimate was from 9,500 in 1961/2 to 32,000 by 1980/1), and this necessarily meant an increase in the number of undergraduates. Combined with this pressure from above for more post-graduate work, was the pressure from below; on egalitarian educational principles, it was felt that it should be possible for all young people with the necessary qualifications to gain a place at university. The additional undergraduate places recommended by the Robbins Report were provided in England (although not necessarily on the scale proposed in the report) in three main ways: first, by the expansion of existing universities; second, by the building of six new universities, a development which had, of course, already begun when the Robbins Report was published; and third, by the upgrading of nine English colleges of advanced technology to full university status. The designation of polytechnics, the introduction of CNAAs degrees, and the creation of the Open University, were further extensions of the principle that all who could qualify should have the chance of studying for a degree.

The Six Groups of English universities.

By 1972 it was possible to categorise English

universities teaching sociology, partly by chronology and partly by the nature of the institutions, into six main groupings, as in Table V.1, and an idea of the approximate number of first year places available in sociology degrees at some of these universities could also be arrived at. In 1967 the Advisory Centre for Education published a survey,² mainly intended for sixth formers and their advisors, on the provision for undergraduate sociology at all universities then offering courses in the subject in the United Kingdom. The numbers of first year places being offered for October 1967 for immediate or subsequent (usually second year) specialisation in sociology are shown in Table V.2.

Universities offering specialist sociology, but not giving numerical information about the numbers of first year places available for October 1967, included Birmingham, Durham (where a new honours course began in October 1967), Leeds, Nottingham and York.

The information included in Table V.2 does not include some universities offering degrees 'less than specialist' in sociology. In some other universities where sociology was a specialism, no rank order in terms of places available could be attempted, because, for example at East Anglia, the candidates did not apply to a specialist department, they applied to a Faculty or School of Studies, and the figures given for available places for these were naturally much higher than those for sociology alone. (For example, the faculty places at Essex totalled 145.) Sussex also operated this form of application, where candidates decided in their

Table V.1
English universities and colleges of London University
teaching sociology for first degrees in 1972

Group 1. The Ancient Universities

Cambridge
Oxford

Group 2. Constituent Colleges of the University of London

Bedford College
Chelsea College of Science and Technology
Goldsmith's College
London School of Economics and Political Science

Group 3. The Older Civic Universities

Birmingham
Bristol
Durham
Leeds
Liverpool
Manchester
Newcastle
Sheffield

Group 4. The Younger Civic Universities

Exeter
Hull
Leicester
Nottingham
Reading
Southampton

Group 5. The New Universities

East Anglia
Essex
Keele
Kent at Canterbury
Lancaster
Sussex
Warwick
York

Group 6. The Technological Universities

Aston
Bath
Bradford
Brunel
City
Loughborough
Salford
Surrey

Table V.2

Numbers of first year places for sociology degrees (or second year places in sociology specialisms) being offered by some universities and colleges of London University in October 1967

University or College	Number of places offered
1. LSE	'a few less than 66'
2. Bedford	65
3. Sheffield	53 (some in dual schools in second year)
4. Leicester	45 (number of students admitted October 1965 choosing sociology in second year)
5. Bristol	43 (reading joint degrees only)
6. Essex	43 + 7*
7. Liverpool	35
8. Exeter	32
9. Kent	30 /
10. Bath	30
11. Goldsmith's	30
12. Sussex	30
13. Reading	24

* In 1966, 43 students at Essex University chose to read Sociology in their second year in the School of Social Studies, and 7 students in the School of Comparative Studies. The notional 1967 figures have been based on this, but in fact the university stated: 'as many places as are needed will be available for second year students in 1967'.

/ These Kent students were not necessarily all going on to read sociology exclusively.

Source: Advisory Centre for Education, 16+ Guide: Sociology, ACE, Cambridge, 1967.

second year, in which subject they would 'major'.

The same reservations applied to some other universities which did not allow specialisation until the second year. The ACE survey provided an ad hoc guide to the increase which had already, by 1967, taken place in the provision for undergraduate sociology in England. It indicated, however, a great diversity in the shape of degrees, and concealed an even greater diversity in the provision of courses on different subjects within the degree outlines.

The Universities Central Council on Admissions.

Various attempts were made to impose some kind of order on the diversity of degree subjects offered. One of these was the system adopted by the Universities Central Council on Admissions, set up in 1961, a system of classification of universities and degrees by number codes, in which the basic degree code stood for the specialist subject degree, and joint honours or other 'mixed' degrees were indicated by suitable coding modifications. For example, in the 1965 Handbook, the code for Sociology was 3600. That for Psychology was 2800. A specialist degree in Sociology was coded 3600, but a degree giving Joint Honours in Sociology/Psychology was coded 3628. The degree of BA Honours in the School of Social Studies at Essex, which might lead to a degree in Sociology after a common first year course with Economics and Government, was coded 3600; but the BSc Economics at LSE, having 14 special subjects of which one was Sociology, was coded 3200 for Economics.

(On the other hand, the HMSO Statistics of Education for 1965, under a discussion of 'Classification of University Degree Subjects', stated:

'The title of a degree is not always a direct guide to the subject of study and it is ignored for subject classification purposes if it does not accurately reflect the subject content of the course. For example, a BSc Economics degree in which the main subject of study is sociology is³ classified under "sociology" and not "economics".')

The UCCA coding system was revised several times to try to reflect more accurately the various characteristics of different degrees; and in the course of administering the many thousands of applications which passed through their hands, UCCA were able to produce, in a series of annual reports, statistical analyses (about aspects of degree courses) which were able to be more sophisticated than those produced previously by the Universities Grants Committee. These UCCA analyses did not contain enough detail to illustrate the amounts of various subjects being taught to university sociology students within their degrees, and they had to be used cautiously as an indication of pressure on places, because students were permitted, on their application forms, to name up to six university courses in order of preference, but they did provide evidence that the number of students applying for sociology rose.

The British Sociological Association Teachers' Section.

More courses meant more lecturers, and it was hardly surprising that the Teachers' Section of the British

Sociological Association flourished between 1963 and 1972. (The BSA began to publish its own learned journal, Sociology, in 1967.) The Teachers' Section had its own problems, however, over the nomenclature and categorisation of its membership. The Section was concerned with the identification of sociology university lecturers as a professional group; but there was pressure from people who were lecturing on sociology courses, some of them for London external degrees, in institutions other than universities, chiefly technical colleges and teacher training colleges, who felt they should be eligible for membership. A system of 'Gates' was introduced in 1965 (to admit, for example, holders of full-time university teaching or research posts in sociology, and holders of full-time teaching or research posts in sociology in non-university institutions), but even its originators admitted that the 'Gates' were not infallible, and the situation they did not wish to introduce, of having to make personal decisions as to the eligibility for membership of any particular individual, could not be avoided. More important for the content of sociology degree courses, however, than its struggles over eligibility, were the Section's discussions and conferences held on the teaching of various separate subjects in the sociology curriculum. The general discussion on the teaching of sociology degree courses has already been mentioned in Chapter IV; in the later sixties, topics such as the teaching of Sociological Theory, of Methods, and of the Sociology of Modern Britain, were introduced.

There was an increasing awareness throughout universities of the possible implications of teaching any subject to any student, and the personal development of the student began, increasingly, to be considered an important part of the situation. This aspect was particularly germane to the teaching of sociology, which introduced the student to aspects of himself and of his place in society which had seldom been presented to him at school. Further developments of this were seen in the introduction of 'O' and 'A' level sociology.

'A' level sociology.

'A' level sociology was first introduced by the Oxford Examinations Board in 1964, but by 1967, when the Associated Examining Board first introduced the paper fully, after pilot explorations, 1600 candidates sat it. The AEB had had talks with representatives of the BSA about a possible paper, in 1964, and a Committee was set up by the Sociology Teachers' Section to consider the pros and cons, for the development of sociology at universities, of having an 'A' level paper. (They were, unavailingly, against the introduction of the subject at 'O' level). The Committee considered that it was an advantage to have sociology taught in the sixth form, because it would attract students to the subject at university level. In the past it had been stated by university admissions tutors complaining of the poor quality of applicants for sociology courses, that bright school pupils tended to stay with the subjects they had excelled in at school, and in which they had more confidence that they would continue to do well. The BSA

Committee thought that it was important that, if sociology were to be taught in sixth forms, it should be examined at 'A' level, and not be introduced merely as a minority subject which would tend to be shrugged off as not academically rigorous. They discounted the objection that undergraduates who had not studied sociology at 'A' level would be at a disadvantage in the first year of their degree courses, and nowhere was there any implication that they considered that changes needed to be made in first year sociology degree courses, for this reason.⁴

There was some controversy over the nature of the 'A' level courses. In 1968 Abrams characterised the AEB syllabus as reading 'like a well-designed effort to induct the child into a formal, functionalist, systems-sociology'.⁵ In the correspondence which followed, no mention was made of the possible effect of the introduction of 'A' level sociology on the intellectual calibre of students applying to read sociology at university, although Cotgrove, whose textbook, The Science of Society, was used for the 'A' level course and was prescribed for many first year degree courses, pointed out that one aim which the AEB had had to bear in mind, was the construction of a syllabus which would be acceptable to universities as part of an entrance qualification.⁶ Obviously this raised wider implications about the relationship between secondary and higher education curricula, but there is no firm evidence that the existence of the 'O' and 'A' level examinations modified undergraduate sociology courses either in the first academic year of the courses, or thereafter.

The Heyworth Report.

The Heyworth Committee appointed to review research in the social studies, published its report in 1965. (As in the Clapham Report twenty-three years earlier, sociology was still represented as something of a mystery: 'Sociology is perhaps the discipline which people find most puzzling of the major social sciences'.⁷) The Report's first priority was, that there should be an increase in the number of postgraduate students in the social sciences, and it recommended that more awards should be made (specifically 400 in 1965/66 compared with 220 in 1964). Part of this estimate was based on the fact that there had been a 20 per cent increase in staff in university social science departments between 1963/4 and 1964/5 - and the Committee projected these figures to indicate a probable increase of 1200 between 1965 and 1967/8. Sociology was, of course, only one factor in this increase, but the general trend was also reflected in sociology staffs.

The Social Science Research Council.

The Heyworth Committee also recommended the setting up of a Social Science Research Council (SSRC), and this body duly came into being in December 1965 (Clapham, it may be remembered, had, in 1946, considered that the setting up of such a council would then have been premature). The SSRC's chief significance as an influence on undergraduate sociology was, firstly, that by providing funds to support postgraduate training and research, it improved the prospects for the undergraduate high-flier in sociology who wanted to continue after a first degree, and therefore made the subject more

attractive as a first degree choice for this type of student; and secondly, that the very existence of the Council was an indication that the subjects under its aegis (which specifically included sociology) had attained higher academic prestige.

Sociology students in the sixties - some surveys.

Joan Abbott carried out research into sociology students and graduates in 1966-7, partly as a follow-up study to the Bankses' surveys of the fifties. The purposes of the Abbott survey⁸ were to find out the origins of students taking first degrees in sociology and anthropology, in terms of social class, marital status, work before university, and type of previous education: their reasons for choosing sociology or anthropology: in particular, whether or not they had feelings of 'social commitment' and/or thought the course would be a training for social work: and whether or not these two latter assumptions persisted at the time just before graduation.

The survey further attempted to ascertain the number of sociology and anthropology students and graduates with religious beliefs, or who were church attenders; and the proportions of such students and graduates who were members of the various political parties.

The third part of the survey concerned career plans, and the fourth and fifth parts, which covered much the same ground as the fifties work, surveyed the actual employment of sociology and anthropology graduates a

year after taking finals. Some comparison was also
made with the American work by Sibley,⁹ Mercer and
Pearson,¹⁰ and Bates,¹¹ and others, and with M.P. Carter's
Survey of Sociological Research,¹² commissioned by the BSA and SSRC
and published in 1968.

The striking fact about the British research was that it contained virtually no information about what sociology and anthropology undergraduates were taught. To be fair, the Carter survey was confined to research, not to undergraduate courses, and the Abbott research was largely trying to reproduce the Bankses' data with a different sample (the specific terms of reference for the Bankses' work excluded content of courses beyond a simple differentiation, for example, between sociology and anthropology). Even the American research cited, apart from Sibley's quite detailed analysis, made only limited attempts to sample the sorts of courses which students had experienced. Sibley asked universities which textbooks they used for methods teaching, and composed a rank order table headed by the most frequently cited textbook. This type of investigation was not possible in the British university system, where the use of one course textbook from which 'assignments' were set, was very rare - in fact, on reading lists it was much more common to find some such comment as: 'There is no satisfactory textbook for this course, but reference may be made to . . .' followed by a selection of books to be sampled.

The questions asked of sociology students in Bates's disturbing survey of 25 American colleges - for example, 'Name five eminent American sociologists, living or dead',

revealed a horrifying ignorance of basic knowledge about their subject on the part of graduates who had taken, on average, 5.3 courses in sociology for their first degrees. Some of them could not produce five names at all, let alone five correct ones (the mean was 2.8). Yet the typical subject in this survey was hoping to go on to a career in sociology. The most interesting finding of the Mercer and Pearson study, on the other hand, was that a rapid rise in promotion to senior professorial rank in sociology correlated negatively with the time spent on teaching, as a proportion of time at work, while in the lower ranks of assistant or associate professor.

The Abbott research revealed that the misconception that a degree in sociology was a training for social work was still quite prevalent (48 per cent of women and 15 per cent of men were under this misconception at the start of their courses). This finding supported the assertions made by, among others, Neustadt and Broady, that one of the primary tasks a sociology lecturer had to face in dealing with first year students was to remove the misconceptions with which they had arrived at university. Neustadt, in his inaugural lecture as Professor of Sociology at Leicester in 1964, laid particular stress on this: 'among the original interests and motivations with which students come to the study of sociology [is] the prevalence of a desire to remedy social ills here and now, to "work with people" or "to help people".'¹³ This focused the student's attention on individual needs and ad hoc remedies and might actually militate against an understanding of the wider causes of

these needs. It might blind people to the part played by institutional arrangements in the causation of social ills.

Broadly felt that many of his students (at Southampton in 1967) believed that sociology was a subject 'that will, almost automatically, tell you how to make the world a better place to live in, how to relieve people of distress, how to secure social peace and harmony in place of conflict. It is, they believe, concerned with "nice" things like families and "good" things like communities rather than "horrid" things like power conflicts . . . they tend to see the individual as prior to and more tangible than society, and to regard a social system as no more than a lot of individuals; and . . . they place moral evaluation before empirical analysis'.¹⁴

No consideration of events concerned with sociology first degree courses in the sixties would be complete without some reference to student unrest. Before passing to a discussion of this subject, it will be helpful to look at Abbott's findings on the political beliefs of the sociology and anthropology graduates in her sample. There was a discrepancy between the percentages of students holding political beliefs, and those actually belonging to a political party. For example, 62 per cent of students called themselves 'socialist', and a further 12 per cent fell into categories to the left of socialist, but only 12 per cent were members of the Labour Party, and only two students were members of the Communist party, out of 520 in this sample. On the other hand, only 12.5

per cent of students in the sample professed any form of political conservatism - and only 3 per cent were members of the Conservative Party.

Student unrest and the undergraduate study of sociology.

A fairly vast literature has grown up on the subjects of student revolt, student participation in university administration and decision-making, and what has been called 'the rise of the student estate'. It seems relevant in a study of the development of sociology degree courses, to ask three questions about the state of student unrest which characterised the late sixties and early seventies.

First, did learning sociology, and realising the variety and impermanence of social systems, lead students to question the university system, and if so, did these questioning sociology students become activist?

Second, were sociology students disillusioned with the slow progress of sociological research into social problems and with the delays caused by the non-application of this research, and did they turn to direct intervention as a reaction against routine empirical investigation?

Third, what effect, if any, did student unrest have on the content of sociology courses; was there any evidence that the courses had, in the long term, been altered as a consequence of student activism?

A common-sense answer to the first question would seem to have been 'Yes' - if one were studying different ways in which society could be organised, this might have led one to look with a critical eye at the social group, i.e. the university, of which one was a part. In a letter to The Observer in 1969, Hyman Levy suggested that the LSE

15

students were only 'doing their practicals' (i.e. by sitting-in and other student activism, rather than by laboratory experiments). However, in his inaugural lecture at Leicester in 1971, Banks partially refuted this idea by quoting examples of very similar student unrest which had taken place at the University of London in the nineteenth century, long before sociology degrees were ever thought of.¹⁶ The first question had to remain an unanswered hypothetical one.

The second question must also remain unanswered; it was shown, from research carried out by Blackstone and others at LSE,¹⁷ that a slightly larger percentage of sociology, social anthropology and social psychology students took an active part in the 'troubles' than would have been expected by their proportions in the total student body, but it was important to bear in mind the tendency of newspapers and periodicals, when reporting findings of this kind, to call the group under consideration 'sociologists' and to ignore the other specialisms. (Compare this with headlines such as 'Sociologists win the day at Cambridge'¹⁸ when Cambridge dons were voting for the introduction or rejection of a Social and Political Sciences tripos which in fact included social anthropology and politics.)

The third question remains to be discussed. How, if at all, had sociology degrees changed as a result of student unrest? Three possible factors emerged. The first was the alignment of (mainly younger) lecturers in sociology with the student causes in some of the confrontations which took place. The second was the greater participation of students in the design of their courses,

examples being the 'workshop' courses at Keele, introduced
in 1973,¹⁹ and the 'Social Movements and Political Action'
contextual course at Sussex 'developed partly as a result
of student initiative'.²⁰ The third was the progress
made by the optional subject 'sociology of revolution' in
sociology degree courses, and the introduction of
discussions of the topic of student unrest, into courses
on the Social Structure of Modern Britain, on Political
Sociology, or on Sociology of Education.

Discussion at a theoretical level of this complex
interaction of student unrest and 'what was taught in
sociology degrees' was carried out exhaustively, but the
amount of rigorous empirical investigation into direct
cause and effect was minimal. With the existence of so
many intervening variables, it was impossible, in the
existing state of the investigation, to draw any firm
conclusions. Analyses of the bias of the media treatment
of this subject, for example the work of Rudd,²¹ had gone
some way towards encouraging extreme caution when
venturing into this field of argument.

Sociology degree structure in the six university groups.

Group 1. The Ancient Universities.

Cambridge.

The major event for sociology at Cambridge was the
establishment of the Social and Political Sciences Tripos
in 1969. This tripos, the subject of tremendous
controversy, was put to a vote of placet and non-placet
by the entire corpus of Cambridge dons, and was passed by
461 votes to 332. The first finals papers were set in
1971, and the numbers of students awarded the tripos in

1971 (38 who had taken it after one year's study, and 46 who had taken it after two years' study) augured well for its future popularity. Several of the papers were shared with the Economics tripos, which had hitherto been the only tripos offering sociology subjects, apart from the social anthropology papers in the Anthropology tripos and the course in Industrial Sociology under Sofer in the Engineering tripos.

Oxford.

In 1972 it was still not possible to take a first degree in sociology at Oxford. Three sociology papers, Modern Social Institutions, Sociology Theory, and Political Sociology, appeared as options in PPE, and there was some sociology in the Human Sciences Honours School, but in each case sociology had to share with many other subjects, and the amount of time devoted to it in finals was limited. There was no methods teaching at all until the B Phil stage.

Group 2. Constituent colleges of London University.

Three constituent colleges of London University, LSE, Bedford, and Goldsmith's College, were offering sociology degrees during the sixties. Bedford and Goldsmith's offered the BA/BSc Sociology, while LSE retained these and the BSc Economics with Sociology specialism, which it advised students to take if they were not sure which area of social science they wished to specialise in, when they first came to university.

In October 1971, however, after 64 years, a radical change took place in the sociology degree structure of London University. This was the introduction by LSE,

which had the oldest sociology department in the country, of their own degree, BSc, Main Subject Sociology, no longer run in conjunction with the other two London colleges, and constructed on the course unit basis. This meant that, overall, students had much greater freedom in the construction of their own degree courses; and they no longer had to take economics, ethics and social philosophy, or social psychology, as compulsory subjects for the Main Field of sociology. The requirement for the degree was that a student should complete ten course units (one a dissertation), three units at least in each year, with examinations at the end of the session in which the course unit was taken. To obtain a degree, a student had to satisfy in eight units. To obtain honours in sociology, certain courses were compulsory: these included Introduction to Sociology, Methods of Social Research, Comparative Social Structures, and Sociological Theory. The extremely wide coverage of the remainder of the course was illustrated by the fact that the options were divided into two groups, List A containing 24 subjects, and List B ('Other courses which may be available') containing 16 subjects. Social Psychology was not included, as such, among these options, although it was possible for students to select one 'non-Sociology' course unit as part of the make-up of the degree. (Teaching for a new specialist degree, at LSE only, in Social Psychology, began in October 1969.)

While many of the subject titles dating from the early years of the degree, were retained, some changes in format indicated an elimination from the regulations

of titles which had outlived their relevance. For example, the original three choices:

1. Social Structure of Modern England
2. Graeco-Roman Civilisation
3. European Civilisation of the Middle Ages

introduced when the degree was first set up in the 1920s, no longer reflected well the emphasis of sociology as it had developed as an undergraduate discipline in the seventies, and the option course units on Social Structure in the new degree read as follows:

4. Social Structure of Modern Britain.
5. Social Structure of the Soviet Union.
6. Social Structure of the Roman Empire.
7. Social Structure of the United States.

Bedford and Goldsmith's Colleges continued to offer the BA/BSc Sociology throughout the sixties. In 1967 Goldsmith's became recognised to teach for the Internal degree also, instead of for the External degree only, as in the past. The degree regulations for BA/BSc Sociology were revised for students registering in and after 1963, but by 1972 there were more far-reaching proposals for a new degree, to be run by these two colleges in conjunction with the Social Administration Department at LSE. This had been mooted as far back as 1961, when Professor Titmuss (of the Social Administration Department at LSE) and Lady Williams of Bedford College, had hoped for a proposed new degree less theoretical than the then existing sociology degrees of London University, which 'were concerned with theories of

sociology and comparisons of social institutions from a wide diversity of societies, literate and pre-literate'. They wanted a degree which concentrated on a specific society (i.e. Britain) and provided 'the social administrators of tomorrow' with a liberal education. However, in 1972, there were expressions of regret that, should this type of degree be introduced, LSE would be the only college in the University of London offering students the opportunity of taking anything approximating to a 'pure sociology' degree.

22

Investigations²² also took place at LSE in conjunction with students, on possible revised methods for degree assessment, but in 1971/2 the traditional structure of assessment by examination had not been substantially altered.

Bedford College taught for Branches I and III of the BA/BSc Sociology in the sixties. Demography, Comparative Morals and Religion, Criminology and Political Sociology were all possible options for Branch I. Bedford also continued to send students to the Department of Social Administration at LSE for certain lectures and seminars for Branch III, under the joint arrangements which had first been set up in the 1930s, but, while maintaining a strong emphasis on Branch III, they published a typical disclaimer: 'It is strongly emphasised that none of the Branches is in any narrow sense a vocational course intended in itself to train students for particular occupations. They offer a liberal

education in the social sciences which prepare students for postgraduate training and employment in a wide variety of occupations'.²³

As has been mentioned, Goldsmith's College became recognised, during this period, to teach for the London Internal sociology degrees, and members of its staff sat on the University of London Board of Studies in Sociology. It had traditionally specialised in adult students and in teacher training, and students took sociology in the Department of Adult Studies, but in the late sixties and early seventies more school-leavers were applying for its undergraduate courses, and its courses were included in a BSA survey on Theories and Methods of Sociology courses in British Universities, conducted in 1966.

Undergraduate course units in sociology began at Chelsea College of Science and Technology in the 1969-70 session, chiefly for the degree course in Human Biology, in which they appeared as combined units in sociology/psychology. However, a unit in Sociology was offered as an optional course unit to students at Chelsea taking degrees in the Faculty of Science. There were, however, no first degrees in sociology at Chelsea at this time.

Group 3. The Older Civic Universities.

The state of sociology degrees in the older civic universities varied from those who had had a sociology degree since the early fifties, and those that were only beginning to introduce a sociology department, or a specialist sociology degree, in the late sixties. An examination of the faculty lists of these universities shows that some sociology staffs were still sheltering under a department of social science, social studies, or

in a faculty of arts or commerce which had been set up many years before and in which subjects, even social science specialisms, other than sociology, predominated.

However, by 1970, most of the older civic universities had chairs of sociology, even if called by other names, and all had some sociology in first degree courses. The amount of specialisation in sociology did, however, vary widely.

In the 1968 Commonwealth Universities Yearbook the subjects of the chairs appeared as follows:

Birmingham (Sociology) Charles Madge
(W. Baldamus, formerly Reader in Economic Sociology, was appointed to the chair in 1970 on Professor Madge's retirement.)

Bristol (Sociology) Michael Banton

Durham (Social Theory and Institutions) John Rex
(Philip Abrams, Cambridge, was appointed to the chair in 1970 when Professor Rex went to Warwick University)

Leeds (Social Studies) Eugene Grebenik
(Zygmunt Bauman, formerly Professor of Sociology at Warsaw, was appointed to the chair in 1970)

Liverpool (Social Science) Lord Simey of Toxteth
(Social Science) J.B. Mays

Manchester (Social Anthropology) Max Gluckman
(Sociology) Peter Worsley
(Urban Sociology) Clyde Mitchell

Newcastle (Social Studies) Peter Collison

Sheffield (Sociological Studies) Keith Kelsall

The faculties and departments, at approximately the same period, were designated thus:

Birmingham Faculty of Commerce and Social Science

Department of Sociology
(there was also an old-established Department of Social Study)

Bristol Faculty of Social Sciences
Department of Sociology
(there was also a Department of Social Work and Administration)

Durham Faculty of Social Science
(set up in 1968)
Department of Social Theory and Institutions

Leeds Faculty of Economic and Social Studies
Department of Social Studies
(no separate department of Sociology)

Liverpool Faculty of Arts
(Faculty of Social and Environmental Studies, 1971)
Department of Social Science
(no separate department of Sociology)

Manchester Faculty of Economic and Social Studies
Department of Social Anthropology and Sociology
(there was also a Department of Social Administration)

UMIST, the University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology, which was part of the University of Manchester, was virtually a technological university in its own right, and had a Department of Management Sciences which included Sociology and Industrial Sociology in its courses.

Newcastle Faculty of Economics, Social Studies and Politics

Department of Social Studies

Sheffield Faculty of Social Sciences

Department of Sociological Studies

The older civic universities with the largest 'sociology' departments in terms of staff were Leeds, Liverpool, Manchester and Sheffield, and, possibly apart from Manchester, all these had degrees in which

a high amount of specialisation in sociology was possible. However, the fact that a degree included other social science subjects in the first year did not ipso facto rule it out as a specialist degree. (After all, the BA/BSc Sociology at London, possibly the most specialist degree in an English university, included, for many years, compulsory economics in the first year.) It was rather a question of when irrevocable choices had to be made. The tendency in degrees in sociology in the sixties was to allow students to keep their options open (as John Rex pointed out in conversation with Max Beloff in 1969, 'from, you know, teaching some hundreds of sociology students over a period of about ten years in British universities, I have found an enormous sense amongst the students of an opening-up of new areas of vastly exciting study for them which they just had not known about before they came, and this of course, the clear index of this, is the way in which whenever students have a chance at the end of the first year, they transfer in great numbers from politics and economics and so on, into sociology. Students of high calibre, not students who are trying to get away from things which are intellectually taxing²⁴'). John Rex had been lecturing at Birmingham before he went to the chair at Durham, and his impressions, which were, of course, only subjective ones, must have been formed partly by the system at Birmingham where the degree was originally in Economics, Politics and Sociology, and a more specialist sociology degree was only introduced in 1969.

Leeds, Liverpool, Manchester and Sheffield.

Thus Leeds, Liverpool, Manchester and Sheffield, the

older civic universities with the largest sociology teaching staffs, on average, all had first year courses for sociology students which included subjects other than sociology. The other subjects most frequently prescribed were economics and politics. Leeds and Sheffield admitted students to a single honours school in sociology from the start. However, the Leeds first year was not a 'common first year' from which students were expected to choose their specialism; and transferring to another subject necessitated a special procedure. Instead of operating a system of separate subject options for the second or third years, Leeds had four options 'groups', of which students had to choose, and keep to, one, from their second year onwards. These were

Social Administration

Sociological Studies

Development Studies

Quantitative Methods

and in each group there were four to ten subjects from which students chose the four finals papers which had to be taken in addition to their five compulsory subjects.

At Sheffield, where students chose their single option subjects in the second year, they also, in that year, had to plan and carry out a social survey.

Liverpool's degree was called Social Science until 1971, when the Honours School in Sociology was introduced; but even before this, the curriculum for the degree would have justified its being called 'Sociology' for those students who selected a course containing the highest number of sociological subjects possible. The

prospectus specifically mentioned that placement in a social work agency was required for the second long vacation for students who proposed to make social work their career. In the UCCA booklet for 1967, under Liverpool, appeared the note 'candidates whose major interest is in Sociology, Social Work or Social Administration are advised to apply for Course 3600' (i.e. the Social Science degree) - a reflection of Liverpool's long-standing reputation as a university where the social science department was experienced in teaching social policy and administration, and where the Charles Booth Chair of Social Science had been the earliest chair of its kind in the country.

At Manchester, of the four universities under discussion, specialisation in sociology had taken longest. The Department was a joint one of Sociology and Social Anthropology, and these two subjects figured jointly as one paper out of four to be taken in the common first year for the BA Economics. In the second year, five subjects had to be taken, including Economics and Government. It was not until the third year that it was possible to take five papers in Sociology and Social Anthropology, but by 1967/8 it was possible, at the third year stage, to specialise in Sociology or Social Anthropology, and more options were introduced. Sociology had only begun to take a significant part, even in the common first year courses, in 1964; but by the early seventies the tendency was for more and more specialisation in Sociology to be possible.

Birmingham.

Birmingham had introduced sociology in the Bachelor of Commerce (Economics, Politics and Sociology) in 1949, Bristol's first intake for this subject was in 1966, while Durham's full honours degree was introduced in 1968/9.

Until 1969, Birmingham had operated a degree with equal amounts of Economics, Politics and Sociology, but while the general first year was retained, by the seventies, specialisation in sociology in the second and third years was possible.

Bristol.

At Bristol, however, it was only possible to take joint honours in sociology combined with one other subject, and the first year was shared between the two subjects. While, in the actual sociology courses, the stress was on sociology as an academic discipline, the fact that no student studied sociology exclusively in the second and third years, necessarily limited the field of options.

(It should perhaps be made clear, at this point, where a joint degree is being discussed, that no judgment has been intended, in the present study, on the relative merits of single, joint, or combined honours courses. It was merely helpful, in the study of sociology degree course development, to concentrate on the shape and contents of those degree courses which were as specifically sociological as possible.)

Durham.

Durham, whose Department of Social Theory and Institutions had been founded in 1964, already had a degree in Social Theory and Administration, but in

October 1967 introduced a full honours degree in Sociology. This also included a first year shared by sociology, economics and psychology, but after that, complete specialisation was possible.

Newcastle.

Newcastle, which until 1963 had been part of Durham University, at first had a social administration and social studies department and a pass degree only, the BA Social Studies, but in 1968, first admissions were made to a new Joint degree of BA Honours in Sociology and Social Administration, and sociology then had a place in all the older civic universities.

Group 4. The Younger Civic Universities.

The same tendency towards greater specialisation in sociology which has already been noted, was evident in some of the younger civic universities, several of which introduced specialist sociology degrees during the years covered by this chapter.

Similarly, chairs of sociology were established in those universities which did not already have them, until by 1968 the Commonwealth Universities Yearbook gave the following names for the subjects of the chairs:

Exeter (Sociology) G. Duncan Mitchell

Hull (Sociology and Social Anthropology)
I.G. Gunnison

(in 1969, M.A. Jaspán was appointed to a chair of South-East Asian Sociology at Hull)

Leicester (Sociology) Ilya Neustadt
(in 1971 Professor Neustadt was succeeded, on his retirement, by J.A. Banks of Liverpool University)

Nottingham (Sociology) S. Julius Gould

Reading (Sociology) Stanislaw Andreski

Southampton (Sociology) J.H. Smith
(Sociology and Social Administration) J.P. Martin

In the younger civic universities, the names of the faculties and departments dealing with sociology at approximately this time, were:

<u>Exeter</u>	Faculty of Social Studies Department of Sociology
<u>Hull</u>	Faculty of Social Sciences and Law Department of Sociology and Social Anthropology (there was also a Department of Social Administration)
<u>Leicester</u>	Faculty of Social Sciences Department of Sociology (there was also a School of Social Work)
<u>Nottingham</u>	Faculty of Law and Social Sciences Department of Sociology (there was also a Department of Applied Social Science)
<u>Reading</u>	Faculty of Letters and Social Sciences Department of Sociology
<u>Southampton</u>	Faculty of Social Sciences Department of Sociology and Social Administration

Leicester.

Of the younger civic universities, Leicester had the largest sociology department and the longest history of teaching the subject, which it developed particularly strongly for the London External Degree before gaining its charter.

Before 1967, in the first year, sociology students took a common course with students reading for other subjects in the BA in Social Sciences. Then, on somewhat similar lines to the Leeds degree, in the second year courses, students were offered three Options:
A. Theoretical Sociology; B. Empirical Sociology;

C. Applied Sociology, which included, for example, industrial sociology, urban development, and the administration of the social services. An unusual feature of the BA Social Sciences was that a test in translation from French or German was held before the final examination.

In October 1967, Leicester launched a specialist degree in sociology, and students took a first year including Comparative Study of Societies, Origins and Development of Sociological Methods, and Sociological Analysis, before continuing with their second year and third year courses. This degree, the BSc Sociology, was described as having been 'developed to meet the needs of the relatively small number of students capable of concentrating on a specialised subject at the very start of their university careers rather than exploring a range of them during their first year'.²⁵ Eleven men and 5 women registered for the degree in this first year - in 1968, about 43 students graduated in the more general BA Social Sciences, having taken sociology as their special subject.

(In 1967 and subsequent years, Leicester held an advanced course in sociology for lecturers in colleges of education, in which staff from the university's Departments of Sociology and of Education combined to give tuition. It was a Leicester sociology graduate, supervised by yet another Leicester sociology graduate, B. Wilson of All Souls, who gained the first Oxford D. Phil in Sociology.)

Exeter.

Exeter was another university which had introduced sociology early, and was one of the first universities, after LSE, to give honours degrees in the subject. In the first year, students took five courses, only two of which were in sociology, before proceeding to greater specialisation. In 1970, Exeter introduced an honours degree in social administration.

Nottingham and Reading.

Nottingham and Reading both operated a system whereby the students had to study sociology and two other social science subjects, at the outset of their degrees. However, the Nottingham student had to apply to read Sociology from the outset, and the broad area of study continued until the Part I examination, which was not taken until the end of the second year. The degree was called sociology, and the main emphasis was on this subject, but in fact it was not until the third year that the student concentrated entirely on sociology.

At Reading, on the other hand, the broader-based First University Examination was taken after only two terms, leaving seven terms for the student who chose sociology, to specialise in this subject. Reading's department had an individualist professor, Andreski, whose iconoclastic Social Sciences as Sorcery was published in 1972, and the Reading University calendar for that year remarked, of the Sociology degree, 'the course aims to provide a general understanding of social problems and processes. It is designed to help, among others, those intending to pursue administrative or

managerial careers; it is quite different from many courses in sociology, social studies, or social administration elsewhere, which are narrower and lead to careers in the personal social services'. Two unusual elements in the Reading degree were the course in Social Biology, and, in 1970, a new compulsory paper called 'Analysis of Literary Sources'.

Hull and Southampton.

Hull and Southampton had not arrived, by 1972, at full specialisation in sociology, but for rather different reasons. The situation at Hull after 1969, when the special degree was first introduced, was that sociology and social anthropology were part of the same specialism, not a joint honours course. 'This department teaches Sociology and Social Anthropology as far as possible as if they were a single subject'. There were roughly equal numbers of sociologists and social anthropologists in the Department; in the first two years of the degree, equal weight was given to both subjects; in the third year, rather more weight might be given to one or the other, if the student wished it. In the first year of the new degree, students had to take one course in Comparative Social Structure ('An Introduction to some fundamental concepts of Social Anthropology by means of the study of specified monographs on non-Western societies') and one course in Social Structures of Advanced Societies. Then a further course was required, 'Sociology and Social Anthropology, an Introduction', which was specifically designed as a link

between the other two.

Finally, Southampton, where the Department was composed of lecturers in sociology and in social administration, had not yet provided a degree in sociology alone; sociology could only be taken as joint honours with another subject, for example, Economics, Psychology, Philosophy, Politics, or with Social Administration. (The Department also taught for Certificates in Social Administration, Health Visiting and Community Care.)

As was mentioned in Chapter IV, the younger civic universities had had to build their sociology departments and degrees into the patterns of already existing organisations of faculties and departments, often with origins in teaching for the External degrees of London University or with training for social administration or social work. With the next group of universities to be considered, the six new English universities, the situation was totally different. With the single exception of Keele, they had been given a completely free hand, to be 'equal but different', collegiate or non-collegiate, having faculties and departments, or schools of studies, and to re-group subjects as they wished. The effect of this capacity for innovation on the structure of sociology teaching to undergraduates of the new universities will now be considered.

Group 5. The New Universities.

The new universities could be ranged somewhere along a spectrum from those having degree structures where sociology was studied along more or less conventional lines for a specialist degree (for example,

York), to those in which sociology could be taken in two or more different schools of studies (for example, Essex, Sussex), in each of which schools, the focus and emphasis were different.

The emphasis in the latter type of degree pattern was not on the building up of the specialist subject, brick by brick, from groundwork in the first year to more advanced work on compulsory subjects, and then work on specialist applications of sociology, or on other options, in the second and third years; in the newer type of degree structure, courses in the specialist subject, sociology, formed parts of various degree structures whose central focus might be, as at Sussex, English and American Studies, or European Studies, or African and Asian Studies. This diversity had been programmed into the degree structure of some of the new English universities from the beginning, and the more multi-subject courses, modelled on the new patterns, fulfilled a declared aim to break down the iron bars of specialist subjects and specialist departments, and to allow more integration, more courses at the boundaries of two (or even more) disciplines. The intention was that staff should be less committed to their specialist group, and should have wider loyalties, to schools of studies, and to interdisciplinary courses.

The new English universities, whose charters were granted in the short span of years between 1962 and 1965, all established chairs of sociology eventually. These chairs were named, in the Commonwealth Universities Yearbook for 1968, as follows:

East Anglia (Sociology) Ray Emerson

Essex (Sociology) Peter Townsend
(Sociology) Alasdair MacIntyre
(David Lockwood was appointed to a chair of Sociology at Essex in 1968)

Keele (Sociology) Ronald Frankenberg

Kent (Sociology) Paul Stirling
(Raymond Pahl was appointed to a chair of Sociology at Kent in 1972)

Lancaster None (John Wakeford was Head of the Sociology Department)
(Michelina E.F. Vaughan was appointed to a chair of Sociology at Lancaster in 1972)

Sussex (Sociology) T.B. Bottomore
(Sociology - Part-time Professor) Z. Barbu

Warwick None (no Sociology Department at first)
(John Rex was appointed to a chair of Sociology at Warwick in 1970)

York (Sociology) Ronald Fletcher

All the chairs were named 'Sociology', an indication, perhaps, that the academic identification of the subject had become clearer with the passing of time. This greater regularity in the naming of the chairs was probably caused by a combination of two main factors, among others: first, the academic advance of the subject; and second, the fact that the planning boards which decided on the chairs started without any already existing departments, faculties, or other groupings of social science subjects, or traditional namings, to be taken into consideration.

At approximately the same period of time, the names of the faculties and departments, or what took their place, in these new universities, were as follows:

<u>East Anglia</u>	School of Social Studies (no faculty, no separate Department of Sociology)
<u>Essex</u>	(Schools of Studies - a department might be associated with one or more of these, according to the degree structure involved; no faculty) Department of Sociology
<u>Keele</u>	Board of Social Sciences (no faculty, but Boards of Studies) Department of Sociology (this first came into existence in 1966)
<u>Kent</u>	Faculty of Social Sciences Department of Sociology (there was also a Centre for Research in the Social Sciences)
<u>Lancaster</u>	Board of Social, Historical and Philosophical Studies (no faculty, but Boards of Studies) Department of Sociology (this first came into existence in 1969 and teaching began only in 1970)
<u>Sussex</u>	School of Social Studies (name changed to School of Social Science in October 1970; no faculty) Department of Sociology
<u>Warwick</u>	Faculty of Social Studies Department of Sociology (teaching of sociology did not begin until after October 1971)
<u>York</u>	Faculty of Social Sciences Department of Sociology

Some of the innovations introduced by the new universities are indicated in the brief descriptions which follow, of the degree course outlines which a sociology student might be offered, in each of these universities.

East Anglia.

Students in the School of Social Studies at East Anglia

began with introductory courses on Economics, Economic History, Sociology, and Philosophy, in their first two terms, after which they took a preliminary examination in each of these four subjects. Thereafter, they took not less than twelve courses, Elementary Statistical Method being compulsory, and if they wished to 'major' in a particular subject, they had to take not less than five and not more than seven courses in that subject. In the 1968/9 regulations, the stipulation was made that candidates taking more than four courses in sociology had to do some supervised field work, possibly during vacations.

In addition to the more usual basic sociology subjects, there were courses on Modern China, and, in the field of underdeveloped countries, on Thailand, Japan, and India. One third of marks towards Honours were awarded for course work.

Apart from the broader first year, the structure of this degree approximated in some ways to the course unit degree at LSE, already described.

Essex.

Essex had as its declared aim the building up of large departments, but to avoid monolithic departmental structures, the university had interlinked schools of study which cut across departmental boundaries, so that most departments 'belonged' to more than one School.

Sociology could be studied in two Schools, the School of Social Studies (which the majority of sociology students chose) and the School of Comparative Studies. Accordingly, sociology as an honours subject could be preceded by two different first year courses.

The system was designed to allow for maximum freedom of transfer.

The Social Studies first year (examined after three terms) included a course in the political, economic and social structure of Britain, and lectures on twentieth century economic, social and political history; students also had to make a choice between taking, on the one hand, two courses, one in statistics and one in mathematics, designed for students who had passed 'A' level Mathematics; and, on the other hand, taking a course in the quantitative aspects of social science and computing (there was a Computer Centre in the university and the SSRC Data Bank was housed there), and a less advanced mathematics course, or a logic course, or a modern language.

After the first year examinations, it was possible to take a two-year specialist scheme in sociology. The 1969/70 prospectus, for instance, mentioned: 'Compared with schemes of study in other universities, it gives considerable emphasis to a rigorous training in methods of social investigation'.²⁶

There were nine papers and an essay in finals, but four of these papers were taken at the end of the second year.

The School of Comparative Studies offered a strongly integrated first year course based on 'selected themes in literary, political, artistic and social life since 1688', and the study of a modern foreign language. Sociology in the School of Comparative Studies required knowledge of either Spanish or Portuguese (for students specialising in Latin America) or Russian (for the Soviet Union specialisation), and facilities were provided for students

to take an 'intercalated' year at the university's Language Centre, to improve their knowledge of the required language. The emphasis in this course was not only on the sociology of the countries to be studied, but also on their literature, art and government.

In the early seventies, three Comparative Studies schemes were differentiated from the outset, but sociology was still included in one of these.

Keele.

As has already been described in Chapter IV, Keele (a collegiate university) had a Foundation Year in which arts, social science and science subjects were studied. Keele's Department of Sociology was established only in 1966, although the university had been in existence (at first as a university college) for far longer than the other new universities. By 1969 the Sociology Department had, however, grown from three to ten in staff numbers. In 1966/7, for the first time, it was possible to take Sociology as a Principal Subject in the BA (previously, the only course offered had been one combining a degree with a Diploma in Applied Social Studies), but sociology had, of course, to be taken in combination with one or two other subjects. The first finals papers of the new Principal Subject were not set until 1969.

During student conflict at Keele between 1968 and 1970, changes in the sociology curriculum began to be introduced; the courses offered in 1969 consisted of a compulsory theory and methods course, taught through analysis of empirical works, and options in sociology (e.g. industrial sociology), social anthropology, social

administration, and social psychology. There were student criticisms of these courses, and in 1972, discussions began to take place about the possibility of a 'workshop' course in which students and staff jointly planned a series of seminars; this was experimentally adopted for the following year, but was to form only part of the main sociology Principal Subject course.

Kent.

This (collegiate) university had a common Part I course for its BA in Social Sciences, in which all students took courses in Economics and Accounting, Economic and Social History, Law, Politics and Government, Sociology, and Economic and Social Statistics. These were described as 'related disciplines concerned with different aspects of society'.²⁷ This course was unusual in lasting for four terms, and in being examined in December of the second academic year. The Part II course then lasted five terms (in this respect it was like the course at York). The prospectus specifically mentioned that students were expected to do course reading in their vacations, and to undertake a four-week course in their second long vacation.

The Part II Sociology courses included three compulsory subjects (Concepts and Theories, Comparative Sociology I (Industrial Societies) and Comparative Sociology II (Non-Industrial Societies)), as well as three subjects from a number of options. In 1969, for example, nine options were offered, including one in Social Administration 'designed 1) for those specifically interested in a career in the social

services . . . 2) for anyone with a general interest in social policy and in problems of the institutional framework of welfare in an industrial society'.²⁸ It was possible, if taking this course, to make arrangements for practical experience in the long vacation.

Lancaster.

Lancaster (also a collegiate university) began with three social sciences only, Economics, Marketing, and Politics, and was still planning its Sociology Part II courses in October 1969. Lancaster operated a system of 'major' and 'minor' courses (terminology also used at East Anglia and Sussex).

In October 1970, a Part II Sociology 'major' course, and a two year 'minor' course, were planned to begin. Sociology in Part I, taken in the first year, included, in the plans made in October 1969, courses covering sociological concepts, and the use of sociological perspective in the study of certain aspects of Britain and other contemporary societies.

Part II was planned to include three courses in the second year, for one of which, 'Methods and Measurement in Sociology', the prospectus indicated: 'Students will carry out a number of short practical projects to be written up and, together with a report on a vacation assignment, bound.'²⁹ The practical work thus produced was to contribute to the assessment at the end of the third year, in which year it was planned that the student should complete his Part II by taking three of a number of optional courses.

The practical approach of the Methods course, described above, reflected the 'laboratory methods'

approach of John Wakeford, then Head of the Sociology Department at Lancaster, a type of course which he had developed at Cardiff and Brunel, and which was fully documented in his Strategy of Social Enquiry, published in 1968.

Sussex.

It was possible to 'major' in sociology at Sussex in various Schools in the university, the ones most commonly chosen by sociology students being the School of Social Studies and the School of Educational Studies. (The other possibilities were English and American Studies, European Studies, or African and Asian Studies).

Applications were made by would-be entrants, to 'major' in a particular subject in a particular school, but it was possible to change to another 'major' or even to another school, after the Preliminary Examination. This examination consisted of a philosophy course (Language and Values), a history course (An Introduction to History), and a course called 'The Economic and Social Framework' which was compulsory for undergraduates in the School of Social Studies. These three subjects were examined after the first two terms, and students then proceeded to their 'major' and 'contextual' courses.

One of the special properties of the Sussex degrees was that even students 'majoring' in one subject, for which they had to take five courses, also had to take four or five 'contextual' courses, for finals. For this reason, no degree could really be called 'specialist' in the traditional sense. In 1967, Jennifer Platt, a

lecturer in sociology at Sussex, wrote: 'The Sussex degree will remain a fairly broad one, so that the student who wishes to concentrate entirely on one major subject, or to receive a full professional training in three years, should go elsewhere'.³⁰ Students were also warned that the system of major and contextual courses meant a heavy workload, with two essays a week, in addition to vacation work.

As in all the new universities, it was inevitable that there should be changes as the degrees developed, but the courses for sociology in the School of Social Studies, proposed for 1969/70, for example, included:

- Introduction to Sociology
- Organization of Advanced Societies
- Methods of Sociological Research

and two chosen from a wide range of possible options including:

- Political Sociology
- Urban Sociology
- Social Policy and Administration
- Sociology of Industry
- Sociology of Knowledge
- Sociology of Education
- Sociology of Development
- Bureaucracy
- Stratification
- The Family
- Social and Economic Aspects of Human Fertility
- Crime and Delinquency
- Sociology and Medicine
- Adolescent Socialization
- Sociology of the Professions
- Selected Themes in Sociological Theory

The same options, it should be pointed out, were also to be available to undergraduates majoring in sociology in the School of English and American Studies and the School of Educational Studies.

Students majoring in sociology also had to take a course in Elementary Statistical Methods.

The two compulsory contextual courses for the

School of Social Studies were: Contemporary Britain; and Concepts, Methods and Values in the Social Sciences. In this latter course, students could concentrate, in the second part of the course, either on The Historical Development of the Social Sciences, or on The Use of Mathematics in the Social Sciences (a nice example of the 'teaching sociology as an arts subject/as a science subject' dichotomy).

Sociology 'majors' had to choose another contextual course from: Social and Political Philosophy, Development of Scientific Thought, or Marxism. Then they had to choose one other from a number of mainly philosophical topics.

They also, in common with all undergraduates in the School of Social Studies, had to take an 'Arts-Science' course - either The Biological Foundations of Human Behaviour, or Mathematics for the Social Sciences.

From this somewhat bewildering array of syllabuses, courses, and possible combinations and options, an examination pattern emerged which was also, not surprisingly, somewhat variable in its structure.

Units 1 to 4: one set paper on each of four Contextual Courses

Units 5 to 9: one set paper on each of the five major courses

Unit 10: one general dissertation

was the basic structure. There were two further units which carried less weight than the ten above - one, a 2,000-word dissertation or a set paper on the 'Arts-Science' course; and the other, a set paper on the Elementary Statistical Methods course.

Some courses included an extended (3,000-5,000 words)

essay as part of the examination (e.g., Contemporary Britain). One 'optional contextual' course, Social Movements and Political Action, was to be examined by extended essay only. (The introduction of this course was partly initiated by activist students.)

The examination system at Sussex was under constant review during the sixties, and by 1971 more dissertations and essays were included in the final examination structure. The emphasis in teaching methods at Sussex, however, continued to be on tutorials and seminars.

Warwick.

Warwick introduced a sociology degree later than the other new English universities. It was hoped to begin teaching for this degree in October 1971, the year after John Rex was appointed to the chair of Sociology, but the sociology syllabus was not sufficiently formulated to be included in the prospectus for 1969/70, nor were any of its courses able to be included in the BSA surveys undertaken on Theories and Methods, Sociology of Modern Britain, and other topics. In the Careers Research and Advisory Centre Degree Course Guide for Sociology for 1970/71, the Warwick degree was described by the words 'New Course' and no subject details were given.

York.

Sociology was studied at York (a collegiate university) in the BA in Social Sciences. The Part I, taken in the first four terms, consisted of Economics, Politics, Economic and Social History, Economic and Social Statistics, Logic and Scientific Method, and Sociology (which included introductions to: A. the comparative study of social

institutions; B. sociological theory; and C. social psychology). The courses in Statistics and Logic lasted three terms only; all the other subject courses lasted four terms.

The Part II in Sociology began in the fifth term. In 1969, the four compulsory subjects were: Sociological Theory and Methods of Social Investigation; Comparative Social Systems; Social Psychology; and Social Philosophy. (These titles, and those in Part I, were very similar to the titles of the subjects of the traditional London sociology degree, for which Ronald Fletcher, then Professor at York, had taught at Bedford before his appointment to the York chair).

There were two groups of options in the York Sociology Part II. The first group offered a choice between two subjects: Social Change in Economically Underdeveloped Countries, or Modern Britain; the second group offered four subjects, from which one had to be chosen. These subjects were: Criminology, Sociology of Education, Industrial Sociology, and Sociology of Religion.

In articles on the new universities, the degrees at York, and the atmosphere of the university, tended to be characterised as more traditional, more 'straight' than those of, for example, Essex, Sussex and East Anglia, and the sociology degree was, at least until 1972, the one, of all the sociology degrees at the new English universities, most like the traditional London degree.

A note on the changing character of degrees at the new English universities.

The prospectuses of the new English universities, during the period from the granting of their respective charters, up to 1972, often included comments on the continual process of change which was taking place in degree structure, in courses offered, and in methods of examination, and these comments applied to sociology. It is important to remember that, with so many experimental courses, the likelihood that the courses actually taking place in any one academic year, accurately reflected the descriptions given in the prospectuses and calendars, was less than in the longer-established universities.

Not only were new courses tried, and accepted, or rejected; examination regulations were sometimes not finalised, or were altered during the year as the courses proceeded. The situation was, often, as different as it could possibly be from that surrounding the London degrees or those at Oxford and Cambridge, with their long-established traditions, hierarchies of committees, and massive books of regulations or statutes. The smaller sizes of the new universities and the fact that, at the outset, all the members of the academic planning bodies were 'new boys' in the situation of each particular university, meant that there was a totally different atmosphere from the traditional one of the older universities.

This is not to say that innovation for innovation's sake was necessarily continuously taking place, still

less to propose that it would have been 'good', educationally, if this had been so. It was difficult to evaluate the 'success', or otherwise, of, for example, a three year degree course, in a short span of years. It took three years for the first intake of students to reach finals; if, by then, the first year courses had been altered, there could never be a standard of comparison between the 'performance' of the first year's intake for the degree, and those coming thereafter. However, one encouraging fact about the new universities, was, in general, their greater self-awareness; several had built-in systems for some assessment of courses and of their 'success', in the light of which, modifications might be made with more substantial factual backing than had, in the past, been at the disposal of many Faculty Boards or Boards of Studies.

Group 6. The Technological Universities.

This, the newest group of English universities, had barely been awarded charters in the years covered by this chapter. The social scientists in this group of universities, which had, of course, been formed from already existing Colleges of Advanced Technology, were, unlike those in the new universities, faced with the problem of introducing or expanding sociology in a situation where strong technological traditions already existed.

Typically, the technological university was dominated by very large departments of, for example, the various branches of engineering and applied science. There would be a smaller faculty or department, its

name often combining social science with some other term covering arts or other non-science subjects. One of the major functions of some of these departments, in the years before the technological universities were chartered, had been to provide 'service courses' for the students on the main technological courses. Some of these service courses, in Christopherson's terminology, were 'colonial' - in other words, providing 'colonies' of subjects completely different from the main 'imperial' technological ones, as a culturally refreshing change; other service courses were 'expansionist', extending already existing subject frontiers, trying to link social science or arts across some bridge built between those subjects and the technological subjects involved. 31

Thus, in some technological universities, the servicing departments were grouped with other, sometimes larger, departments, which provided courses in subjects such as management and industrial administration, which were part of the main course structure of the university, and which sometimes included sociology, particularly industrial sociology, in their degrees.

Loughborough, for example, created a new social science department after it received its charter; other universities modified or extended their existing departmental structure.

Most of the technological universities also operated sandwich courses, i.e., courses on which students, sponsored either by industry or by their university, would work full-time in industry and full-time in university in alternating patterns of semesters or years. Thus, when full-time social science courses began to be

introduced into the technological universities, they were often, initially, also of the 'sandwich' type, with work placements in social work or similar situations, substituted for periods of work in industry. The study of sandwich courses at Brunel, by Marie Jahoda, was an example of an attempt at an objective assessment of sandwich courses in general, while the paper by Burton on sandwich sociology at Bath was a more subjective account of the methods by which these courses were operated, and of the effect they had on students. Both studies agreed on the difficulty of arriving at an assessment of 'success' or 'failure' of sandwich courses in their own right, or when measured against the more traditional three year course spent entirely in the university.

In the 1968 Commonwealth Universities Yearbook, the names of the chairs of 'sociology' at the technological universities appeared as follows:

<u>Aston</u>	None
<u>Bath</u>	(Humanities and Social Sciences) C.T. Sandford (Sociology) Stephen Cotgrove
<u>Bradford</u>	None (J.E.T. Eldridge was appointed to the newly created chair of Sociology in 1969)
<u>Brunel</u>	(Social Institutions) Elliott Jacques
<u>City</u>	None
<u>Loughborough</u>	(Social Sciences) A.B. Cherns
<u>Salford</u>	(Sociology) W.H. Scott (in 1969 Professor Scott left for a chair in Australia and L.F. Baric was later appointed to the chair)
<u>Surrey</u>	(Sociology) Asher Tropp

The distribution of faculties and departments at about 1969/70 was as follows:

<u>Aston</u>	Faculty of Social Sciences (no Department of Sociology) (some Sociology taught in the Department of Industrial Administration)
<u>Bath</u>	School of Humanities and Social Sciences Sociology Group
<u>Bradford</u>	School of Studies in Social Sciences (there was also a School of Studies in Applied Social Sciences)
<u>Brunel</u>	(no faculty) Department of Social Institutions
<u>City</u>	(no faculty) Department of Social Science and Humanities
<u>Loughborough</u>	(no faculty) Department of Social Sciences and Economics (founded in October 1967)
<u>Salford</u>	(no faculty) Department of Sociology, Government and Administration
<u>Surrey</u>	Faculty of Human Studies Department of Humanities and Social Sciences

Aston.

The University of Aston in Birmingham had a four year sandwich course in Behavioural Science, in which sociology could be taken as a special subject in the second and fourth year, with economics and psychology as subsidiary subjects. This course was run by the Department of Industrial Administration, which had been established as long ago as 1947, when Aston was still Birmingham Central Technical College.

The course was of the 'thick sandwich' type, i.e., the first two years were spent full-time in the university. (In the first year, the student took five social science subjects, one of them sociology, and, in addition, 'general studies'. In the second year, students could specialise in sociology, but kept up psychology and economics also.) In the third year (the 'filling' in the sandwich layers), the student moved out of the university 'on practical project work in an industrial, commercial, or voluntary organisation',³⁴ and was supervised both by a member of the university staff, and by an Industrial Supervisor in his or her place of employment.

In the fourth year, the students returned to university, and continued sociology as their specialisation, but in addition, read Management Control Systems and Management Theory, and also continued to study Logic and Scientific Method, which had been introduced in the second year. Examinations were held at the end of the first, second and fourth years.

The specialist in sociology had to take, in the second year, five compulsory courses: Industrial Sociology; Social Institutions with special reference to British Social Structure; Industrial Law; Techniques of Field Research; and Project Seminars.

In the fourth year, the three compulsory courses in sociology were: Advanced Sociology; Organisational Sociology; and Social Administration/The Community and Society (one course).

It will be seen from this description, that the sociology part of the Aston Behavioural Science degree

was oriented towards industry, organisations, and administration.

Bath.

The University of Bath was unique among the technological universities in having, from the beginning, a specialist BSc in Sociology, in which students could choose from the start to specialise in that subject. The course included periods of 'practical placement' and was, therefore, like Aston's, a four year course, but the sandwich layers were arranged somewhat differently.

The main field of study in the degree was the Sociology of Industrial Society. The degree also included, as an option, the Sociology of Science and Technology. The first year was spent in the university. The beginning of the second year, and the end of the third year, were spent on practical placement, the other halves of those years being spent in the university. The fourth year was again university-based.

The first year courses were: Sociology of Industrial Societies; Introduction to Sociological Theory; Social Problems and Policies; Statistics and Methods of Social Research; Philosophy of Science.

In the second and third years, interspersed with their practical experience, students continued to study the Sociology of Industrial Societies, and added Social Psychology, and the Sociology of Industry, Work and Organisation, as well as four options from a possible eight being offered. These options were chosen with an eye to which specialism the student would choose in the fourth year. There were four choices from which to select

one: Advanced Sociology, Professional Social Work, Education (in conjunction with the School of Education), and Personnel Management (in conjunction with the School of Management). These were specifically described in the prospectus as being training for careers.

Nancy Burton, Lecturer in Social Administration at Bath, writing in 1971, denied that English universities, as a whole, had accepted the relevance of the sandwich course to the social sciences. She emphasised the strong influence of personal factors in the 'success' or 'failure' of a placement: 'A superb placement one year for one student may prove with another student a year later to be a dismal failure'.³⁵ However, the problem of the highly intelligent student who was irritated by the interruption in academic work was, she felt, somewhat offset by the help the outside placement gave to other students, either in choosing careers on leaving college, or in bringing to life theoretical studies (e.g. a student working in a village community development in India, who found her Comparative Sociology classes were acquiring a living meaning).

Nancy Burton's summing up of the value of sandwich courses in sociology was, however, somewhat tentative: 'In the course at Bath there does appear to be a reasonably high correlation between successful placement experience and good degree results. We do not yet know, because we have not yet run a non-sandwich course in Sociology at Bath, whether a full-time course over three years would produce a higher level of intellectual achievement'.³⁶

Bradford.

The University of Bradford had had a large department of Management and Administration which provided its own degree courses in social science subjects, but by 1966 there was a Department of Sociology in the School of Studies in Social Sciences, and the BSc Social Science was developed as a full-time three year joint honours degree. Sociology could only be taken in conjunction with another social science subject. At first, the only other subject available, was Psychology, but later, History, or Politics, or Literature and the History of Ideas, were introduced as possible combinations, with Sociology, for joint honours.

The first year was a broad foundation year including eight courses. In Year 2, specialisation began. The sociology specialism included: Sociological Analysis, Comparative Social Structures, Urban Industrial Society, and Methods of Social Investigation, as well as one option; Year 3 was mainly a further study of these same subjects to a more advanced level. Examinations were held at the end of the first and third years.

The Bradford degree had no particularly industrial or management orientation, and no sandwich element, and was therefore more like a joint honours sociology degree in a non-technological university. (The degree in Applied Social Studies which Bradford also offered, did, however, include practical work placements.)

Brunel.

Brunel University, unlike Bradford, was firmly

committed to the sandwich degree principle, but, like Bradford, had a combined honours course in Social Science. It was the only technological university to use the name Bachelor of Technology (B Tech) for its social science degree.

The degree was called B Tech Psychology, Sociology and Economics, and was constructed on a course unit system. It was broken up, chronologically, into nine academic terms and three six-month periods of practical training, occupying the third academic term and most of the summer vacation, each year. (It was also possible to study Sociology in the Psychology degree.)

In the first year of the B Tech Psychology, Sociology, and Economics, students took courses in the three main subjects of the degree, as well as one other chosen from Law or Recent History, and all students also took Introductory Statistics. Also, students were expected to take a 'Complementary Study' (equivalent to a 'General Studies' course), in common with students in the rest of the university.

Elective courses for third or fourth year students included Political Sociology, Sociological Theory, Industrial Sociology, Sociology of Religion and Belief Systems, Human Ecology and Population Problems, and Industrial Relations. In addition, various subjects from outside the three main subject areas could be chosen, for example, Theory and Analysis of Complex Organisations.

Some of the practical work periods undertaken by

Brunel students took place abroad, for example in industry in Sweden and Ireland, child care in France, adolescent work-groups in the USA, and kibbutzim in Israel. These overseas arrangements were made by the students, although with backing from the university. All students had to keep diaries of their work experience, and were given reading lists related to the field of work in which they were engaged. They also had to submit a full report of each period of practical training, but only the report on the third industrial assignment was expected to be fully structured, and this report counted towards the final degree assessment.

City.

The City University offered a three year BSc degree in Social Science which included roughly equal amounts of Sociology and Psychology, with some Economics in the first year. The academic year, beginning in September and ending in July, was organised in two semesters, the second one beginning in February, and the full-time degree consisted of five semesters of study in the university, and, in addition, one six-month period of industrial or other suitable training during the second year. (The majority of the City University's courses were organised on a four year basis with six-month periods of employment followed by, and integrated with, full-time periods of study in the university.)

In the first year of the Social Science course, students were given roughly equal numbers of courses in Sociology, Psychology and Economics, and were also advised to attend the Gresham Lectures, a series of

lectures on various subjects, by outside lecturers, traditionally delivered to all students in the university. These approximated, in the social science degree, to the 'general studies' taken by students in other degrees in the university, or to the 'Complementary Studies' in some other technological universities.

The Part I examination for the Social Science degree was held at the end of the first year. In their second year, in addition to their period of work outside the university, students continued Sociology and Psychology and took their Part II examination. While in their final year, it was possible for them to arrange courses so that they concentrated on either Sociology or Psychology. Each student also had to prepare a project which was assessed as part of the final (Part III) examination. It was originally possible to take the BSc Social Science as a four year sandwich course, with one year away from the university, but this arrangement was phased out by the end of the sixties.

Loughborough

Loughborough University of Technology had established a new Department of Social Sciences and Economics in 1967, but undergraduate courses did not begin until 1968, and the general pattern of the degree (BSc Joint Honours in Social Sciences) included, in the first year, Economics, Economic and Technological History, Political Science, and Sociology. Further specialisation was possible in the second and third years, when a system of major and minor courses was introduced. The courses offered in sociology focused on the analysis of industrial societies, and took account of the contribution of the Centre for the

Utilization of Social Science Research, at the university, especially in the field of sociology of organisations.

Loughborough also offered a B Tech in Social Sciences and Technology.

The Sociology major, as planned in 1969, led to four examination papers in Part I at the end of the second year: (i) Sociological Theory/Social Psychology (joint paper); (ii) Sociology of Organisations; (iii) Social Structure and Social Change (Urbanisation); (iv) Social Structure and Social Change (Sociology of Work/Education).

The finals papers at the end of the third year were on similar subjects, but there, options were to be offered in: Crime and Delinquency, Demography and Social Structure, and Theories of Social Change and Economic Development. All students had to study quantitative methods in the first year. There was no sandwich element in this degree.

Salford.

The University of Salford's degree of BSc Honours in Social Studies contained some sociology. The degree had begun in the former Department of Liberal Studies (the Department of Social Studies was formed in 1965). There was a broad first year, but it was possible to take combined honours in Sociology and one other subject, in Part II of the course. A dissertation also had to be completed in Part III, and counted as one examination paper.

Certain alternative subjects had to be taken in the second year, selected from a list including Social

Psychology, and Social and Economic Statistics, and these were examined at the end of the second year.

The sociological element in the common Part I course was called 'Comparative Social Systems', 'a co-ordinated course in two parallel lectures, one being an introduction to small scale and peasant societies, and the other being an introduction to industrial societies'.

In Part II, this emphasis on Social Anthropology was maintained (in fact, in the 1968/9 syllabus, the heading for the sociology specialisation read 'Sociology and Social Anthropology'), and the second and third year courses called 'Economic and Political Systems' included 'special reference to non-industrial countries'.

The courses at Salford, and, to a lesser extent, at Bradford, were unusual, among sociology courses at technological universities, in including a substantial social anthropology element, although, as courses developed at the other technological universities, they too began to broaden out from what had been a main emphasis on industrial societies.

Surrey.

The degree courses at the University of Surrey which included sociology, were unlike those at any other technological university. The Department of Humanities and Social Sciences was in a Faculty of Human Studies, and there were two degree courses containing sociology.

The first was the degree of BSc in Human and Physical Sciences, started in 1963, in which it was possible to

take Sociology as a 'principal' subject in the second and third years. In the first year, there were courses for two groups of entrants, those with science 'A' levels and those with Arts 'A' levels, both of which groups took a course entitled 'Human Sciences' and a two-term 'General Studies' course, 'Man in Society'.

In the second and third years, while all students followed five courses in Physical Sciences (one of which was Materials Technology), it was possible to specialise in Sociology on the Human Sciences side. This specialism also included five courses, which were: Social Structure and Social Institutions; Economics; Social Psychology; and Modern Britain; plus one from a group of five possible options. For the student choosing Sociology, this part of the degree was virtually a joint honours course in Physical Sciences/Sociology.

In the second long vacation, all students were expected to spend a period of about six weeks in industry, and they also wrote a dissertation in their final year, which counted towards their examination results.

The second degree course containing Sociology, the BSc in Human Relations, on the other hand, comprised Philosophy, Psychology and Sociology, and was divided into two Stages. In Stage 1 (four terms) all courses were compulsory and spanned all three subjects. There were four Philosophy courses, four Psychology courses, two Sociology courses, and a course in Economics. Students also took courses in General Studies 'planned to introduce students to the world of science and technology'.

In Stage 2 (terms five to nine) students could take Sociology combined with one of the other subject courses, Psychology or Philosophy.

The Sociology specialism included four courses and a seminar. These were: two compulsory courses, Industrial Sociology, and Research Methods in Sociology; two from four options; and a seminar on Development of Cultural Ideas. These courses would be balanced by an equal number of courses on either Philosophy or Psychology, and this structure was, again, equivalent to the structure of a joint honours degree.

The Stage 1 assessment was made, not by examination, but by continuous assessment of essays and tests. After Stage 2, there were conventional degree examinations. Practical work was required for six weeks of the first long vacation, together with a related theoretical project.

Sociology at some other University Institutions.

While this concludes the brief descriptions of sociology in the eight technological universities previously listed, one other institution, Chelsea College of Science and Technology, was sometimes referred to among the Colleges of Advanced Technology which had been upgraded. Chelsea has not been included in the group above because, strictly speaking it fell within the purview of the University of London, and sociology at Chelsea has therefore been described under Group 2 above.

There were many other university institutions in England where some sociology was being taught - to take only two examples, sociology of Education, and Sociology of

Higher Education, at the University of London Institute of Education, and Industrial Sociology in the unit at the Imperial College of Science and Technology. These were not, however, first degree courses in sociology.

Sociology degree structure at universities in England, 1963-1972.

To sum up the position of sociology first degrees in the period 1963 to 1972 in England, one word seems appropriate - transition. The very rapid increase in the number of courses, the newness of many of the institutions in which they were offered, the changes in the climate of opinion about the way in which degrees should be run in general, all precluded any great emphasis on consolidation. There was a tendency for occupants of chairs of sociology to change more often during this period than in previous years, partly owing to the retirement of some professors of long standing, and partly owing to the formation of new departments and the increase in the size of staff numbers, and the changes in subject and research emphasis, in already established departments, which meant that new chairs were created or existing ones modified in ways which attracted professors from other universities.

Sociology degrees did not fall readily into categories along the lines of the six groups of universities which have been delineated (see Table V.3). This shows the range of subjects in first year courses. Combined courses are included with the special courses. The titles of the subjects given in the table are approximations to the subject-matter concerned.

Table V.3

Subjects listed as included with first year sociology degree courses, in Careers Research and Advisory Centre Degree Course Guide, 1970/71

Key: C=compulsory O=optional 2C=two compulsory $\frac{1}{2}$ C=counts as half a compulsory paper J=joint or combined course
JO=alternative options in joint course CFY=common first year

University or college	Socio logy	Econ omics	Pol iti cal Sci	Social or philos or logic	Econ/ social hist ory	Method ology/ Statis tics	Psych ology	Social Anthr opol ogy	Social Admin istra tion	
<u>Group 1</u>										
Cambridge	0	-	0	-	-	-	0	0	-	
<u>Group 2</u>										
Bedford	2C	C	C	C	C	C	-	-	-	
(3 years' study: no separate 1st year course)										
Goldsmith's BA/BSc(Soc)	2C	C	0	C	0	C	C	-	-	
LSE BA/BSc(Soc)	2C	C	-	C	-	C	C	0	0	
and 60										
(3 years' study: no separate first year course)										
LSE BSc(Econ)	C	C	C	-	C	0	-	0	-	CFY
<u>Group 3</u>										
Birmingham	C	C	C	-	C	C	C	-	-	CFY
(Accountancy optional)										
Bristol	2C	JO	JO	JO	JO	C	JO	-	-	J
(Theology alternative option in joint course)										
Durham	C	0	-	-	-	-	C	-	-	
(C - wide range 20)										
Leeds	C	C	C	-	-	-	-	-	-	CFY
Liverpool	C&O	0	0	0	-	-	C	-	0	
(Choice of some options--depends on previous experience)										
Manchester	$\frac{1}{2}$ C	C	C	-	0	-	-	$\frac{1}{2}$ C	-	CFY
(Mathematics optional)										
Newcastle	C	0	0	-	-	C	-	-	C	CFY (J)
Sheffield	C	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	CFY
(Mathematics, Language, Accountancy, Law, Geography optional)										

Table V.3 (continued)

University or college	Socio logy	Econ omics	Pol iti cal Sci	Social or philos or logic	Econ/ social hist ory	Method ology/ Statis tics	Psych ology	Social Anthr opol ogy	Social Admin istra tion	
<u>Group 4</u>										
Exeter	2C	C	0	0	0	C	0	-	-	
(Mathematics, Law, Geography optional)										
Hull	2C	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	
(Law, Geography optional)										
Leicester BA	C	C	C	-	C	-	-	-	-	CFY
(Geography compulsory)										
Leicester BSc	2C	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
(C - wide range)										
Nottingham	C	0	0	0	0	-	0	-	0	
(Language optional)										
Reading	C	0	0	0	0	-	0	-	-	
(Various languages optional)										
Southampton	C	0	0	0	0	C	0	-	0	
(Mathematics, Accountancy, Law optional)										
<u>Group 5</u>										
East Anglia	C	C	-	C	C	-	-	-	-	CFY
										2 terms only
Essex (Comparative Studies)	C	-	C	-	C	-	-	-	-	CFY
(Art and literature compulsory)										
Essex (Social Studies)	C	C	C	-	-	C	-	-	-	CFY
(Mathematics, Language optional)										
Keele	Foundation year									
Kent	0	0	0	-	0	C	-	-	-	CFY
(Language optional)										
Lancaster	C	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	
(Mathematics, Language, Religious studies, Arts & Science optional)										
Sussex	$\frac{1}{2}$ 0	$\frac{1}{2}$ 0	-	C	C	-	-	-	-	CFY
(Literature optional, Language compulsory in School of European studies only)										2 terms
Warwick	New course									
York	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	-	-	CFY
										4 terms

Table V.3 (continued)

University or college	Socio logy	Econ omics	Pol iti cal Sci	Social or philos or logic	Econ/ social hist ory	Method ology/ Statist ics	Psych ology	Social Anthr opol ogy	Social Admin istra tion	
<u>Group 6</u>										
Aston (General studies compulsory)	C	C	-	C	-	C	C	-	-	CFY (J)
Bath	C	-	-	C	-	C	C	-	C	
Bradford (Science, technology and society compulsory. Language, Accountancy, Law, Geography optional)	C	O	JO	-	-	-	JO	-	-	CFY (J)
Brunel	C	C	-	-	-	C	C	-	-	CFY (J)
City (General studies compulsory)	C	C	-	C	-	C	C	-	-	J
Lough- borough (Mathematics optional)	C	C	C	-	C	C	O	-	-	CFY (J)
Salford (*includes some anthropology. Geography optional)	C*	O	O	-	O	C	O	-	-	CFY (J)
Surrey (General studies compulsory)	2C	C	-	4C	-	C	2C	-	-	CFY (J) 4 terms

Specialist degrees were found in London colleges, in the older and younger civic universities, in several of the new universities, and in one technological university. Sociology degrees which included broader groups of subjects in the first year, or joint or combined honours in the later years, were found in several groups of universities. It is true that sandwich degrees, and those including a 'general studies' subject as such, were not found outside the technological universities, presumably because both these factors had derived from the structure of the courses offered by these universities in their previous guises as Colleges of Advanced Technology. Nevertheless, periods of practical work had been introduced in sociology degrees in some non-technological universities, and courses at Keele and Sussex, for example, already contained elements of the 'complementary studies' idea to form bridges between sociology and science or arts.

In describing the outlines of development in the present chapter, no attempt has been made to furnish any detail of the contents of the courses offered. An overview of some of the subject-matter which sociology undergraduate students in England encountered in their courses in the period 1963 to 1972, will be attempted in the chapter which follows.

REFERENCES
CHAPTER V.

1. Committee on Higher Education, Report, Cmnd.2154 (The Robbins Report), HMSO, 1963, quoted by Green, V.H.H., The Universities, Penguin Books, 1969, p.136.
2. Advisory Centre for Education, 16+ Guide: Sociology, ACE, Cambridge, 1967.
3. Department of Education and Science, Statistics of Education, 1965, Part Two, HMSO, 1966, p.178.
4. University Teachers' Section, British Sociological Association, Report of a Committee set up to consider Sociology as a School Subject (duplicated), 1964, Appendix A, para. 6.
5. Abrams, Philip, 'The Trouble with School Sociology', New Society, October 31, 1968, p.636.
6. Cotgrove, Stephen, 'Sociology in Schools', (letter), New Society, November 7, 1968.
7. Department of Education and Science, Report of the Committee on the Social Studies, Cmnd.2660 (The Heyworth Report), HMSO, 1965, p.3.
8. Abbott, Joan, Employment of Sociology and Anthropology Graduates 1966-1967, British Sociological Association, 1970.
9. Sibley, E., The Education of Sociologists in the United States, Russell Sage Foundation, New York, 1963.
10. Mercer, B.E., and Pearson, J.B., 'Personal and Institutional Characteristics of American Sociologists', Sociology and Social Research, April 1962, pp.259-269.
11. Bates, A.P., 'Undergraduate Sociology: a Problem for the Profession', Sociology Quarterly, Vol.VI, 1965, pp.21-36.
12. Carter, M.P., 'Survey of Sociological Research in Britain', Sociological Review, NS, Vol.XVI, 1968, pp.5-40.
13. Neustadt, I., The Teaching of Sociology, (Inaugural Lecture), Leicester University Press, 1964, p.9.
14. Broady, Maurice, 'The Academic Tension in Student Life', Universities Quarterly, Vol.XXI, 4, September 1967, p.408.
15. Levy, Hyman, 'Doing Their Practicals', (letter), The Observer, February 23, 1969.
16. Banks, J.A., Sociology as a Vocation, (Inaugural Lecture), Leicester University Press, 1971, p.5.
17. Blackstone, T., Gales, K., Hadley, R., and Lewis, W., Students in Conflict: LSE in 1967, Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1970.

18. Ezard, John, 'Sociologists Win the Day at Cambridge', Guardian, June 11, 1969.
19. Bellaby, Paul, 'Sociology Without a Syllabus: The Keele Workshop Experiments', Network, British Sociological Association, March 1975.
20. University of Sussex, BA Syllabus, 1969/70, p.151.
21. Rudd, E., 'Student unrest: can we get the facts straight?', in Butcher, H.J. and Rudd, E., (eds.), Contemporary Problems in Higher Education, McGraw-Hill Book Company (UK), Maidenhead, 1972, pp.233-244.
22. London School of Economics, 'Survey of Sociology Undergraduate Opinion on methods of teaching and assessment', (duplicated), Sociology Department, LSE, May 1968; London School of Economics, 'Recommendations made by the Staff/Student Committee of the Sociology Department, L.S.E., to the Sub-Committee of the Board of Studies in Sociology on the question of assessment for the degree of B.A. and B.Sc. (Sociology), Branch I', (duplicated), Sociology Department, LSE, 1969.
23. 'A Guide for Applicants', in 16+ Guide: Sociology, Advisory Centre for Education, Cambridge, 1967, Item 3, p.5.
24. Beloff, M., and Rex, J., 'Is Sociology Respectable?', discussion, BBC Radio 3, September 3, 1969 (transcript of tape recording made by the researcher).
25. University of Leicester, Annual Report, 1965/6, p.31.
26. University of Essex, Prospectus, 1969/70, p.49.
27. University of Kent at Canterbury, Prospectus, 1968/9, p.44.
28. University of Kent at Canterbury, Faculty of Social Sciences, Part II Courses, June 1969, p.71.
29. University of Lancaster, Prospectus, 1971/2, p.146.
30. Platt, Jennifer, 'Sociology at Sussex', in 16+ Guide: Sociology, Advisory Centre for Education, Cambridge, 1967, Item 4(b), p.4.
31. Christopherson, D.G., The Engineer in the University, English Universities Press, 1967, p.80.
32. Jahoda, Marie, The Education of Technologists, Tavistock Publications, 1963.
33. Burton, Nancy, 'A Sandwich Course in Sociology', Universities Quarterly, Vol.XXV,3, 1971, pp.369-374.
34. University of Aston in Birmingham, Faculty of Social Sciences, Prospectus, 1969/70, p.18.
35. Burton, Nancy, op.cit., p.371.
36. Ibid., p.372.

CHAPTER VI

1963 - 1972 (II). SUBJECTS TAUGHT IN FIRST DEGREES IN SOCIOLOGY

Introduction.

Various 'counts' were made in the sixties of the subjects most often included in sociology first degrees at English universities. (At this point it must be re-emphasised that the discussion which follows in this chapter, is concerned with those subjects which were present in sociology first degrees as areas of undergraduate teaching material, rather than with the question of which subjects sociology contained, or should have contained, as an intellectual discipline in general.)

In the 'counts', then, made by such bodies as the
Advisory Centre for Education,¹ the Careers Research and
Advisory Centre,² and the British Sociological Association,³
the subjects in sociology first degrees tended to be divided into two main groups. The first group, usually called 'compulsory' or 'core' subjects, were (a) included in the majority of first degrees, and (b) compulsory subjects in the majority of the degrees in which they were included.

The second group, called 'optional', 'alternative', or 'elective' subjects, or by some similar title, either (a) were included in a large number of sociology first degrees, but were less often compulsory than the subjects in the first group (an example of this category would be Industrial Sociology), or (b) were included in only a small number of sociology first degrees, and were never

compulsory (an example of this category would be Sociology of the Professions).

Because of the autonomy of English universities, and because of the comparative newness of sociology as a first degree subject, there could be no hard and fast rules about the allocation of subjects to one or other of these two main groups. The present discussion will cover, as 'compulsory' subjects:

1. Sociological Theory, including History of Sociological Thought.
2. Methods (including Survey Methods in Social Investigation, and Statistics).
3. Comparative Social Institutions.
4. Social Structure of Modern Britain.
5. Social Psychology.

(Some study of Economics was compulsory in a large number of sociology first degree courses, but, since Economics falls outside the main 'core' area of Sociology, courses in Economics which formed part of sociology first degrees have been excluded from the present discussion.)

Other subjects included in sociology first degrees will be discussed as options, grouped as in Table VI.1.

The sections in this chapter on compulsory and optional subjects will be preceded, first, by a section on teaching methods in sociology first degrees in general; and second, by some consideration of Preliminary and Introductory courses, which, while necessarily overlapping the subject areas outlined above, provided some interesting characteristics of their own.

Table VI.1

Optional* subjects in sociology first degrees over the approximate span of years 1963 to 1972

- | | | |
|---------------------|-----|---|
| <u>Group A.</u> | 1. | Social Anthropology. |
| | 2. | Social Administration. |
| | 3. | Social Philosophy. |
|
<u>Group B.</u> | 1. | Industrial Sociology. |
| | 2. | Political Sociology. |
| | 3. | Sociology of Deviance, and Criminology. |
| | 4. | Sociology of Religion. |
| | 5. | Sociology of Education. |
| | 6. | Urban Sociology. |
| | 7. | Demography. |
| | 8. | Race Relations. |
| | 9. | Sociology of the Family. |
| | 10. | Social Stratification. |
| | 11. | Sociology of Medicine. |
|
<u>Group C.</u> | 1. | Sociology of Development and Change. |
| | 2. | Sociology of Revolution. |
|
<u>Group D.</u> | 1. | Sociology of Knowledge. |
| | 2. | Sociology of Science. |
| | 3. | Sociology of Culture. |

* The inclusion of a subject in this Table does not signify that it was not included as a compulsory subject in some degree schemes.

Methods of Teaching Sociology.

1. Lectures, Seminars and Tutorials.

The vast majority of undergraduate sociology teaching in the period under review was performed by the traditional lecture method. In its simplest form, this was a situation where the lecturer delivered an address to a large group of students, who took notes on the material. Variations on this were (a) the smaller seminar group, where, under the direction of a lecturer, one or more students read paper(s); this procedure was followed by more or less well-informed discussion by other members of the group, who were expected to have acquainted themselves with some of the subject-matter of the seminar beforehand; and (b) the tutorial, where the lecturer either heard essays read to him by one or two (sometimes more) students, and made comments on them, or where work previously prepared and handed in to the lecturer was discussed and assessed. The chief difference was in the greater feedback between lecturer and student which was expected (if not always present) in this tutorial situation. In addition, some universities arranged tutorial classes in which the lecturer who had delivered a series of formal lectures, or another member of staff, discussed the subject-matter of the more formal delivery in greater detail, and answered students' questions, helped with difficulties, or related the material to other parts of the students' course.

The presence or absence of lectures, seminars and tutorials, and the amounts of emphasis laid on these, varied greatly according to the size and organisation of

the university and department.

At one end of the scale, there was, theoretically, the situation where the majority of sociology students attended lectures, took notes, wrote very few essays, which were marked and assessed in some way but not discussed in person, and then took examinations at the end of the session, after which they gained their first real notion of the ranking their lecturers assigned to them, from their examination marks.

At the other end of the scale there was, theoretically, the situation where there were fewer lectures (often optional), but frequent seminars and/or tutorials, and frequent production by the student of essays and papers which were discussed in detail, which formed the main teaching process, and which sometimes figured largely, in assessment for examination purposes, with formal papers written in the traditional examination situation.

The tutorial method had typically been associated with Oxford and Cambridge (at the latter, tutorials were called supervisions), and the lecture method had typically been associated with the older civic universities, but modifications of both basic systems during the sixties tended to be towards the introduction or retention of more discussion and seminar-type methods, rather than a return to a greater use of the large lecture system as the main teaching method. All such statements, however, can only have a very generalised application.

The teaching of Methods courses, and the teaching of Social Psychology, were two areas in sociology undergraduate teaching in which innovations took place.

2. The teaching of Methods courses.

Methods of Social Investigation could be taught by lectures, note-taking, and the working out of examples. (Examination papers on Methods in the sixties sometimes contained a mixture of essay-type questions and mathematical-exercise questions (e.g. Surrey), but a more frequently encountered situation was one like that at Leeds, where one paper was called 'Methodology', and contained essay-type questions, and another paper, called, in this case, 'Methods of Social Investigation', contained the mathematical exercise questions.) Where there was a separate paper called 'Statistics', or a separate statistics course, this dichotomy was often built into the examination structure (as at Sheffield). In some universities, however, (e.g. Sheffield, Bedford), Methods lecturers arranged for students to plan, operate and analyse a small social survey or other social investigation. Further developments, along American lines, were being planned, for instance, to eliminate the tedious process of coding a whole set of questionnaires, once the coding procedure had been learnt, by giving students sets of ready-punched cards on which to operate; other short cuts were to be introduced. The installation of computers in universities was a development seen by some (e.g. Essex) as important to the development of Methods courses, while apparently being totally ignored by other Methods lecturers.

Another, similar, approach to the problem of giving students some practical experience of survey and other methods was that described by Liggett and Wakeford in their 1964 paper, and by Wakeford in his book in 1968:⁴

students could be given 'kits' of statistical material, ready-prepared, on which to perform certain techniques which would then be 'written up' in the manner of experiments in natural science (as in the proposed course at Lancaster).

The interspersing of academic work, whether lecture-and-note-taking or 'lab. work', with periods of work in social or government agencies or other placements, either in vacations or in 'sandwich' periods, is included here under the discussion of the teaching of Methods, as it sometimes formed the basis for a dissertation or report (e.g. at Brunel) which was more likely to be methods- than theory-oriented, but the general attitude towards such work experience seems to have been, in the sixties and early seventies, that the placement was a contribution to the whole sociology degree course (e.g. at Bath), in some way enriching the academic element, and it was less often viewed as an integral part of Methods courses.

3. The teaching of Social Psychology.

Social Psychology sometimes also broke away from the lecture-seminar-tutorial group of teaching methods and included some experimental sessions, e.g. in group behaviour (LSE). If the social psychology course took place in the psychology department of the university, the equipment and environment for more experimental methods were more likely to be readily available.

4. Visits to situations outside the university.

The sociology student who took part in a social survey programme was already compelled to move out of

the classroom/library situation for some of his course work, even if, as was often the case, the survey were to be conducted on students in his university. Placement sessions spent wholly away from university have already been mentioned. There were, however, some lecturers in Sociology of Education (e.g. at Leeds) and in Social Administration, who programmed in brief visits to schools, or hospitals, for example, as part of a seminar or lecture syllabus, and seminar topics would then be arranged to form links with the out-of-university sessions.

5. Audio-visual aids.

This short survey of some teaching methods in sociology first degrees would not be complete without a brief reference to the increasing interest shown, in all university teaching, in the use of such methods as CCTV, video-tape recording, computer feedback and data preparation facilities, and the greater sophistication of information-retrieval systems in libraries. Peter Marris's vision of the 'automatic university'⁵ was still a science-fiction fantasy, but elements of it were making their appearance.

The methods of teaching sociology as an indication of its categorisation as a science or arts subject.

⁶
Kuhn's thesis that the way in which a subject was taught as an academic discipline had fundamental implications for its claims to be a science or an arts subject, stirred up a basic controversy in the sixties, over methods of teaching sociology. Kuhn's argument,

simply stated, was as follows: in science subjects, when a theory was disproved, it no longer formed part of the syllabus, and the textbook stating it as 'truth' had to be rewritten or revised. All scientific activity in the past tended to be looked at from the perspective of the up-to-date state of 'true' knowledge, and those scientists who had anticipated the currently received ideas were mentioned in histories of science with more prominence than those whose theories had not, in the end, been accepted. How different was the situation in sociology. Here, the 'development of the subject' often formed the basis for a whole course of lectures, and students were often expected to know, not only conflicting theories currently received by various groups of theorists, but also theories propounded by sociologists long dead, which either were not capable of proof or disproof, or had lost their relevance because of advances in the state of empirical knowledge in sociology.

Despite the papers and articles on this controversy, undergraduate sociology in England in 1972 was only marginally taught as a 'science', with laboratory methods and practical experiments; it was still very largely taught as an arts subject with classic texts, founding fathers, and lecture notes and essays in continuous prose which far outweighed in volume the use of mathematical symbols.

Preliminary and Introductory Courses in Sociology.

1. Preliminary courses.

These were not courses in the full sense, because

they were not taught personally at the university; they were composed of advisory notes to students who were coming up to university in the autumn term to read sociology, or to take a first year course containing sociology, as well as lists of books suggested for preliminary reading. Some universities (e.g. LSE) suggested that some books should be bought, and therefore concentrated on cheap paperback editions; others specifically advised their students not to buy books, but to borrow them from libraries. This advice partly depended on the purpose of the preliminary list. If the purpose was, to introduce the student to sociology in general, to give an overall idea of the perspectives to be encountered, the list might include some books which the student would not need on first year courses. A note on a list of this sort advised: 'read these rather quickly, as many as you like on the topics which interest you, but not as if you were to be examined in them'. (Reading University background reading list for the first year).

Other lists were actually selections from first year reading lists (for example, lists for the Cambridge triposes included books marked 'Recommended for reading in the Long Vacation preceding the academical year in which a candidate intends to sit for the examination') and the purpose here obviously was that the student should do some serious preliminary groundwork reading.

The aim of most preliminary lists probably lay somewhere between these two extremes.

The books recommended fell into several broad

categories. There were general introductions to the subject of sociology, for example Berger's Invitation to Sociology (LSE, Durham), Wright Mills's The Sociological Imagination, Carr's What is History?, Inkeles' What is Sociology? There were general textbooks: for example, Bottomore,⁷ Chinoy,⁸ Mitchell,⁹ Cotgrove¹⁰ (City, Durham, LSE). There were case-histories, fairly readable empirical studies, pieces of factual research, for example, Dennis, Henriques and Slaughter's Coal is Our Life, David Lockwood's The Blackcoated Worker, Young and Willmott's Family and Kinship in East London.

In addition to these main groupings, some lists¹¹ suggested books of readings, e.g. Broom and Selznick, others, (for example, Reading University) included novels with a sociological slant (ranging from science fiction, Brave New World or 1984, to 'literature based on social class or situation', Robert Tressall's Ragged Trousered Philanthropists, Gorky's My Childhood, even Jessica Mitford's Hons and Rebels).

For those who had read little modern history, paperbacks such as D. Thomson's England in the Twentieth Century were suggested, and some lists included books on¹² particular social institutions - the family (Fletcher),¹³ class (Bottomore),¹³ or education (Jackson and Marsden),¹⁴ were examples.

2. Introductory Courses.

There were two main types of Introductory Course in sociology first degrees. The first type was a general

introduction to the whole subject, given, alongside introductions to other social science courses, to students taking broad first year courses (e.g. Birmingham, Leeds, Aston, Loughborough). This type of introductory sociology course was usually examined at the end of the first year (exceptionally, as at East Anglia, after two terms) and so had to cover a large number of topics in a fairly elementary way. It also sometimes served the function of encouraging the student to continue with sociology as a specialism in the second and third years.

The second type of introductory course, although sometimes called by the same title, 'Introduction to Sociology', was run at the same time as other courses in different areas of sociology (e.g. LSE, Bedford, Exeter, York), and was therefore more likely to be, in fact, an introduction to sociological theory and concepts in general. The students attending these courses had often already committed themselves to sociology as a specialism, and a higher standard could be aimed at. In universities where both specialist sociology, and joint or combined honours or more general social science courses, were offered, the same set of introductory lectures might be attended by both types of student. In other universities (e.g. Bristol, Brunel, Salford, Leicester), no one introductory course was offered; the first year students plunged straight into lecture courses on the different subjects on the sociology syllabus.

The following observations apply to these various categories of introductory courses in sociology in first degrees at English universities in the sixties and early

seventies:

Some courses (e.g. Exeter, Leeds) began with a brief account of the origins, history and development of sociology - others omitted this altogether. There was typically some discussion of sociological 'perspective(s)', (e.g. Manchester, Loughborough), perhaps with a delineation of the whole scope of the subject-matter of sociology, and often with a discussion of sociology's claim to be a science, and of scientific method and sociological method in general (e.g. York).

Many courses included a section on 'concepts' - for example, Aston, Durham, Exeter, Essex - such concepts as social system, social structure, social organisation, role, norm, institution, conflict, cooperation, exchange, authority, status, community, association, culture, relationships.

Another frequently occurring heading was 'social institutions'; these were sometimes, but by no means always, divided into 'pre-industrial' and 'industrial', or, institutions of simple and complex societies (e.g. in courses at Exeter and Durham). The institutions most often dealt with in introductory courses were: family, marriage and kinship; economic institutions; political institutions; education; stratification and social mobility (or social differentiation); class, status and power; urban society; religion; mass society; (mass)communications and media.

Under the heading 'social processes' (e.g. at Aston and Bradford), lecturers discussed social control, conflict, cohesion, socialisation, deviance and conformity, and exchange and reciprocity.

Sometimes the terms used above were included, instead, under the heading 'social change', where the ideas of evolution, industrialisation, urbanisation and revolution might be introduced (e.g. at Birmingham, Bradford and Durham).

Sociological theories, where they were not brought in to the opening historical introduction to the subject, formed part of later sections of introductory courses at, for instance, Liverpool and Loughborough, examples being: role theory and social interaction, the theory of groups, the use of comparative study, and the use of evolutionary, conflict, and structural/functional models of society.

Occasionally (e.g. at Hull) the first two or three lectures of a course on 'The Social Structure of Modern Britain' would be used for an introduction to sociology in general, where no such separate course was included in the degree pattern. Here there would be time to introduce only topics such as concepts, the problem of objectivity, a brief critique of theories of society, and the idea of social structure.

Students were usually advised (as at Aston and Loughborough) to buy some basic textbooks - Bottomore, Cotgrove, Chinoy and Mitchell were again frequently mentioned, among others - but no course was based on one textbook alone. Students at Newcastle were advised to look at the major sociological and anthropological journals as a means of gaining some idea of the scope of the subjects they were to study, but introductory courses in sociology tended, as a general rule, to stay clear of journal articles, although works of reference

such as Encyclopaedias of Social Science, or Duncan Mitchell's Dictionary of Sociology, were mentioned as useful (e.g. on Newcastle's list) as were 'the general introductions to the field' (e.g. Berger's Invitation to Sociology) already mentioned above in the section on Preliminary Courses (lists mentioning these general introductions included those at Bradford, Loughborough and Salford).

Frequent reference was made to the difficulty of obtaining books from libraries, and this was often given as the reason for the presentation of a long reading list (for example, that at Leeds), the assumption being that, if enough books were mentioned, the students would be able to find references to the topics they had to study, in one or more of a variety of alternative sources. The general impression was gained that lecturers did not expect students to buy many books, and that they made great efforts to recommend cheap paperback editions where possible; if a more expensive book were recommended, it was sometimes pointed out that it would be in use throughout the entire course, or would form the basis for work in more courses than one, to justify the expenditure.

It is impossible to assess the probable effect of these general introductory courses on the students, or as part of the whole degree pattern, since they took place in such a rich variety of academic settings, and the way in which they fitted into the total sociology degree structure varied not only from university to university, but also from one introductory course to another,

according to the different degrees being taken by the students who made up their audiences.

Specialised Sociology Courses.

As has been indicated in Chapter V, some universities allowed students to specialise in sociology from the beginning, others allowed them to wait until the second year (exceptionally, until the fourth term) before making their choice of specialisation.

In Table VI.2 are listed the main subjects taught to students specialising in sociology. These have been taken from the headings under 'Internal subjects' in the table 'Sociology: Specialised Studies' in the CRAC Degree Course Guide for 1970/71. 'Internal subjects' are classified as those taught in the department of the main course, and relating directly to the discipline concerned, while other subjects, such as Economics and Political Science, are classified as 'External subjects' and have therefore been omitted from the table. As in Table V.3, the titles of the subject headings, having been standardised, do not always correspond to the title of the course used by the university or college concerned. As has been mentioned previously, optional subjects tended to vary somewhat from year to year according to the availability of staff, and the table therefore shows only the approximate pattern of the degrees. The compulsory and optional subjects will be discussed individually in the sections of the present chapter which follow Table VI.2.

Table VI.2

Subjects listed as included in Sociology:Specialised Studies
in Careers Research and Advisory Centre Degree Course Guide,
1970/71

Key: C=compulsory O=optional 2C=two courses compulsory
2-O=2 optional courses J=joint or combined course

Subjects	Universities and colleges				
	Group 1 Cambridge	Group 2 Bedford	Gold smith's	LSE BA/ BSc(Soc)	LSE BSc Econ
Sociological theory	O	C	C	C	C
Methods of social research/ statistics	O	C	C	C	-
Philosophy/ logic	O	C	C	C	C
Social psychology	2-O	C	C	C	O
Social structure	-	2C	2C	C	C
Social change/ Sociology of development	O	-	-	O	-
Comparative sociology	-	C	C	C	-
Anthropology	3-O	-	O	O	-
Social Admin- istration	-	O	O	O	-
Sociology of industry	O	O	O	O	-
Sociology of education	-	-	-	-	-
Sociology of deviance	-	O	O	O	O
Sociology of religion	-	O	O	O	O
Political sociology	O	O	O	O	O
Urban sociology	-	-	-	-	-
Race relations	O	-	-	-	-
Demography	-	O	-	O	O
	O-sociology of the family				

Table VI.2 (continued)

Subjects	Universities						
	Group 4 Exeter	Hull	Leices ter BA	Leices ter BSc	Nott ingham	Read ing	South ampton
Sociological theory	C	C	C	C	C	-	C
Methods of social research/ statistics	C	C	C	C	O	C	C
Philosophy/ logic	O	-	-	-	-	C	O
Social psychology	C	-	-	-	-	O	-
Social structure	C	-	-	-	C	O	C
Social change/ Sociology of development	C	-	O	O	O	O	-
Comparative sociology	C	-	O	O	C	-	-
Anthropology	C	C	-	-	-	O	O
Social Admin- istration	O	-	-	-	-	-	O
Sociology of industry	-	O	O	O	-	O	O
Sociology of education	-	-	O	O	O	O	O
Sociology of deviance	O	-	O	O	-	O	O
Sociology of religion	O	O	O	O	-	O	-
Political sociology	O	-	O	O	O	-	O
Urban sociology	O	O	-	-	O	-	O
Race relations	-	O	-	-	O	-	-
Demography	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	<u>Hull</u> O-soc- iology of the family	<u>Leicester</u> All subjects taught under general head- ings:Theoretical sociology, empirical sociology, applied sociology. This includes the subjects shown	<u>Reading</u> Analysis of literary sources. History of sociological theory. O- sociology of politics and administration	<u>South'ton</u> O-ideas and society O-org- anisa- tions			

Table VI.2 (continued)

Subjects	Universities							
	<u>Group 3</u> Birm ingham	Bris tol	Dur ham	Leeds	Liver pool	Manch ester	New castle	Shef field
Sociological theory	C	C	C	C	0	C	C	C
Methods of social research/ statistics	C	C	C	C	0	C	0	2C
Philosophy/ logic	-	-	-	-	0	-	0	-
Social psychology	C&O	-	C	C	-	0	C	0
Social structure	C	C	C	C	0	-	C	0
Social change/ Sociology of development	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-
Comparative sociology	0	0	C	0	0	0*	0	0
Anthropology (Manchester:*range of options in comparative sociology & anthropology)	0	-	-	-	-	0*	0	0
Social Admin- istration	-	-	-	0	0	-	C	0
Sociology of industry	C	0	0	0	0	0	-	0
Sociology of education	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	-
Sociology of deviance	-	-	0	0	0	0	-	0
Sociology of religion	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	-
Political sociology	-	0	0	0	-	0	0	0
Urban sociology	-	-	-	0	-	0	-	-
Race relations	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
Demography	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-
		J	<u>Leeds</u> O-medical sociology		<u>Liverpool</u> O-family sociology		J	

Subjects	Table VI.2 (continued)				
	Universities				
	Group 5				
	East Anglia	Essex Comparative studies	Essex Social studies	Keele	Kent
Sociological theory	0	C	C	0	C
Methods of social research/statistics	0	C	C	C	0
Philosophy/logic	-	C	C	0	-
Social psychology	0	0	0	C	-
Social structure	0	C	C	-	-
Social change/Sociology of development	0	C	C	-	0
Comparative sociology	0	2C	C	-	2C
Anthropology	0	-	-	-	0
Social Administration	0	-	0	2-0	0
Sociology of industry	0	-	0	0	0
Sociology of education	-	0	0	-	0
Sociology of deviance	0	-	-	0	0
Sociology of religion	0	0	0	-	-
Political sociology	0	0	0	-	0
Urban sociology	-	-	0	0	0
Race relations	-	-	-	-	-
Demography	-	-	-	-	0
	0-mathematical sociology	0-various; Courses aimed at specialist study of particular areas	0-social policy & planning 0-sociology of culture 0-Mathematical sociology	0-social J ogy of fertility 0-history of labour movement	0-statistics

Subjects	Table VI.2 (continued)				
	Universities				
	Group 5 (continued)		Sussex European studies	Sussex Social studies	York
	Sussex Educational studies	Sussex English & American studies			
Sociological theory	C&O	C	C	C&O	C
Methods of social research/ statistics	C	C	C	2C	C
Philosophy/ logic	O	O	O	O	O
Social psychology	C	-	O	O	C
Social structure	C	C	C	C	C
Social change/ Sociology of development	O	O	O	O	C
Comparative sociology	-	-	C	C	-
Anthropology	-	-	-	-	-
Social Admin- istration	O	-	O	O	-
Sociology of industry	O	O	O	O	O
Sociology of education	O	O	O	O	O
Sociology of deviance	O	O	O	O	O
Sociology of religion	O	O	O	O	O
Political sociology	O	O	O	O	O
Urban sociology	-	-	-	-	-
Race relations	-	-	-	-	-
Demography	-	-	-	-	-
	O-various C-artist and public in society	O-various		O-various	4 options taken 2 of them examined

Table VI.2 (continued)

Subjects	Universities							
	<u>Group 6</u> Aston	Bath	Brad ford	Brunel	City	Lough borough	Sal ford	Surrey
Sociological theory	C	C&O	C	O	O	C	C	$\frac{1}{2}$ C
Methods of social research/ statistics	C	O	-	-	O	-	-	$\frac{1}{2}$ C
Philosophy/ logic	C	O	O	-	-	-	-	-
Social psychology	C	2-O	C	O	O	C	-	-
Social structure	C	O	C	-	-	C	O	-
Social change/ Sociology of development	-	-	-	-	-	C	O	-
Comparative sociology	-	O	C	-	-	-	-	O
Anthropology	-	-	-	-	-	-	O	-
Social Admin- istration	-	O	-	-	O	-	O	-
Sociology of industry	C	-	-	O	-	C	O	O
Sociology of education	-	-	-	-	-	C	-	-
Sociology of deviance	-	O	O	-	-	C	O	O
Sociology of religion	-	-	O	O	-	-	-	-
Political sociology	-	-	O	O	O	-	O	-
Urban sociology	-	-	-	-	-	C	O	-
Race relations	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Demography	-	-	- J	O	O	C Joint with psych- ology	-	- J

Compulsory or core subjects in sociology first degrees.

1. Sociological Theory (including History of Sociological Thought.

Courses on Sociological Theory were often laid out on a chronological plan, so that it was convenient to study the subjects of Sociological Theory, and History of Sociological Thought, together (although arguments were made out, during the sixties, for the educational advantage of including them as two distinct courses, in degrees).

Peel's survey¹⁵ of Theory courses for the BSA Teachers' Conference in January 1968 (the material for which dated from 1966 or 1967) adopted the procedure of surveying the two subjects together. His collection of material included some from Scottish and Welsh universities, and the Sociological Theory course in the Oxford B Phil, but only the material he gathered on English undergraduate courses has been referred to, in conjunction with other, later descriptions of theory courses, to form the basis of the discussion which follows.

Weir's paper¹⁶ delivered to the BSA Teachers' Section Conference, and based on the 1967 collected material, gave as a rough estimate that the proportion of universities offering a theory course which he characterised as the 'Great Man in his Theory' type, was approximately two to one. (In the years which followed, this proportion appears to have declined in English universities if anything, in favour of more topic-centred courses.) The 'Great Man in his Theory' course took, as section headings, great theorists (Marx, Weber, Durkheim, Pareto, Simmel, Parsons and Merton were the writers most frequently chosen for this

treatment), and the lectures were divided accordingly. It was not unusual to find two or three lectures being devoted to one writer, and sometimes texts, commentaries, and an exegesis of the works, were fairly elaborately treated. Other authors were discussed more cavalierly, in one lecture or part of a lecture.

Courses of this kind sometimes, after the early sections where each theorist was allotted one or more lectures, telescoped the more modern writers into groups under some such heading as 'conflict theorists', and ended with a section on current theoretical problems.

Weir suggested that a typical central book for the first half of such a course, would be Martindale's Nature¹⁷ and Types of Sociological Theory (a work which continued to be frequently prescribed).

The second main type of course on Sociological Theory discarded the chronological ordering, and had as its early topic one type of theory, typically some form of structural/functionalism, which was documented at some length, to be followed by various critiques or counter-theories (e.g. conflict theory, theories of social change, dialectical materialism) which were discussed as variations or altered perspectives of the one 'main' theory, which, it was assumed, remained in the student's mind as the currently 'received' mainstream theory. (Weir suggested¹⁸ Charles and Zena Loomis's Modern Social Theories as a possible central book for this type of course.)

A third possible type of course (of which few examples were actually found) started from a more pragmatic approach, and, being based on a book such as Hammond's Sociologists at Work,¹⁹ discussed theories as they were

actually being tested in the field, or in the analytical work of contemporary sociologists.

Still other courses (and these did exist) combined some aspects of all the above types, and, in addition, tried to fit in every possible author, theory and sub-theory, no matter how briefly, in order to achieve what was considered by some to be a spurious and confusing comprehensiveness. These courses were condemned by Weir, for example, for having no focus, for rushing from one item on the list to the next, on a 'so much for organic interactionism, now on to atomistic functionalism' basis.²⁰

There was some controversy as to whether meta-theory and epistemology should be included under the category 'Sociological Theory', but these elements were found in theory courses, although there was sometimes another course in the degree, probably linked with topics of methodology and its problems, in which meta-theory was covered.

Courses in Sociological Theory were almost always compulsory in specialist sociology degrees, and were typically taught to second or third year students. This raised the problem of whether or not they should be geared to the needs of students who were going on to postgraduate courses, or whether they should leave the student who was never going to study theory again, with some kind of mental theoretical equipment with which he could make sociological sense of the world he would encounter when he left the university. Some saw this as an argument for including more, rather than less, discussion of the grounds of theory, and of epistemology in general.

Another practical problem for the lecturer in Sociological Theory, was the link-up with Methods courses. It was not uncommon, even by the end of the sixties, to find courses which combined the two, but where this was done, the claim was made that either theory without methods, or methods without theory, would be afflicted with a sort of academic atrophy, since the discussion of one must inevitably lead to the discussion of the other.

The 'founding fathers' most often studied in Sociological Theory courses were Marx, Durkheim and Weber, with Simmel, Pareto, Spencer and Comte next, Of modern writers, Parsons and Merton were studied in almost every theory course, and next most often there were considerations of the work of Rex and Dahrendorf.

The works of these writers, particularly the earlier ones, were considered in various ways. Some lists referred to 'texts' or made some such comment as 'the key text for the course will be . . .'. There was a distinction between texts, textbooks, and readers (of extracts of the writings of the author under consideration). The treatment ranged from a critical examination of the text, with commentaries recommended as background reading for the lectures, to the bare inclusion of an author in a treatment of a topic in sociological theory, in which other authors were also discussed.

However, some authors, particularly Marx, Weber and Durkheim, were most often represented by several works, even if these were not alluded to as 'texts'; alternatively, different books by the same author might appear in

different 'topic' sections, in a course organised around topics rather than 'great men'.

There was a central dilemma in the teaching of theory. If it was assumed that every sociologist should, as a matter of sound sociological education, have a notion of the development of the subject and of the way in which theories had grown up, some emphasis and time had to be given to the historical element. On the other hand, for the working sociologist (as for the working natural scientist), the more important emphasis might be the working theoretical tradition of here and now, in which case the lecturer might have to be more rigorously selective, spending more time on those areas of theory which seemed currently viable and testable. This would involve students in being equipped, not only with the knowledge of various people's theories, but with the mental equipment to evaluate them (for example, was Davis and Moore's functionalist theory of social stratification tenable? was Jencks's assertion that the school was not a major factor in the redressing of social inequality, sound?); and lecturers trying to give their students this mental equipment, might find themselves involved in greater difficulties in maintaining an objective academic approach (having, if necessary, declared a bias) than would be found in natural sciences, where the problem of value judgments was less central to the intellectual material being imparted. The solution already mentioned, of having

completely different courses on sociological theory, one historical, and one with a 'current problem areas' approach, did not solve this latter difficulty.

An example of one course, the title combining Theory and Methods, which contained elements of some of the types of courses discussed above, was LSE's for the (pre-course-unit) London degree of 1969/70. Four possible approaches were mentioned: a) Issues; b) History of ideas; c) The exegesis of individual sociologists, or even of one member of the sociological trinity Durkheim/Marx/Weber; d) Schools: functionalism, positivism, phenomenology, Marxism, etc. It was pointed out that study must be selective, and that students should concentrate on areas of the booklist as their interests dictated.

The lecturer decided to treat the course under four main headings: I. Central Themes of Sociology; II. Theories of Social Development; III. Functionalism and Action Theory, Consensus and Conflict, Holism and Atomism; and IV. Sociology and Science. In this fourth section, methodology was discussed.

Another way of treating the same syllabus was given in the guide, compiled by the LSE Sociology Department, and published by the External Department of the University of London, for teachers for the external degree.²¹ This was a discussion of five main schools of sociology: I. Evolutionary theorists (Progress); II. Historicists (Utopia); III. Cyclical theorists (Continuity); IV. Formalists (Organisations); V. Equilibrium theorists (Stability).

Both types of approach to the syllabus were suggested in the LSE Teachers' Guide, and this was an example of the way in which the same syllabus, and, indeed, virtually the same basic reading, could lead to lecture courses structured very differently.

To turn from a long-established course for a traditional degree, to one at a new university, York had a Part I course in sociological theory which began with problems relating to the individual in society (social interaction, roles, reference groups, class or status groups), and moved on to 'a consideration of macrosociology' (power and authority; structure and function; the systems concept; conflict and social change; values and social change - Weber's critique of Marx; social disorganisation and deviance; and the concepts of anomie and alienation, their uses and abuses). For this course the minimum reading consisted of five books, Coser and Rosenberg,²² Rex's Key Problems in Sociological Theory,²³ Aron's Main Currents in Sociological Thought,²⁴ Runciman's Social Science and Political Theory,²⁵ and Misbet's The Sociological Tradition,²⁶ the historical aspect of the development of theory also being taken care of by a footnote to the reading list: 'N.B. For a general historical survey: N.S. Timasheff's Sociological Theory: Its Nature and Growth²⁷ should be consulted'.

The heading for the York Part II course ('This Course Will Cover Both Classical and Contemporary Sociological Theory') bore out the contention that, in theory courses in the sixties, there was a degree of polarisation. The

approach adopted in this York course was to devote a whole term to an examination in depth of the work of Durkheim and Weber; the second term began with Tönnies and Marx, and continued with Simmel and Pareto, and Parsons, while the third term 'Mainstream Contemporary Social Theory', was to contain two lectures each on Structural Functionalism, T. Parsons and Systems Theory, The General Theory of Action, and Neo-Evolutionary Theory.

Durham and Exeter had courses which began further back in time: Durham's began under the general heading 'The Idea of Progress and the Search for Laws of Social Development', with subheadings on 'Sociological Reactions to the French Revolution' and 'Utilitarianism and Social Darwinism in England and America', while Exeter's course on Origins of Social Thought required study of texts by Montesquieu, de Tocqueville, Comte and St. Simon.

In 1972, then, predictably, there was no typical first degree course in sociological theory. The historical emphasis was, if anything, given less time, if one took an overall view of university courses, while the type of course least often encountered was that emphasising theories being used by sociologists working in the field. This was, perhaps, a consequence of the types of Methods courses being offered. These will now be discussed.

Compulsory or core subject 2. Methods (including Survey Methods in Social Investigation, and Statistics).

The collection of material made in 1967 by Peel for the Sociology Teachers' Section of the BSA, already mentioned, also covered Methods courses, and the same

process of selection has been applied in using this material, as was applied to the material on Theory courses.

Under the general heading of 'Methods' there were four main types of course being offered to sociology undergraduates (some degrees, naturally, offered more than one of these types, or a course combining two of them), and, in addition, there was one type of course less frequently encountered.

Methods course type (a). Survey Methods.

This type of course had been pioneered in the London degree, and there were universities where the survey method was taught separately from other research methods; it was still the central method in most syllabuses. A typical course went through the process of teaching the following: planning the survey, collection of data, sampling (random, cluster, etc.), drawing up the questionnaire, pre-pilot and pilot tests, interviewing, coding, analysis of answers, presentation of results. A textbook commonly used was C.A. Moser's
28
Survey Methods in Social Investigation. A course

of this kind might or might not include some practical work. Some examination questions were mathematical exercises, some referred to the use of certain methods in specific published surveys which had been included in the syllabus. Students might be asked to give an account of survey work in which they had taken part, or to discuss some particular aspect of it. A report on a survey

carried out by students formed part of the syllabus at Bedford and Sheffield, for example.

Methods course type (b). Methods of Social Research in general.

This type of course covered the same ground as (a) above, but included other methods: secondary analysis, documentary material, participant observation, case-histories, content analysis. Textbooks frequently recommended for these courses included Goode and Hatt,²⁹ and John Madge's The Tools of Social Science.³⁰

Methods course type (c). Methodology of the Social Sciences, Social Analysis, Logic and Scientific Method.

The courses under headings such as the ones mentioned above were concerned less with the actual 'cookbook' techniques used by the sociologist undertaking social research, and more with the principles behind the choice and use of such techniques.

Logic and Scientific Method, a long-established course in the London degree, re-emerged in more recently established courses, sometimes at technological universities (where it had obvious relevance for many students of the other departments in the university), sometimes as a 'bridge' subject in courses at the new universities. Other courses ranged more widely over topics such as phenomenology, existentialism, ethnomethodology, linguistics, structuralism, and the 'verstehen' approach. Obviously, it was in the consideration of these subjects that methods courses most closely approached philosophy;

these courses tended to be more verbal than mathematical and the answers to the examination questions were in essay style.

There were courses, such as the Social Research Methods course at Durham, which covered all three areas (a) (b) and (c), starting with the logic of sociological inquiry, continuing with research design, and going on to research technology. At Leeds, the course in Methods of Social Research was similarly broken up, but in the opposite order, Part A covering Statistical and Formal Methods, and Part B, Sociological Methodology. At Bedford, on the other hand, there were separate courses in Statistical Methods, The Socio-Economic Structure of Contemporary British Society as illustrated by Statistics, Methods of Social Investigation, and Practical Survey Methods.

Methods course type (d). Statistics.

Some kind of statistical training was included in almost all sociology specialist courses. The minimum course requirements for would-be students of sociology in the early seventies reflected this: 'O' level mathematics was almost universally required, and more sociology departments were expressing a preference for a pass in a mathematical subject at 'A' level, from applicants for their courses. Some universities provided special classes in 'Mathematics for Sociologists' to help the less numerate students, and thus ensure that statistics lecturers could assume a certain basic level of competence in their audiences.

The statistics courses for sociology students varied from those in which the emphasis was on mathematical techniques and statistical ideas in general (such a course was typically given by a non-sociologist, and taken by students in other social sciences, as a course requirement), to those, given by sociologists, in which the examples were taken from sociological subjects, the emphasis was on statistical techniques most commonly used in sociological research rather than on statistical techniques in general, and the students were all taking the subject of sociology, although not necessarily all for the same degree or with the same amount of emphasis in finals.

(Some courses were provided specifically, describing ways in which sources of statistical data could be located and used.)

Methods course type (e). Mathematical Sociology.

This heading has been included under Methods as it falls within the subject category of sociological methods and of statistics, but courses in Mathematical Sociology differed from courses under the headings (a) to (d) mentioned above, in that they were not compulsory (except, in some cases, in joint degrees), and in that the subject was not thought of, in the early seventies, as a core subject in sociology degrees. (It was, however, on the fringe of one.)

31

John Rex, in a 1966 article, mentioned mathematical sociology as one main direction in which sociology might develop in the seventies. The subject was sometimes closely linked with the development of computer techniques;

collections of software programs and packages specifically for the use of sociologists, began to appear. Their use in undergraduate courses was naturally limited; nevertheless the possibility of performing, for example, stepwise multiple regressions and other multivariate techniques in a fraction of the time they would have taken without a computer, was seen by Selvin in 1963³² as being capable of revolutionising sociological research, and led Clydē Mitchell to consider, in 1968,³³ that it would be a worthwhile exercise to introduce every sociology student to the technique of multivariate analysis. Mitchell complained that a statistics course which left off at the bivariate analysis stage, was doing sociologists a disservice, since their data must, by the nature of the subject, introduce a large number of variables.

Apart from the type (e) courses in Mathematical Sociology, which usually appeared, if at all, as a third year option, the types of Methods courses described above were placed in sociology degrees in a number of ways. Some degrees introduced the methods course at the outset (this had the disadvantage that the student might not know enough about sociology in general to make the necessary intellectual adjustments). Other universities left the methods course until the third year (this had the disadvantage that the students had not kept up practice in mathematical techniques). Some universities provided a two year course and placed great emphasis on the subject. There were problems of integration with other subjects - should the Methods

course be based on, or take examples from, empirical studies in other courses, for instance, courses on Social Structure of Modern Britain, or on The Family, or on Demography? Should examples be taken from an empirical work by one of the theorists being studied in the Sociological Theory course? These possibilities depended, obviously, on the amount of coordination of courses which took place between individual lecturers, which could be very close (Clyde Mitchell gave the example of the system used at Manchester in 1967, where the links were between formal methods lectures, and tutorial classes taken by teachers of theory and thematic courses. {It is possible,' he wrote, 'to illustrate participant observation by industrial sociology texts, and principal components from urban sociology, interviewing by educational sociology texts').³⁴

Another method of coordinating courses, was to take one large piece of empirical research and, from this, to illustrate as many statistical techniques as possible. Both of these approaches necessitated teamwork on the part of the lecturers in the sociology department.

At the other extreme, if the statistics lectures were given by lecturers in a separate department, or to students taking various social science courses, such close coordination was impossible.

There was some difference of opinion in the sixties and early seventies, in the development of sociological methods in general, between the systems theorists (and the mathematical sociologists, who looked to more

sophisticated techniques of analysis, computerised and otherwise), on the one hand, and the phenomenologists, ethnomethodologists and the exponents of 'verstehen' theory, on the other hand, who tended to reject these somewhat mechanistic approaches in favour of a much 'softer' and more humanistic approach to 'the social construction of reality'. Cicourel's critique³⁵ of the application of the techniques of natural science to sociological research was widely prescribed in courses on methodology, and books like Peter Winch's The Idea of a Social Science and also Garfinkel's Studies in Ethnomethodology appeared in reading lists, while³⁶ Dawe, from the theorists's point of view³⁷ and Vulliamy, from the point of view of the teacher of sociology, elaborated on what they saw as a growing polarisation of attitudes which, Vulliamy felt, fundamentally affected sociological methods teaching.

An interesting aspect of this development was that, in the past, sociology had been criticised for not being methodologically rigorous enough, and had developed methods modelled on those of the natural sciences; by 1972, a new vogue for a logically still rigorous, but methodologically more 'philosophical' approach, was gaining favour.

Social anthropological methods, as a specific area of methods teaching in sociology, will be touched on in the next section of this chapter, as part of the third compulsory subject to be discussed, Comparative Social Institutions.

Compulsory core subject 3. Comparative Social
Institutions.

There was a time when the title 'Comparative Social Institutions' automatically meant that the subject-matter of the course so named would overlap with that of Social Anthropology, and in the period covered by this chapter this was still frequently the case, but there was nothing in this title to preclude the comparative study of social institutions of developed countries or post-industrial societies, and the implication that the title meant a consideration of pre-literate peoples really came from the subject's history: this title, again, was one of the original subject titles of the London degree dating back to the years before the First Great War. (As one lecturer put it, in a heading to a course on Comparative Social Structures at Sheffield, 'In principle no society is irrelevant to this course, however remote or close it may appear to be in time or in space'.)

However, in 1960 Banks and Tropp had described Comparative Social Institutions as follows:

'A comparative study of different societies at different periods in their history in terms of their economic, political and religious systems, and of certain characteristic groupings within them, such as the family and the division into social classes.'

Seven years later, the Careers Research and Advisory Centre listed the main topics of Comparative Sociology courses as being:

- '1. Systems of education
2. Family and class structure
3. Political organisations
4. Religious framework³⁹
5. Economic framework.'

and explained that these aspects of different societies were compared at different stages of their development.

In practice, in the sixties and early seventies, the types of societies considered were divided into three main groups: 1. 'simple' or small-scale' societies; 2. 'complex pre-industrial societies'; and 3. 'industrial societies'. While some courses concentrated on one or other of these groups, other courses included all three. In addition, many courses which covered only groups 1. and 2., ended with a section on 'social change' or 'industrialisation' or 'modernisation'.

A distinction should be made here between (a) Comparative Social Institutions as a compulsory subject in a sociology degree; (b) those courses in which Sociology and Social Anthropology were taught together, which formed a separate category from (a), but which were often similar in much of their subject-matter to some Comparative Social Institutions courses; and (c) Social Anthropology as a separate subject option to be taken in the second or third year. (Categories (b) and (c) will be discussed below in the section on Social Anthropology.)

Courses named, for example, 'Comparative Social Structures', 'Comparative Social Systems', 'Comparative Study of Society', 'Comparative Sociology', will be included in the present discussion, but for convenience' sake, will all be referred to as 'CSI' unless specifically described otherwise.

The peoples considered most often in courses on 'simple' or 'small-scale' societies were those which had been studied by the eminent anthropologists whose works the reading lists most frequently included, e.g. the Trobriand Islanders (Malinowski), the Andaman Islanders

(Radcliffe-Brown), the Nuer (Evans-Pritchard), and the peoples studied by Levi-Strauss. Courses on 'complex pre-industrial societies' mentioned, among others, India (usually as an example of a caste society), Africa, China (or 'oriental despotism' and Asia in general), and Egypt. Courses on 'industrial societies' included, as countries to be compared with Britain, one or more of the following: the USA, the USSR, Germany, Canada, South America, Japan, China, Thailand, and Israel (particularly on kibbutzim as a family pattern). But a course at Bristol, for example, took one of each type, the Trobriands (a simple society), Tepoztlan (pre-industrial), and Yankee City (industrial), and examined each community-study in detail.

Topics in lectures on 'simple' societies included kinship systems, chieftains, family, incest, exogamy, magic and ritual, economic rationality, and communication. Topics in lectures on 'complex pre-industrial societies' included feudalism, caste, slavery, the family, marriage and kinship, social stratification or differentiation, religion, ideology and belief systems, political and economic systems, the city state, the army and military systems, elites, social control or the control of aggression, pre-industrial bureaucracy (particularly with reference to Weber's 'ideal type'), and industrialisation and change and its effects on some of the institutions mentioned above. Topics in lectures on 'industrial societies' included those mentioned above which had a more modern significance.

Some CSI courses were arranged on different lines. One (optional) course at Sheffield, for example, was divided into sections on Geographical Areas (Africa, Asia and the Caribbean); Anthropological Problems (i.e. the state of social structure obtaining in the areas discussed: tribal, primitive magic, despotic, caste, class - or other topics such as language, myth, underdevelopment); and Theoretical Zones (empirical functionalism, neo-positive structuralism, dialectical materialism, dialectical idealism).

As in courses on Theory, some CSI courses went back further in time than others. A 1967 Exeter course on 'simple societies' began with pre-history and ancient civilisations, in Year II, and only in Year III moved to 'simple societies', for which it was a requirement that 'at least six ethnographic accounts of simple societies should be read'.

A parallel course at Exeter, CSI II, studied marriage and the family, property and social class in complex societies. In 1969, however, a revised syllabus replaced CSI with courses named 'Introduction to Social Anthropology' and (a main course) 'Social Anthropology', which centred on an examination of theoretical and methodological problems in anthropology, rather than on specific social institutions.

An example of a course concentrating on one geographical area was Hull's 'Comparative Social Structures II', which studied Africa, and emphasised particularly West Africa, and social change in that region. (Essex also had a course on African sociology in the option

'Sociology through Foreign Texts'. While this Essex course was mainly concerned with modern African development, its first section was headed 'The Comparative Study of Colonialism'.)

The course at East Anglia, on the other hand, though it was named, like Hull's, 'Comparative Social Structures', concentrated entirely on China, Japan and Thailand, in both their agrarian and industrial phases, and in this respect was like a 1967/8 course at Birmingham.

Essex, having a School of Comparative Studies, was in a unique situation in that the whole shape of some of the degrees it was possible to take, was built up on a comparative basis. Nevertheless a fairly typical course at Essex, named 'Comparative Sociology', in 1968/9, carried the usual subheadings on kinship, politics and economics in primitive societies, peasant societies (Bradford also had a course on peasant societies), and religious systems.

A course at Bedford centred on certain authors: Malinowski, Radcliffe-Brown, and Levi-Strauss, and their application of theory and method in the study of small-scale societies, but methods of field-work rarely appeared as headings. However, in the Cambridge reading list for papers 1 and 2 in the Social and Political Sciences tripos ('Theories in the Social Sciences' and 'Research Methods and Analysis'), books such as The Craft⁴⁰of Social Anthropology were included. It was difficult to select books which were most frequently cited in CSI courses in general, as so much depended on the emphasis of the course, and these emphases varied so widely, but

Andreski's Elements of Comparative Sociology⁴¹ and
Radcliffe-Brown's Structure and Function in Primitive
Society⁴² were both fairly frequently cited as basic
reading, along with many other works.

Many of the topics mentioned in CSI courses
reappeared in the next compulsory core subject to be
considered, The Social Structure of Modern Britain.
Compulsory core subject 4. The Social Structure of
Modern Britain.

The Social Structure of Modern Britain ('Modern
Britain' for short) created a problem for sociology
lecturers in the sixties. It seemed to stand apart
from the other compulsory core subjects in having
absolutely no theoretical focus. As will have been
observed, all the compulsory subjects mentioned so far
were either theoretical by their own nature (e.g.
Sociological Theory) or had a body of theory which
could be discussed in relation to the other parts of
the course, or could be used by the lecturer as a way
of approaching the subject-matter of the course and
giving it a focus. 'Modern Britain' was in a different
category. It had been adumbrated by the 1905 'General
Scheme of Study' as part of two sections of that scheme:
first, what was termed 'Descriptive Sociology': 'the
selection of representative societies for detailed study,
e.g. a group of savage tribes, an ancient or modern or
mediaeval civilisation',⁴³ and second, 'an adequate
knowledge of the investigations of existing social
conditions in civilised communities'.⁴⁴ When the BA
Sociology was first drawn up, 'Modern English Social

Structure' was suggested as an option, along with Graeco-Roman Civilisation, Simpler Societies, or some Oriental Civilisation. When the subject appeared in Regulations in 1920, it was called 'Modern England', with the further description '(Social and Industrial Development, Contemporary Social Conditions, and Social and Political Theories)⁴⁵'. The title was changed to 'Modern Britain' in the revision of the degree which took place in the fifties.

'Modern Britain' in the sixties and early seventies was usually taught as a collection of topics; these covered a very wide area of investigation. Some examples were: population and demography; family, marriage, divorce; property and income; economic associations; occupational structure and the labour market; industry, work, trade unions, professions; industrial relations, the affluent worker; social stratification, social mobility, social class; education systems, socialisation, educational opportunity; social policy and the social services, poverty, welfare; political parties and voting behaviour. Some other topics included slightly less frequently were as follows: religion and ideology; urban and rural communities; town planning; race and immigration; crime and delinquency, the penal system; power and elites.

Examples of headings under which several of these topics might be grouped, were: Social Groups; Culture, Religion and Recreation; The Changing Nature of British Social Structure; Recruitment and Composition of the Population; Industry and Employment; Politics and Law.

Under each individual topic, the student was given reading consisting of empirical studies about British society, or collections of readings on the topic being investigated, or, perhaps, a book giving a more integrated approach to the whole topic.

The basic approach to the Modern Britain course, as well as the subject-matter, was often strongly empirical. In Dawe's opinion, as expressed in a paper on 'Teaching Modern Britain' delivered to the BSA Teachers' Section at a conference in 1966,⁴⁶ the lectures were looked upon as fact-imparting situations, often with little theoretical emphasis. Some of the topics would already, in some degree structures, have been mentioned to the student more briefly in introductory courses; while in other degrees, a student might be studying a topic in 'Modern Britain' and in 'CSI', in the same year.

Occasionally, as at Leeds in the sixties, a course on 'Modern Britain' formed part of a larger CSI course on 'complex societies'; several societies were studied one after the other, and Modern Britain formed one section, which was shorter (ten lectures) than most 'Modern Britain' courses (a typical course might last for 24 lectures). However, at this time Leeds also ran a course called 'Social Change in Britain in the 19th and 20th Centuries', which covered some subject-matter included by other universities in the main 'Modern Britain' course.

This arrangement illustrates one of many diverse ways of dealing with the 'Modern Britain' course in a sociology first degree structure. Several sorts of decisions had to be made. For instance, in studying

Under each individual topic, the student was given reading consisting of empirical studies about British society, or collections of readings on the topic being investigated, or, perhaps, a book giving a more integrated approach to the whole topic.

The basic approach to the Modern Britain course, as well as the subject-matter, was often strongly empirical. In Dawe's opinion, as expressed in a paper on 'Teaching Modern Britain' delivered to the BSA Teachers' Section at a conference in 1966,⁴⁶ the lectures were looked upon as fact-imparting situations, often with little theoretical emphasis. Some of the topics would already, in some degree structures, have been mentioned to the student more briefly in introductory courses; while in other degrees, a student might be studying a topic in 'Modern Britain' and in 'CSI', in the same year.

Occasionally, as at Leeds in the sixties, a course on 'Modern Britain' formed part of a larger CSI course on 'complex societies'; several societies were studied one after the other, and Modern Britain formed one section, which was shorter (ten lectures) than most 'Modern Britain' courses (a typical course might last for 24 lectures). However, at this time Leeds also ran a course called 'Social Change in Britain in the 19th and 20th Centuries', which covered some subject-matter included by other universities in the main 'Modern Britain' course.

This arrangement illustrates one of many diverse ways of dealing with the 'Modern Britain' course in a sociology first degree structure. Several sorts of decisions had to be made. For instance, in studying

British social institutions or social structure, how far back in time should the course extend? A generally accepted starting point was about 1850 (an example of this was the syllabus for the Bedford course on 'Social Structure of Modern Britain').

The University of London Teachers' Guide mentioned that the appropriate material for the 'Modern Britain' course was very scattered (in the Sociology Department at LSE in the sixties there was a very long bibliography of some hundred pages, which had been put on cards for easier updating). The wealth of material formed the basis for another sort of decision which had to be taken - what to include in the reading list, and what to omit. Then there was the question of the lecturer's approach. The Teachers' Guide warned of the danger that the student would learn facts (statistical, historical and so on) by rote, irrespective of their purpose and relevance. (This was also Dawe's opinion in the paper referred to above.) He mentioned the inadequacy of, for example, 'inequality' as a central approach in sociology of education, and in many other topics such as social policy, or social stratification. The solution seemed to be, to introduce an element of social process (as distinct from a merely historical 'social change' approach). Dawe tentatively proposed the substitution of some sort of 'action towards goals', 'interaction between groups', as an alternative approach which could then be applied to each of a number of factual topics and would, it was hoped, leave the student with a more coherent view

of modern British society. The Teachers' Guide, on the other hand, suggested three themes, 'Social change and continuity' (which indicated a somewhat historical emphasis), 'Social stratification and its pervasive influence', and 'Large-scale organisation'.⁴⁷ (In the conference discussion which followed Dawe's paper, 'conflict' was mentioned as an additional possible focus, while locality or residential community studies were mentioned as empirical areas which were often neglected in 'Modern Britain' syllabuses.)

Dawe pointed out that the reforming and empiricist traditions behind the 'Modern Britain' course had led to its divisions into topics such as population, education, etc., which were, in the sixties, becoming specialisms in their own right. However, as these individual specialisms developed, they became subjects not confined to Britain, but subjects whose 'units of analysis' were, in Dawe's words 'specific patterns of rationalised interaction, defined cross-culturally'. There was a sense, therefore, in which continuing to teach 'Modern Britain', was to go against the grain of the possible future development of sociological research.

On the other hand, the retention of 'Modern Britain' courses in sociology first degrees, could be defended on pedagogical grounds. Students coming into sociology degree courses had to bridge the gap mentioned by so many writers on sociological teaching, the gap between society as the students had previously seen it, and 'a⁴⁸ totally new battery of concepts and propositions'. The subject-matter of the 'Modern Britain' course was

suited to this 'bridging' activity because much of it was already familiar to the British student (the problem of students from overseas was not mentioned). The question of teaching students from other European countries was, however, raised by Rex in a talk where he mentioned having to lecture to Czech refugee students, and their different approach to the problems of living in a mixed or a socialist economy, since they had lived all their lives in one-party states.⁴⁹

If 'Modern Britain' could also be used as a means of conveying sociological concepts and theories, it would be serving another useful, identifiable pedagogical purpose. (The same argument had been used for linking Methods courses with classes in Theory.) The basic question was, which concepts, which theories should be used? They should ideally embody both order and conflict, continuity and change, structure and process. Dawe, as has been mentioned, postulated an organisation of the subject-matter around groups of occupational roles, classified according to aims or goals, but he admitted that this proposition needed much detailed working out in practical lecturing terms, and might, in any case, result in a schema which would be beyond the capacity of first degree students. He characterised his paper as a request for guidelines rather than as a presentation of solutions to problems.

What, in practice, were sixties courses in 'Modern Britain' like? They tended to cover the topic groups mentioned earlier in this chapter, and in each section,

certain books would recur on the reading lists of almost every university where the topic was offered. 'Modern Britain' reading lists tended to need updating with particular regularity. A new government report, material from a new census, were examples of new publications which cried out for inclusion. The proliferation of empirical studies meant that the latest ones under any one topic heading, needed to be evaluated by the lecturer and considered for inclusion. New 'readers' were making their appearance (there was, it seemed, once again no central textbook, as indeed there could hardly be on a course so amorphous and ever-changing). A typical supplementary list issued to students in 1969/70 was introduced with the words 'Most of the following books have been published since the main list was prepared. With the exception of those marked with an asterisk, which report new research findings, or present new arguments and analysis, they should be regarded as alternatives to books already listed'.⁵⁰

The attempt in the Teachers' Guide (one of several similar attempts) at a categorisation of the reading material was as follows:

'T: Text Can be used as something of a "text", generally or within its particular field [e.g. Carr-Saunders and Wilson, The Professions⁵¹].

P: Perspective Provides a general perspective, interpretation or critique [e.g. Runciman, Relative Deprivation and Social Justice⁵²].

S: Summary Incorporates or summarises a good deal of relevant information, or provides critical new information [e.g. J.W.B. Douglas, The Home and the School⁵³].

O: Official A document of importance for official policy [e.g. The Robbins Report⁵⁴].'

One other reason for the inclusion of 'Modern Britain',

whatever the approach to its subject-matter, was that it contained, in its topic sections, material which formed third year options (e.g. Industrial Sociology, Sociology of Education) in many degree patterns; the 'Modern Britain' course was, therefore, both a preparation for these, and a means of giving the student some knowledge on which to base his choice of option, and also a means of conveying basic knowledge about subjects which students did not choose to follow further, in their options choice in the third year.

In concluding this discussion of the 'Modern Britain' courses, it should be mentioned that some degrees, particularly the newer ones, did not have a compulsory course of this all-embracing kind, but did have compulsory courses in some sections of it, for example 'The Family', or 'Industrial Sociology'. Other degrees had courses named 'Social Structure', 'Social Institutions', which in fact concentrated on modern Britain, although these words were not included in the course title.

Compulsory or core subject 5. Social Psychology.

Although Social Psychology was a compulsory subject in a substantial number of sociology degrees in the sixties, it occupied a less central position than the other core subjects, partly because it was, unlike the subjects which have been discussed above, more closely allied than they were, with another main discipline, psychology. As the Teachers' Guide put it: 'Social psychology differs in "flavour" from the other sociology courses. It is more experimental, more often linked with

the biological sciences, more closely concerned with the individual within a social setting, and places emphasis upon empirical verification'.⁵⁵

It was not uncommon to find the courses in social psychology for sociology first degrees being taught by members of the university's psychology department (or, at LSE, of the social psychology department). This situation, in which the courses were supplied from another department, had also been true of statistics courses, and some of the same problems were encountered. Sociology students taking courses in social psychology often lacked a grounding in general psychology (which lecturers could expect from their psychology students), just as sociology students taking statistics sometimes lacked sufficient grounding in mathematics.

There were two main methods of overcoming this difficulty. The first was, to give the sociology students a course on General Psychology, or General and Developmental Psychology, in the first year, and to proceed to Social Psychology in the second or third year. The second method was, to structure the lectures in Social Psychology so that they included some general theory, usually in the earlier sections, but also, sometimes, in the introduction to each topic being discussed. (The syllabuses for the papers in the Social and Political Sciences tripos at Cambridge, named 'Attitudes, Perception and Social Influence', and 'Personality, Roles and Social Interaction', were examples of the admixture of general and social psychological theory.)

The subjects covered by most General or Basic Psychology courses for sociology students included: motivation; perception; cognition; learning; memory; personality (sometimes including psychoanalytical theories of personality); emotion; intelligence.

At Leicester, however, Part I of the course named 'General and Social Psychology' started from the heading 'The Relationship of Biology to Psychology' (evolution of man, evolution of the human brain and nervous system, men and machines, emotional behaviour). Under the next heading, 'Elements of Behaviour and Action', were included: the 'nature and nurture' controversy; tropisms, reflexes, instincts and drives; perception, including socialised perception; and different theoretical approaches to learning, including the behaviourist, gestaltist, developmental and 'social self' approaches. Part III of this introductory first year course began to bring in the more specifically social aspects of the subject, under the heading 'Personality and Society', and considered, in turn, the psychoanalytic and symbolic interactionist approaches to personal development.

Typical courses on 'Social Psychology' as a separate subject, began with a description of the scope of the subject and the relationship between the disciplines of sociology and psychology. (Reading University's course, for example, included a section on the development of social psychology as an academic discipline). Most courses also included a discussion of methods in social psychology, including experimental

methods (for example, as at Manchester, methods of attitude change). Emphasis on practical experimental work varied, but at Birmingham, for example, students attended laboratory classes and were expected to keep laboratory notebooks which were used as part of the assessment for the examination; at LSE, where social psychology was particularly well developed and where the first chair in the subject had been founded, students were involved in group sessions with the deliberate intention of encouraging observation and introspection (to show them, for example, 'through the shock of personal experience'⁵⁶ the existence of people's common tendency to make their perceptions fit the familiar and the prestigious).

Some courses proceeded with a discussion based, in the main, on theoretical divisions of topics: psycho-analytic theory, cognitive theories, balance theory, cognitive dissonance (based on Festinger's work), group dynamics (Homans), reinforcement theory (Skinner), social learning, moral learning, role theory (Mead, Linton, Merton's 'role set', prescribed role, subjective role, role conflict, and other related concepts), symbolic interactionism, and reference group theory.

Some of these topics overlapped with the more empirical topic headings introduced by some lecturers, which included: social influence in small groups; leadership, crowds and mass behaviour; socialisation; the social structuring of personality; social motivation (including achievement motivation); attitudes (their formation, development, measurement, and change);

prejudice; political and religious attitudes; stereotypes; social learning, social roles; social cohesion and community networks; group productivity; group pressure towards conformity; perception of people.

Subjects omitted from many courses, but included in others, were, for example, aspects of abnormal psychology under such headings as: deviance, and mental illness (including its social distribution). Attraction and rejection, and language, communication, and the development of words, were other topics included. Other courses purposely introduced concepts as similar as possible to those being encountered by students in their other sociology courses, including: social mobility and social class; norms and reference groups; innovation and social change; race prejudice; the study and influence of mass media; the authoritarian personality.

A course at Leeds was structured on chronological lines of the impact of the social environment on the social life of the individual throughout the life span, under such headings as: the school years; adolescence; adulthood; old age; this series of lectures was followed by a series covering the various theories and methods of social psychology already mentioned above.

Occasionally a Social Psychology course was called something else; at Sheffield, for example, the course on 'The Sociology of Small Groups' was, in fact, a course on Social Psychology. The lecturer saw Social Psychology as an important part of the total sociology degree structure, for two reasons: 'Too often sociologists tend

to "sociologism" - the belief that only sociology can "really" explain human behaviour Social Psychology teaches that explanations in terms of personality factors are just as necessary and as "scientific" as explanations in terms of social forces. The study of Social Psychology also brings another advantage - it encourages the formulation of cross-⁵⁷ disciplinary theories and propositions'. (It may be noted here that Social Psychology was a 'contextual course' in the School of Social Studies at Sussex).

The Sheffield course, although promising an extremely informal approach to classes and course work, used small group discussion as the basic teaching method, and adopted an experimental approach to course assessment in which it was hoped to allow students some say in the way they would be assessed - continuously, or by examination, or by some other method.

The basic book for the Sheffield course, Krech,⁵⁸ Crutchfield and Ballachey's The Individual in Society, was frequently recommended as a basic book for Social Psychology courses, along with others; for a 'reader', Maccoby, Newcomb and Hartley's Readings in Social Psychology was frequently prescribed. Several lecturers mentioned that there were a number of good textbooks (a change, this, from the usual complaint of sociologists that there was no one basic textbook for the course), and also listed 'books of collected readings' and 'books on research methods' as well as 'books on specific topics'.

Goffmann's works (particularly The Presentation of

Self in Everyday Life which often occurred on reading lists in this 'books on specific topics' category) had⁵⁹ aroused some reservations. Pahl, in 1973, although acknowledging Goffmann's contribution to social psychology as an important one, despite Goffmann's unorthodox and sometimes 'unnecessarily offhand', literary, presentation, was concerned about the effect his theories might have on students, and even staff, in the sociology departments where he was studied. Pahl's argument seemed to be, that Goffmann was basically misunderstood, but that too much superficial reading of his work made people cynical, disenchanted with ritual, mistrusting motives, 'seeing through' everything, feeling uneasy on formal occasions, even unwilling to take on roles involving too much responsibility or formality because these roles, too, had been 'seen through'.

Pahl's argument, although (possibly purposely) exaggerating the effect of one author among so many, raised the question, 'should sociologists write books which have unintended social effects?' and, in the particular context of the sociology first degree, the question of the effect on the development of the students, of studying social psychology in general. Laurie Taylor,⁶⁰ in a 1967 paper, had also been concerned with the effect of social psychology courses on students, and argued for courses with a more problem-oriented approach. He felt that the sometimes despised desire on the part of the student to 'help people' could be canalised by providing more inter-disciplinary social psychology courses taught on more 'applied' lines.

There was little evidence in the sixties that social psychology courses were incorporating this kind of material. But social psychology did enter into many of the optional, more 'applied' subjects - notably industrial sociology, political sociology, and sociology of education - which will be discussed in the next section of this chapter, on optional subjects.

Optional subjects in sociology first degrees, 1963-1972.

A general overview.

Optional subjects in sociology first degrees in English universities in the period 1963-1972 included some subjects which were taught in a large number of degrees, but which were less often compulsory than the five subjects discussed in the sections above. They also included other subjects which appeared in fewer degrees, and were hardly ever compulsory.

This broad classification is expanded, in what follows, into a general explanatory background for the sub-divisions into Option Groups in Table VI.1 (see page 235). In the extremely varied sociology degree patterns of the sixties and early seventies, a number of ways in which subjects might be chosen by the individual student, were introduced. The term 'option' might, at its broadest, refer to the whole pattern of a degree (the three 'Branches' of the London BA/BSc Sociology had originally been known as 'Options'). Also, it was quite common (usually after the first year) for the student to choose as an 'option' a group of subjects under a general heading (e.g. 'Applied Sociology', 'Theoretical Sociology');

within this group, there might be further choices. .
However, a basic pattern, regularly encountered, was one where students followed a fairly homogeneous group of core subjects in the first year, or the first two years, and then chose options for the second or third years. Booklets or individual leaflets of descriptions of options were prepared, if the options were only listed by title or very short syllabus in the calendar or prospectus, and the courses to be offered were listed, with an outline of the fields they would cover, sometimes accompanied by the teaching methods which would be used and the course work which would be expected. If the option, or the lecturer, were new to the department, the course outline was being offered in some sense as an advance notice (or advertisement) for the course, and would only be fully developed if enough students chose it (a satirical account of this situation occurs in Kingsley Amis's novel Lucky Jim.⁶¹) In prospectuses, lists of options were frequently accompanied by some such proviso as: 'Not all options will be offered in all years; this will depend on availability of staff'.

The grouping of optional subjects in this chapter has been made arbitrarily, and does not imply that any one subject habitually occupied any particular position in the various degree patterns mentioned above.

Group A. The first three optional subjects (Social Anthropology, Social Administration and Social Philosophy), have been left outside the main (Group B) body of options, for various reasons. The first two subjects, Social

Anthropology and Social Administration, were often running as honours degrees alongside the Sociology degree, in the same university, sometimes in the same or a closely linked department. These two subjects had, in some sense, 'grown up with' sociology as degree subjects (Social Anthropology had a longer academic pedigree, and Social Administration a shorter one, than Sociology). Yet, since these subjects were also treated in single courses as optional subjects which sociology students could choose, they merited a place in any discussion of optional subjects in sociology first degrees.

Social Philosophy was also in a different category from the main (Group B) options, but for somewhat different reasons. First 'Ethics and Social Philosophy' had been a compulsory subject in the early sociology degrees, and was still a core subject in the London (pre-course-unit) degree in 1972. Social Philosophy was still a compulsory subject for sociology honours at Essex, Reading and Durham. It had traditionally been linked with sociology, and its place and value in the education, not only of sociologists, but also of social workers, had been cogently argued by Ginsberg and MacIver in the forties and fifties. While its place as a central subject in sociology degrees was less assured in the sixties and seventies, it still remained an important element in some degree structures, and its academic history long pre-dated that of sociology.

Group B. This was the largest group of options, and included subjects which covered various institutional or structural aspects of society. These subjects were: Industrial Sociology; Political Sociology; Sociology of

Deviance and Criminology; Sociology of Religion; Sociology of Education; Urban Sociology; Demography; Race Relations; Sociology of the Family; Social Stratification; and Sociology of Medicine.

With the exception of Criminology and Demography, these subjects had grown out of sociology courses and had first made their appearance in sociology degrees.

Group C. This third group consisted of optional subjects centrally concerned with social process and change, either of societies or of groups within societies. It included Sociology of Development (including Sociology of Developing Societies, and Social Change), and Sociology of Revolution.

Group D. This fourth group included some subjects mainly concerned with thought systems (Sociology of Knowledge, Sociology of Science, and Sociology of Culture).

In what follows, the subjects in Groups A, B, C and D will be discussed under separate headings. Finally, some mention will be made of options occurring very seldom, and of emerging or embryo options, subjects beginning to be mentioned in calendars and prospectuses at the turn of the decade, but not yet, in 1972, established as subjects attracting significant numbers of students.

Optional subjects Group A.

1. Social Anthropology.

Social anthropology as an optional subject was available at about twelve universities (or University of London colleges) in England in sociology first degrees in 1970. A typical course began with an introduction to the

principles and methods of the subject (the London BA/BSc Sociology option paper was called 'General Principles of Social and Cultural Anthropology'), sometimes coupled with a topic such as 'the emergence of social anthropology as a discipline and its relation to other branches of knowledge'.

Different types of primitive societies were discussed, e.g. tribal societies, hunters, and peasants; then most courses concentrated on topics similar to those already encountered in CSI courses. Examples were: kinship, marriage, family, age-sets and associations; descent; moral, jural and ritual institutions; law and social sanctions; religion and magic; culture, contact and change; culture and personality.

Some courses concentrated on one theoretical area - for example, the relationship between the structure of social relationships and systems of belief and ritual, a topic which was examined through the work of Frazer, Durkheim, Radcliffe-Brown, Evans-Pritchard, Levi-Strauss, and Leach.

Some courses stressed that social anthropologists now studied modern societies, and concentrated on 'modernising societies' rather than 'tribal societies'. Others adopted a more uncompromising approach; one lecturer who concentrated on ethnography added to his course outline and reading list the comment: 'I hope to bring out points of interest in relation to modern society; but it is up to students in the last analysis to get what

they can out of the course in relation to their other interests'.

Almost all optional courses in Social Anthropology recommended Lucy Mair's Introduction to Social Anthropology,⁶² and J. Beattie's Other Cultures⁶³ was also frequently included. Some courses concentrated on a particular area (e.g. West Africa, at Birmingham University), others included two or three societies (e.g. Trobrianders, Lapps, and Chinese, at York University), but most courses did not limit themselves in this way, although the Exeter optional course, which was offered until 1968/9, treated certain theoretical problems intensively, e.g. lineage systems, cross-cousin marriage, divorce, political systems and ritual activity.

After 1969/70, Exeter made Social Anthropology compulsory in its sociology course, and was thus able to take a more extended view of the subject, starting with biological anthropology, prehistoric society, and ancient civilisations. In the second year, a more theoretical approach concentrated on the relationship between systems of value, on the one hand, and systems of communication, on the other.

At Hull, sociology and social anthropology were taught as far as possible as a unified subject, and the methods course included some anthropological methods. In the first year two courses, one on specified monographs on non-Western societies, and the other on advanced societies, were linked by a third lecture course, 'Sociology and Social Anthropology, an Introduction', which discussed the similarities and dissimilarities of

the theoretical approaches of both disciplines. A third year course was included, on developments in theory and changes in methods in anthropology since Radcliffe-Brown.

The Cambridge Social and Political Sciences tripos included four papers which were mainly on Social Anthropology, and a general tendency was perceptible in the early seventies, to stress the closer relationship which, it was felt, was developing between sociology and social anthropology as academic disciplines.

Group A. Option 2. Social Administration.

In 1970, Social Administration was an optional subject in sociology courses, or courses having a large sociology component, in as many as 16 universities (or London university colleges), but in some of these, it formed a whole optional group, so that, although the degree might be called sociology, it was in fact heavily weighted with social administration subjects. The present discussion will concentrate on social administration as a single optional subject course. There were a few courses in comparative social administration, but the majority concentrated on the situation in Britain. Some courses named, for example, Social Problems, in fact covered some of the same ground as Social Administration courses.

Social Administration, according to the CRAC 1966 Course Comparison Bulletin, tended to be thought of by⁶⁴ prospective students as 'what the social services do'; but in fact by 1972 it had a very strong academic content, although it had been argued that it constituted a field of enquiry, in which economic, political and sociological

approaches were applied, rather than constituting an academic discipline in the traditional sense.

A typical Social Administration optional course began with an introductory section on social policy and social welfare; sometimes a section on the history of the development of social welfare in general (e.g. the effects of the breaking up of the Poor Law) was included at this stage; in other courses the sections on different branches of welfare were each preceded by the history of that particular branch. After the introductory section, there were, typically, sections on demography and population distribution, income distribution and social insurance, health services, the education system (from an administrative rather than a sociological point of view), housing, and social work services concerning the family, child welfare, the aged, the delinquent, and the mentally and physically handicapped.

At the outset of the course, it was sometimes pointed out that each area of social administration would be considered in three ways: (1) the needs arising in the community which led to the setting up of the social service; (2) the organisation and functioning of the social service provisions made; (3) the degree of success or failure of the impact they made on the problem.

Other broader aspects of the whole field included in some courses were: the making of policy, priorities, pressure groups, advisory bodies, voluntary bodies, the cost and financing of the social services, and, less frequently, casework and the professional organisation of social work.

Some courses emphasised particular areas of the social services; the Essex courses, for example, were particularly thorough in the areas of poverty and the aged (areas where Peter Townsend, chairman of the Sociology Department, had been so much involved), and, in addition, in the Essex course on 'Priorities and Planning', the theoretical aspects of priorities were explored, and comparative material from Britain, Hungary, Austria, France and Germany was introduced. Keele's course, 'Problems and processes in social welfare policy', Kent's inclusion of 'the ideology of welfare', were other examples of a more theoretical approach. Kent also drew on aspects of organisation and administration theory to provide some of the course structure, while a course at Southampton aimed 'to cut across the conventional divisions of the subject' by including, in lectures on 'Processes of Social Administration', headings on administrative structure, decision taking, financial resources, need, means tests, positive discrimination, manpower (professional and administrative staffs, recruitment, training, mobility, organisations representing staff groups), the assessment of efficiency, criteria of success, policy-making, committees of enquiry, political groups, and the philosophy of social policy.

The Social Problems course at Sheffield proposed to explore poverty, alcoholism, suicide, mental illness, and old age, through concepts such as deviance, anomie, and social disorganisation, and other courses included sociological concepts briefly at the end of the more

factual sections.

Reading lists had necessarily to rely heavily on government and other official material, but the standard general works by Titmuss,⁶⁵ Donnison,⁶⁶ Marshall,⁶⁷ and Slack⁶⁸ were almost always included in the more conventionally structured courses, and some lecturers recommended biographies of such pioneers as Octavia Hill and Beatrice Webb. The suggestion was also made that it might be useful to draw on the experience of any mature students who were present on a course; however, although there were Social Administration course lists which mentioned their relevance to social work as a career (e.g. Keele, Kent), the emphasis in most courses was predominantly academic.

Group A. Option 3. Social Philosophy.

Social philosophy courses for sociology degree students in the period covered by this chapter dealt with some or all of three broad subject areas: (a) ethics, ethical theory, moral philosophy; (b) socio/political theories and problems; (c) the philosophy of the social sciences.

Under (a), some authors typically considered were: Plato, Butler, Kant, Hume; and J.S. Mill and utilitarianism, Westermarck and moral relativism; course lists also covered ethical theories including intuitionist, rationalist, existentialist, and empiricist, the psycho-analytic position, the naturalistic fallacy, free will and determinism. A less traditional outline for a proposed option in Ethics at Aston suggested as topics for consideration: life and death, licentiousness, taste,

means and ends, happiness, wanting, masochism, cruelty, love and hatred.

Some other topics found under Ethics, for example, 'law and morality', obviously merged into the second main division, (b), socio/political theories. Here, some of the authors mentioned under ethics were again included, in addition to Aristotle, Hobbes, Hegel, Machiavelli, Marx, Rousseau, Spinoza, Locke and Weber. The topics most frequently considered were: natural law; justice, distributive and corrective, including theories of punishment; responsibility and liberty; sovereignty and the state; authority; equality; rights; the freedom of the individual; the social contract; property; and power.

Some courses concentrated on broader philosophical and political theories or topics: conservatism, nationalism, democracy, representative government, holism, social causation, scientific determinism, Utopian and non-Utopian social planning, religion. Other courses related these concepts, and others, very specifically to aspects of society and social policy. After first posing the questions: 'What ought society to be? What ought to be the ends of our endeavours?' and asking students to consider how far they needed to be acquainted with moral philosophy in order to be adequate as social scientists, such courses moved on to consider, for example, individual rights in the sphere of religious belief, and their influence on such subjects as abortion and birth control; the moral values involved in the operation of the welfare state, and of the education system; the ethical principles behind reward and

distribution, with reference to industry, wages and profits; theories of the state, and of sovereignty, and their relevance to international relations; and the moral problems of crime and punishment.

The most commonly recommended general text for such courses was Benn and Peters' Social Principles and the Democratic State. Gellner's Thought and Change, Hospers' Human Conduct, Laslett and Runciman's series called Philosophy, Politics and Society, and MacIntyre's Short History of Ethics, also frequently appeared on reading lists. Courses at York and London, among others, also drew on Ginsberg's and Hobhouse's writings, thus forming a link with courses in earlier years. An option at City proposed critical reading of original texts and consideration of the relevance of their ideas to contemporary social and political problems; and the reading of a few books thoroughly and thoughtfully, rather than the reading of many books superficially, was also recommended by the LSE Teachers' Guide (the LSE course in Ethics and Social Philosophy had, nevertheless, an extremely long reading list).

The third main area of social philosophy courses, (c), philosophy of the social sciences, overlapped with the subject-matter of some courses called, in other degrees, 'logic and scientific method'; courses in the philosophy of the social sciences dealt with topics such as the nature of social knowledge, the meaning of explanation, action theory, 'verstehen' theory, cause, function, teleological explanation, and the place of value judgments

in social science. While some options called, for example, 'Philosophy of Sociology' or 'Philosophy of the Social Sciences', stayed with this epistemological approach throughout, others moved on to the subject area (b) described above. Alternatively, a course beginning with ethical ideas, might end with a section on the status of laws and theories, the grounds of explanation, and a consideration of sociological concepts such as social structure, social action, function, objectivity, progress, development, and understanding. In the course unit degree plan at LSE, 'Ethics and Social Philosophy' as a course title no longer appeared, but there were, in 1972, three half-unit courses named 'Introduction to Social and Moral Philosophy', 'Structure of Ethical Theories', and 'Concepts of Society' - in other words, a separating-out of the three subject areas which had previously been combined.

Social Philosophy's long academic pedigree meant that it was an established subject at both Oxford and Cambridge, but it was associated only rather distantly with sociology at those universities. At Oxford, Philosophy was one of the basic subjects of the PPE Honours School, and the three sociological papers were options, so that Social Philosophy, although naturally included in the degree, could not be categorised as 'a subject in a sociology degree'. In the Social and Political Sciences tripos at Cambridge, there was no specific paper named 'Social Philosophy', but the paper on 'Modern Political Philosophy' did cover some of the subject areas (a) and (b) above.

Table VI.3
Frequency with which Group B Optional Subjects 1-8 (see Table VI.1, p.235) were listed in Sociology: Specialised Studies, in the Careers Research and Advisory Centre Degree Course Guide, 1970/71

Subject	Number of universities listing the subject
1. Industrial sociology	26
2. Political sociology	23
3. Sociology of deviance (and Criminology)	22
4. Sociology of religion	19
5. Sociology of education	14
6. Urban sociology	11
7. Demography	7
8. Race relations	4

Group B. Option 1. Industrial Sociology.

In the CRAC 1970/71 Degree Course Guide, 23 English universities (or colleges of London University) listed Industrial Sociology as being an optional course for sociology students, and in addition the subject was listed as compulsory at Aston, Birmingham and Loughborough. Scott's 1967 prophecy, that 'a specialised option in industrial sociology is not widely available although its availability is increasing' ⁶⁹ had proved true.

Industrial Sociology was typically introduced in the second or third year of the degree course. The option was sometimes called Sociology of Work, and courses in Sociology of Organisations (or Organisational Sociology) covered some of the same ground. In the period covered by this chapter, the balance of emphasis in Industrial Sociology courses between 'the worker as individual' aspects and the organisational aspects of the subject, was

weighted, in most first degree courses, in favour of a more organisational approach; another tendency was to try to regard the industrial enterprise as an open rather than a closed system, and to include some consideration of the relationship between industry and other social institutions; as a corollary to this, the ways in which work roles affected roles outside the work situation, were also often discussed.

There was a variety of ways in which a lecturer in Industrial Sociology might structure his course material. One was, to begin with the emphasis on the worker inside the organisation, with such topics as: the worker as 'economic man'; efficiency, reward, control, leadership, authority, supervision; Taylor and 'scientific management'; Mayo, the Hawthorne studies and the 'Human Relations approach' with its emphasis on informal social organisation; the influence of group structures on norms and roles; incentives and incentive payment systems; work satisfaction; the industrial enterprise as a social system; the Glacier Metal studies; technical factors affecting work groups, and the enterprise as a socio/technical system; the relationship between skilled and unskilled workers; the role of the shop steward; the 'effort bargain'; the division of labour in the workplace; the managerial role.

Some study of occupational groupings might next be introduced, including manual, white collar, professional and managerial groups; occupational and industrial communities; occupational choice; occupational mobility; the employment of women, and equal pay; technical

employees; foremen and supervisors; problems of professionals in bureaucratic organisations; full-time trade union officials; scientists and their values; conflict and cooperation on the shop floor; relationships between managers and workers. Frequently a list of topics on occupational groups would be followed by two main themes on workers' attitudes: Goldthorpe's embourgeoisement and 'affluent worker' themes, and the concept of alienation (usually citing Blauner's Alienation and Freedom as a reference).

Having dealt with some of the situations inside the working environment, courses then turned, often with occupational associations as the link, to the study of industrial relations: trade unions and management; explanations of strikes; the Donovan report and the reform of collective bargaining; productivity bargaining; the closed shop; conciliation and arbitration; the settlement of disputes; 'restriction of output'; white collar unionism; trade unionism and oligarchy; the concept of industrial democracy; workers' self-government. There were two ways in which the subject of strikes was sometimes more fully documented: first, by a study of case histories in specific industries, which formed the topics for separate sessions (a course at Durham, for example, considered coal mining; shipbuilding; dock-workers; the printing, motor and steel industries; and industries with a high degree of automation, e.g. oil and chemical processing). Another method was to look at the strike situation in other countries, or at comparative

studies; Japan, Sweden and Yugoslavia, and, of course, the USA, were examples of countries whose industries were considered in courses in the late sixties and early seventies.

Some courses began from the concept of industrial society, and dealt with larger issues: theories of industrialism, theories of industrial development and change; ownership and control; the geographical location of industry and its effect on the community; types of industrial enterprise; public and private ownership; the rise of bureaucracy (which might be further divided into Weberian and post-Weberian analyses); the effect of the market and the role of the consumer and of advertising; the effect of technological change on management structures and on organisation; the management of innovation; the problems of automation; changes in manpower demands; occupational mobility; and occupational choice.

A course at Bristol began by emphasising bureaucracy, its structure, its relationship to industrial organisation, some of its dysfunctions, and its effects on rules and bargaining; then followed a section on trade unionism and industrial relations, which further explored the topic of bargaining, and investigated various patterns of industrial conflict. Next the course covered post-capitalist theories of management and labour, under which convergence and the end of ideology and theories of managerialism and embourgeoisement were included; and the course ended under a heading 'Control and Satisfaction at Work' with the themes of alienation and participation,

industrial democracy, and worker control.

A group of topics relating industrial sociology to other social institutions occurred in some courses: these included, under some such heading as 'links with industrial institutions and society', or 'the factory and the wider environment', some of the following: industry and the educational system (for example, the effect of greater availability of education on occupational choice); industry and the family (including the effect of the employment of women, the relationship between status at work and status in the family, work roles and non-work roles); industry's effect on stratification and social mobility, and on class consciousness; industry and the local community; and, in a wider politico/economic setting, topics such as relations between industry and government, the effect of factors of production on the social structure, the effect of social norms on wages and profits, the connection between distribution shares in the national product and social class and status, and the relation between social structure, capital accumulation and long-term growth.

Apart from the theories of bureaucracy and alienation already mentioned, another more specifically sociological framework which was introduced, was the action frame of reference in relation to workers' participation in the industrial enterprise; in contrast to this was the more technological, or 'systems' approach, with more 'functionalist overtones'.

Courses named 'Sociology of Organisations' did not

always concentrate entirely on a 'systems' approach, and while they could, theoretically, be concerned with any type of organisation, industrial, welfare, educational, or custodial, the course at East Anglia, for example, had many subheadings which recurred frequently in industrial sociology courses: division of labour within organisations; rules and procedures; authority and hierarchy; bases of power and authority; command, compliance and conflict; technology and organisational structure; technology and work group behaviour; work organisations and unions; professional associations. (The main journal reference for this course was, however, Administrative Science Quarterly). At Kent, in a course on 'Sociology of Work and Organisations', many of the same subheadings occurred, and this course also considered 'communication and coordination', 'decision-making and rationality', and 'organisations and occupational milieux'. The course in the Engineering Tripos at Cambridge, although named Sociology of Organisations, in fact included much industrial sociology and industry psychology material.

In 1970, courses called Sociology of Organisations occurred more frequently in sociology degrees at new universities and technological universities than in sociology degrees in the rest of the university sector. Texts such as Etzioni's Modern Organisations seemed to be cited with equal frequency in both Industrial Sociology and Sociology of Organisations courses. The most frequently cited books in Industrial Sociology courses were Miller and Form's Industrial Sociology,⁷⁰ Blau and

Scott's Formal Organisations,⁷¹ Schneider's Industrial Sociology, Friedmann's Industrial Society, and Parker, Brown, Child and Smith's The Sociology of Industry. On more specific topics, frequently cited works were Burns and Stalker's The Management of Innovation, the series of books by J.H. Goldthorpe and others on the theme of the affluent worker and embourgeoisement,⁷² and Joan Woodward's Management and Technology.

John Rex had predicted in 1966⁷³ that there would be attempts in the seventies to formulate a typology of industrial enterprises; to apply objectively formulated theories of conflict resolution to industrial disputes; and to make more studies of occupational sub-cultures. While hints of some of these topics were appearing in course lists (for example, 'conflict theory and industrial behaviour' was a lecture title in a course at Brunel in 1970), the main impression was one of trying to make coherent courses out of several main subject areas: the industrial enterprise, its system and structure, and the operation of authority; occupational groups and associations; industrial conflict; worker/worker relationships and worker/management relationships; and the influence of industrial organisations on other social institutions.

In ending this section it may be apposite to mention the remark of Peter Gibson, a Manchester sociology research student, reported in a 1969 discussion on peace or war in the universities, that industrial sociology

meant, in effect, managerial sociology, and that students might want to develop a sociology of use to the working class.⁷⁴ One industrial sociology lecturer in fact included in his lecture heading these words: 'It [the course] does not, of course, set out to provide specific training for management', which could be taken to imply that the general content would be, nevertheless, generally useful to future managers. The effect of the industrial sociology course on the students' personal development, role-identification, and attitudes to their future careers, were seldom mentioned in the course outlines passed in review in the above description of Industrial Sociology courses, although they may, of course, have been included in seminar, class or tutorial discussions.

Group B. Option 2. Political Sociology.

Political Sociology was listed as a course for sociology students at 23 English universities or colleges of London University, in the CRAC guide for 1970/71. Political Sociology was taught by methods ranging from the formal lecture course to the informal class or seminar; and while some courses concentrated, at the outset, on the classical theorists, some focused on political models or systems, and some concentrated on the behaviourist approach, or on voting behaviour, more than others; still there were many topics which appeared on nearly all reading lists or lists of essay and seminar topics, and the emphasis of each course was, perhaps in this subject more than in some others in sociology degrees, likely to be more evident in the actual lectures and

seminars which took place, than in the outlines of them provided in advance.

As a basis for a description of the kind of coverage given by political sociology courses in the period dealt with in this chapter, the structure of an Exeter syllabus introduced in 1969 will be used as a starting point, and examples of additional topics from other universities' courses will be introduced under each section of that syllabus. It should not be assumed that the Exeter course was in any way typical; it had, however, short headings covering a fairly large field. (It was, incidentally, like some Political Sociology courses at other universities, to be taught partly by members of the Department of Politics.)

Under the first heading, 'Approaches to the Study of Politics and Society', were listed: group theory of politics; conflict theories; functionalism and systems theory; game theory and other formal methods.

At Brunel the introductory material discussed the difference between political sociology, political science and political philosophy, and took as basic themes, conflict and consensus, and bureaucracy; as basic theoretical approaches (partly replicating the Exeter pattern) were listed the Marxist, Weberian, and functionalist/system views of society. Several courses (e.g. at Leeds, Kent, City) took, as their central focus for the Political Sociology course, the concept of 'power', and essay topics set at Oxford, included power and decision-making, and the correlation between economic and political power.

Under the second heading in the Exeter course, 'Development of Political Society', were listed: the development of the forms of political society from pre-industrial to industrial society; stateless societies; the development of the state; and modern forms of government.

City, for example, also included an historical account of world democracy; and other courses, under the general heading of the development of the state and modern forms of government, discussed bureaucracy, democracy, the nation state, Marxism, totalitarianism, fascism, mass society, and monism and pluralism in society.

The third heading of the Exeter course, 'Elites and Power', covered the topics of power, authority, influence, elites; problems of the measurement of power; and community power.

Of the topics under this third heading, power has already been mentioned as a central topic of some Political Sociology courses. In most courses elites were also analysed in some detail - their recruitment and performance, the theories of Mosca and Pareto, and, as elite groups, the military, bureaucrats, managers and intellectuals.

Under the fourth heading, 'Political Organisations', Exeter listed: political parties in Western societies; in totalitarian societies; in modernising societies; pressure groups and interest groups; and types of involvement in political organisations.

In considering political parties in Western societies, some courses concentrated on the British political system, others ranged over party systems in democratic and

totalitarian societies (a course at Durham, for example, had topics covering the USA, France, Germany, and the USSR, and also included China, Japan and India, while a seminar on 'les événements de 1968' was proposed, in addition, for the 1970 course). A course at East Anglia concentrated on a comparison between modern Britain and modern France, in politics (including, for example, such studies on pressure groups as 'The Winegrowers of France'); and an Essex course considered 'Western, Eastern and developing nations'. 'Political parties in modernising societies' were often included in the final section of Political Sociology courses (the course at Manchester used Worsley's term 'Third World societies'). The topic, 'types of involvement in political organisations', although sometimes, as at Exeter, included under 'Political Parties', was more often discussed under the heading 'Political Behaviour', the next Exeter heading.

Under this fifth heading in the Exeter course were listed: the individual and the way in which personality and social factors shape his political attitudes and behaviour; voting behaviour; political socialisation; personality and political behaviour.

Some courses (one at Leeds, for example) focused largely on the behavioural approach to political sociology; but many courses discussed the topics listed in the paragraph above, and, in addition, headings under 'behaviour' frequently included the whole subject of class and stratification correlated with political behaviour in voting and in participation or non-participation in party activity; working class conservatism; the

influence of mass media on public opinion, voting and other political behaviour; political apathy and the sense of powerlessness; the role of intellectuals and students in politics; and the concept of national character.

A course outline at Sheffield made the point that 'psephology and political sociology are not the same thing', but studies of elections, both British and American, were nevertheless frequently included in reading lists.

The last section in the Exeter course, 'Political Changes', included: the factors inducing change in political systems; revolutions; problems of political modernisations; the military in politics.

Some of the above topics have already been mentioned, as they were covered at other universities by earlier headings, but some such title as 'sources of political instability' was often included; a course at Leeds proposed to consider the theory of war and international relations; while Manchester included in its syllabus 'Social change and stability; theory of revolution'.

Other main concepts occurring in Political Sociology options in the sixties and early seventies were: 'political movements'; 'Political culture'; the subject of ideologies in general and of 'ideology and utopia' in particular; and the theory of the 'iron law of oligarchy' in relation to political parties.

Some courses (for example at LSE and Reading University) were structured on the works of classical

writers, a section or sections for each. These included de Tocqueville, Marx, Mosca, Pareto, Ostrogorsky, Sorel, Michels, Weber, Graham Wallas, and Karl Mannheim.

Group B. Option 3. Sociology of Deviance.

The CRAC 1970/71 guide listed 22 English universities or colleges of London University letting students take 'Sociology of Deviance' as a subject for their degree, but in fact many of these options were called either 'Criminology', or by some variation such as 'Criminal Behaviour' (Southampton), 'Sociology of Crime and Delinquency' (Loughborough), 'Social Deviance and Social Control' (Surrey). Any such courses have been considered under this Option 3 heading. There may have been some tendency at the turn of the decade for courses to change from an emphasis on traditional criminology to an emphasis on deviance. Manchester, which had had a course on 'Criminology' under Social Administration, was considering the introduction of a course named 'Sociology of Deviance' in 1971. As a second example, the course at Durham was called 'Criminology' until 1969/70, when it was re-titled 'Sociology of Deviance'. The outline for the Durham 1969/70 option stated: 'This course contains the major part of what is conventionally taught in a Criminology course, but is broader, in that it deals with the phenomenon of deviance as such and types of deviant behaviour other than crime and delinquency'.

In the detailed Bibliography for the Durham 1969/70 course, the lecturer commented: 'Because the study of

crime and delinquency - criminology - is the best established subfield of deviance, the course will have to draw heavily on this literature. Some of the problems covered in the readings below - scope, methods, value position, measurement - apply to other types of deviance as well'.

In fact there were changes of emphasis in the course structure of the Durham 1969/70 option as compared with the two previous years. There was less emphasis on biological theories of crime, intrafamilial maladjustment, and learning theory; the heading 'Subcultural and Interactionist Approaches' was followed by the comment: 'This is the main section of the syllabus', and while a section on 'Violence' was omitted as such, a new section on 'Mental Illness' was introduced, and mental hospitals were included in the section on 'The sociology of the prison'. This reading list also included a final heading: 'AND FOR WHAT IT'S REALLY ALL ABOUT', under which the books listed consisted mainly of writings by articulate people in deviant subcultures, for example William Burroughs, Alexander Trocchi, Jean Genet, and Tony Parker's 'ghosted' writings about the lives of various criminal types.

The change of emphasis at some universities from 'criminology' to 'deviance' was also illustrated by the option outline for York for 1969/70, which, although still named 'Criminology', was headed by the statement: 'This course might be more appropriately called "The Sociology of Deviant Behaviour" in so far as it is concerned not merely with the nature of criminal law

and those who break it, but also with non-legal norms and their transgressors'.

To take a fourth example, at Exeter, the revised syllabus for the Sociology degree introduced in 1969/70 included an optional group of subjects (3 papers) called 'Deviance and Control'. The previous single option paper had been called 'Criminology', but the relevant paper in the new option group was named 'Criminology and Deviance', and separate courses of lectures were given on these two topics. The rubric for the 'deviance' part of the syllabus read: 'The definition of deviance. Mental abnormality, alcoholism, narcotic addiction, sexual offences, prostitution, homosexuality, abortion, marital conflict, physical abnormality, homicide and suicide. The relationship between the individual and society'.

A similar subject separation took place at LSE. The subjects previously taught under the Criminology option in the London BA/BSc Sociology (which was to go on being examined until 1976) were included in three course units in the new degree structure at LSE under the titles: 'Introduction to Criminology'; 'Selected Problems of Criminology and Penology'; and 'Sociology of Deviant Behaviour'.

The difference of emphasis can be illustrated in more detail by looking at a course at Southampton on the one hand, and a course at Kent, on the other.

Southampton's course, 'Criminal Behaviour', began with the state of crime in England and Wales, problems of measurement, frequency of offences of different types,

and regional and demographic distribution of crimes.

Some 'explanations' of criminality were next considered, in terms of family structure, parental deprivation, different child-rearing patterns, and psychoanalytic theories.

A consideration of migration and of criminal behaviour among minority groups was followed by a section on group differences of delinquency, delinquency areas, and social ecology (often identified in criminology courses with 'the Chicago tradition'), gangs, and adolescent groups.

A section on economic, white collar, organised and professional crime was followed by a section on attitudes to law, property and people, and the concepts of rationalisation and neutralisation.

The topics of recidivism, the prediction of delinquency and criminal behaviour and technical problems in the evaluation of penal treatment, led to a consideration of the nature of punishment, and its use as control; and of individual differences in response, and their penological implications.

The course ended with a section on the social content of sentencing, the social structure of penal institutions, and the social consequences of penal treatment.

Although the word 'deviance' was never mentioned, the two books recommended as 'essential reading' for the course were Walker's Crime and Punishment in Britain (also used as a 'basic textbook' by a course at Sheffield) and A.K. Cohen's Deviance and Control, recommended by the

Southampton lecturer as 'a good introduction from a sociological point of view'.

The outline for the option 'Sociology of Deviance' at Kent, on the other hand, started from the nature and significance of deviance, went on to list such topics as 'the transformation of deviant actors into deviant characters and of deviant acts into deviant careers', and 'the social functions and dysfunctions of deviance', and then proposed to examine various theories, including 'ecological, sub-contra-cultural, cultural transmission and differential association, anomie and social disorganisation, economic and social conflict; social labelling, role-self, exchange and calculation, and drift'.

The word 'criminal' was not introduced until the penultimate paragraph, where 'various types of criminal and deviant behaviour system' were suggested as topics. The last paragraph dealt with treatment inside and outside institutions; and the last topics mentioned were: 'agents of social control and enforcement; police, police practices, other moral entrepreneurs and custodians'. Walker and Cohen were again mentioned under the 'General Texts' for the option, but Herbert Mannheim's two-volume Comparative Criminology (cited as 'the basic text book' for Reading University's six term Criminology course, for example) was not included.

As the Durham course had pointed out, no matter how different the terminology in the rubrics for the different courses might be, much of the material they used was still taken from 'traditional criminological' literature,

and the difference was sometimes essentially one of terminology rather than a more fundamental delineation of different areas. For example, 'criminal statistics and their limitations' might be transformed into 'problems of measuring deviance; prevalence, visibility, identification; use of official records; limitations', but similar materials would be listed for the two types of topics.

A Bedford seminar course provided a good example of a mixture of a traditional and more modern ordering of topics. It began with the problem of defining crime, both legally and sociologically. Next, the problems of methodology mentioned above, were considered - in particular, the use of official statistics, the nature of unreported crime, and the possibility of alternative methods of collecting data.

A section on crime as a social and sociological problem, was followed by a consideration of the various theories of the causes of crime, starting with biological constitutional theories, and continuing by looking at the possible contribution of low intelligence, mental abnormality, and developmental and learning theory, to the make-up of the criminal. Next the possible connection between crime and economic conditions was discussed, followed by a consideration of the ecological approach. More specifically sociological topics began with the theories of anomie and of deviant behaviour, and these were followed by sections on gangs and delinquent sub-cultures in general, the theory of differential association,

interactionist theories and societal reaction to crime; deviance, law and social structure; and a section on social control. This latter section covered the topics of sentencing policy, the police, the social worker, action research, the sociology of penal institutions, including organisation theory as applied to them, inmate sub-cultures, and the functional model of sociological analysis of the prison. The last sections covered female criminality, drug abuse, white collar crime, the treatment of juveniles, and crimes of violence.

The references for this Bedford course, like those for many others, included a large proportion of American works, and lists of journals included the US along with the British journals. The courses at LSE and Leeds also attempted some comparative study of the subject by including studies from Scandinavian countries as well as from the USA, and the course at Reading University, among others, used comparative material in its study of penal systems.

The Teachers' Guide emphasised that the course could not possibly be as specialised as the Diploma in Criminology at Cambridge, and it advised lecturers for the London Criminology option to try to achieve a balance between a wholly sociological approach and a too legalistic approach, pointing out that criminology and criminal law were different subjects.

However, at Sheffield, a Criminology course was given in the Department of Law, and the sociology students attended part of a larger course intended primarily for law students, and were expected to take part in at least

one visit to a penal institution. It was not uncommon, indeed, in criminology courses, for one or two lectures or sessions to be devoted to the various penal institutions - approved schools, borstals, detention and attendance centres - and other services - probation and after-care, for example.

Kent and Surrey both included as a topic the relation between homicide and suicide, while other courses (e.g. Reading and Keele) devoted a special section to the psychopathic offender. Reading University's course was one among many which began with sections on the history, scope and general theory of criminology, and the Reading course also included under 'Special Foci': 'Crime and the School; Crime and War; Crime and Religion; and Political Factors in Crime'.

Not surprisingly, the conclusions to be drawn from a consideration of the reading lists, seminar topics and course outlines for Criminology and Sociology of Deviance options, were, firstly, that the causes of crime were still considered to be multifactorial, that no one theory of causation was considered definitive; and secondly, that, in the late sixties and early seventies, the role of the police, and the effectiveness of various forms of treatment of criminality and deviance, still constituted social as well as sociological and criminological problems.

Group B. Option 4. Sociology of Religion.

The Sociology of Religion (under which heading are included courses with such titles as 'Comparative Morals and Religion' (London), 'Society and Religion' (Cambridge), 'Sociology of Religion and Belief Systems' (Brunel), 'The

Comparative Sociology of Religion' (Exeter), and 'Sociology of Religion and Ritual' (Hull)), was offered as an optional course by 18 English universities or colleges of London University, and was compulsory at Loughborough, according to the CRAC 1970/71 guide.

One approach to the structuring of the Sociology of Religion courses in the sixties and early seventies, was to begin with the basic theoretical approaches of classical and modern writers. These most frequently included Marx (sometimes with Engels), Weber, Durkheim, Freud, Malinowski and Parsons, and Troeltsch on the typology of religion, church and sect. Others mentioned were, among psychologists, James, Jung and Fromm; among anthropologists, Levy-Bruhl, Radcliffe-Brown, Evans-Pritchard, Fortes, and Levi-Strauss; and a course at Bristol included as a section, the 19th century anthropological studies of Robertson-Smith, Tylor and Frazer.

There were various ways in which these theorists were grouped. Sometimes the sections corresponded to the writers; other groupings were broader. York's option outline for 1969/70, for example, began with four groupings: first, the evolutionist's concern with origins; second, the functionalists' concern with functions; third, the Weberian concern with the interaction of religion and social structure (Weber, it may be noted, was almost always allotted at least one section); and fourth, a review of contemporary assumptions about the nature and function of religion and religious behaviour.

Other groupings were: anthropologists/classical sociologists/contemporary studies; psychologists/sociologists; and Marxist/functionalist/Freudian approaches to the study of religion.

Some courses began, not with the various theoretical approaches of classical and other writers, but with other issues. Bristol, Leeds and Exeter began their courses with sections on the purpose and methods of a sociological study of religion; Reading University's first section considered the relationship between morals and religion. A topic associated particularly with the early stages of religious development was the relationship between religion and magic, and their relation, in turn, to economic, political and other social institutions in pre-industrial societies; sometimes magic, science, morals, religion and ideology, or the differentiation between the sacred and the profane, were discussed at this point in the syllabus.

As the courses moved forward from the early theorists, there were several ways in which they structured their material. Some moved, next, to a consideration of world religions and a sociological comparison between these. The Reading University course was quite typical in including in this section: Ancient Judaism; Greek and Roman religions; Zoroastrianism; Hinduism; Buddhism; Chinese religion (Confucianism was mentioned specifically in some other courses); Shinto; Islam; and millennial movements. Brunel's course also mentioned the religion of the warrior (e.g. the Samurai of Japan), the peasant, the merchant, the deprived, and the mandarin, while a course at Sussex included tribal religions and the

Tokugawa religion in addition to Islam, Hinduism and Buddhism; and the Bristol course specifically mentioned cargo cults.

Some courses emphasised more particularly studies of Christianity, or studies of religion in Great Britain and America. A 1967 outline for a course at Sheffield pointed out: 'The Sociology of Religion is a rapidly developing branch of the discipline and clearly in a one-year course it is impossible to cover the whole field'.

As soon as the move was made to the more modern material, the emphasis shifted to empirical studies. Topics included in many courses were: sects (usually with a reference to Troeltsch's typology of church and sect); denominations and denominationalisation; forms of church organisation, e.g. hierarchical and equalitarian (sometimes with an organisational analysis of the British churches, or a section on 'the parish'); the secularisation debate, and the differences in secularisation between Britain and the United States.

Further modern material often included a general discussion of the leadership and ministry of the church, and sometimes there was a more detailed treatment of the clergy, their role, their recruitment and professional structure, the change in clergy/laity relations, and the role of the chaplain in various institutions.

The position in the modern Western world (sometimes specifically in Great Britain) was reviewed under such headings as: church attendance and membership; the relation between religious behaviour and social class; the social origins of belief; scientists and religion;

the decline of the social importance of religion in Britain; religious pluralism; immigrant religion; revivalism, ecumenicalism and conflict; and the rise of new religious or quasi-religious movements (a York course gave as examples, Humanism, LSD and the New Mysticism, flying saucer cults, scientology; Brunel mentioned the continuing belief in luck).

Two important aspects of religious sociology were sometimes interlinked: the relation between religious institutions on the one hand, and political and economic institutions on the other hand; this topic was usually included, at least at the outset, under Weberian theory, but was sometimes reintroduced later in the course, under headings such as: 'the place of religion in processes of social and economic development' (Sussex); 'patterns of religious belief and other ideologies both as reflections of, and agents of, rapid social change' (Hull); 'religion and social change' (Bristol, Leeds): 'religion and contemporary social change: the Third World; messianic movements' (Bristol).

A course at Manchester looked at the function of religion in providing explanations of 'senseless suffering' and 'good and bad fortune' (Brunel's phraseology was 'the attitude to the problem of evil in the world'). Brunel also gave a very detailed treatment of typologies - orientations to the world such as acceptance/rejection, mysticism, innerworldly asceticism, world-rejecting asceticism - types of religious authority, such as prophetic, ethical and exemplary, and charismatic - and types of sect such as adventist, conversionist, and agnostic.

Southampton's course, concentrating on different functionalist theories, studied 'integrative religion' (contributing to the maintenance of a given social order); 'neutral religion' (having little bearing on the maintenance of social order); and disintegrative religion (contributing to the breakdown of social order).

Preliminary and introductory reading consisted, apart from basic texts such as Weber's Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism, chiefly of collections of articles such as Schneider's Religion Culture and Society (characterised by Sheffield as 'a wide ranging book of readings') and M. Yinger's Religion, Society and the Individual; while lists of 'general introductions to the subject' often included B.R. Wilson's Religion in Secular Society and T. O'Dea's Sociology of Religion. The Teachers' Guide had some friendly advice about reading for the London 'Comparative Morals and Religion' course. They advised that the students should read articles summarising the long primary accounts of the important subjects, e.g. Troeltsch on typologies or Cohn,⁷⁵ Worsley,⁷⁶ etc. on millennialism - before 'settling down to enjoy' the primary works if time permitted. Their attitude (not, of course, necessarily shared by all lecturers) was that it was the logic of the sociological approach which it was important to grasp. Providing oneself with 'a welter of illustrations or historical materials' could come later.

Group B. Option 5. Sociology of Education.

Sociology of Education as an option in sociology first

degrees was sometimes taught by a member or members of the Department of Sociology, sometimes by a member or members of the Department or Institute of Education of the university concerned.

In a majority of courses, one book dominated the reading list: Halsey, Floud and Anderson's Education, Economy and Society (sometimes referred to as 'the Reader'). After 1968, Olive Banks's Sociology of Education appeared with almost equal frequency.

The amount of sociological theory incorporated into the Sociology of Education option varied very greatly. Some courses began with the development of British education from about 1895 and followed an empirical and historical approach for the first years - often up to 1944 - before beginning to draw on more sociological material as they began to discuss primary, secondary and tertiary education. Other lecturers began with the sociological theories of Weber, Parsons, Durkheim, Marx and Karl Mannheim. Some courses took as their central theme, the relationship between the educational system and the structure of British society; but, while many courses included material from the USA, fewer adopted a wider comparative approach, drawing on studies of educational systems in the USSR and African and European countries. Yet another method (e.g. that used in the course under Kelsall at Sheffield) was to concentrate on specific pieces of empirical research and investigate them in detail. A course at York in the sixties required students to write essays by examining research articles on a chosen theme in educational social psychology and

sociology, and analysing them with regard to methods used, variables measured, and any uncontrolled variables which had not been allowed for, in drawing conclusions.

Yet another theoretical approach was to apply organisation theory to the school, and to other educational institutions. In some respects the pattern of Sociology of Education courses resembled that of Industrial Sociology courses, in that some lecturers started from inside the school, from theories of group activity in the classroom, socialisation of pupils, the teacher's role, different forms of organisation inside the school such as streaming, and from there, moved out into the wider sphere of society with an account of educational administration, the role of the parent, the effect of home background, the transition from school to work, and the interaction between the school's activity and the demands of industrialised society in terms of professional and non-professional manpower.

A course at Nottingham was structured under two main headings. The first was 'Education and the social structure in Britain', which related primary, secondary and higher education to the family, the economic and administrative environments, the occupational structure and social mobility (the interaction of education and social mobility was included in many courses, with references to Floud et al., Social Class and Educational Opportunity, and Douglas's The Home and the School, among other studies), and educational institutions considered in the light of organisational and group theories ('the school as a social system' was another topic heading

frequently encountered).

The second main heading in the Nottingham course, 'The teaching profession', included: the development of the profession, the teacher's role, and factors influencing the status of teaching. The course also considered educational problems such as comprehensive education and social change, and educational aims. In the reading list under the topic 'education and the social environment' were included the Cox 'Black Paper',⁷⁷ Daiches' The Idea of a New University, Martin's Anarchy and Culture, and Cockburn and Blackburn's Student Power.

Recent work on comprehensive and public schools was included in some courses; other specific topics less frequently included were: the education of immigrant groups; linguistic codes, particularly with reference to Bernstein's work⁷⁸ (a paper in the Cambridge Social and Political Sciences Tripos called 'The Sociology of Learning, Knowledge and Belief', while containing much sociology of education material, particularly emphasised linguistics); the growth of 'youth culture'; and the politics of educational control. A course at York looked at the whole subject of sociology of education in terms of three 'actor' variables (child, family, teacher) and three 'environmental' variables (school, home and neighbourhood), forming an inter-related matrix.

Emphasis on higher education varied - at Essex, for example, where the lectures were given by different lecturers on different themes, the course began with higher education (the Robbins Report, the work of Marris,⁷⁹ and Sanford's The American College were among the

references), and continued with lectures on Education and Social Mobility, Private Education, Economics and Education, Education and Development, Cross Cultural Comparisons in Education, and Economic and Social Change in Industrial Societies. At Bristol, the 'higher education' topics came, as was more usually the case, at the end of the lecture course, and included, in three lectures: the rôle of the university and of higher learning in industrialised society; research, innovation and technical need; academic freedom and the pluralistic society; social and economic returns of higher education; the academic profession; and student cultures and values.

The main government reports: Early Leaving; 16-18 (Crowther); Half our Future (Newsom); Higher Education (Robbins); and Primary Education (Plowden) were on most reading lists. A course at Leeds attempted to breathe life into these reports, by organising visits for the students on the course, to different types of schools and colleges; essay topics were then given, related to the students' observations outside the university.

Group B. Option 6. Urban Sociology.

There were 11 universities listed as offering Urban Sociology in the 1970/71 CRAC guide (Urban Sociology was not an option in the London degrees).

Two main types of course seem to have been offered in the years covered by this chapter, although much of their subject-matter overlapped. The first type dealt with pre-industrial urbanisation (which varied from the mediaeval city, as at Leeds, to 'planned landscape before 1800' at Exeter), and then moved on to the following topics: the impact of industrialisation on the urban

economic and social structure, urbanisation in the modern world (sometimes with reference to Africa and Asia, but always relying heavily, also, on American material), the relationship between urban communities and social stratification, demographic factors in urban growth, and the social groups of towns, including the concepts of neighbourhood, network, community, town, metropolis, and the suburb.

The course at Keele, for example, began with a consideration of the Chicago school of urban sociology and its critics, and later made comparisons between studies of American and English suburbs. This led to a consideration of the effect of place of residence on the way of life of the urban inhabitants, and to the problems of segregation and subculture, density of development, and communications.

In courses of this first type, discussions of urban politics and government, and social change in the city, were sometimes used as closing topics. The Keele course finished with a consideration of new towns, urban renewal, and the relevance of urban sociology to town planning.

In the second type of course, while much of the same ground was covered, greater emphasis was laid on planning and on the contemporary situation. Southampton's courses on 'Urban Planning and Community Development' plunged straight into 'the sociological issues involved in the design and development of new communities', and examined the different types of planning administration in Britain and the USA, the distinction between physical and social planning, and the theory of community

development.

Kent's course saw urbanisation as a restructuring of patterns of social relationships, and in the second part of the course discussed 'the complex relationship between spatial structure and social structure', as well as urbanism as different ways of life for the middle class, the working class and ethnic minorities, and the topics of community power structure and locality status systems.

It was proposed that students taking the Kent Urban Sociology option should have an opportunity of doing a project in applied urban sociology in connection with part of their course in research techniques.

Essex's option on Town Design could form part of the 'Sociology in the School of Social Studies' degree, and included analysis of the social aspects of the design of individual houses, as well as the relationship between user research and housing schemes.

Hatt and Reiss's Cities and Society was frequently recommended reading, while a then newly published English reader, Readings in Urban Sociology, edited by Pahl, appeared on Kent's 1969 reading list, along with Gans's studies of American urban life,⁸⁰ which were standard reading on most Urban Sociology optional courses.

Group B. Option 7. Demography.

Writers on the origins of British sociology sometimes quoted the Scottish demographers of the 18th century as the early forerunners of the subject. Banks and Tropp, in their introduction to the Guide for

Intending Students for the BSA in 1960, mentioned that demography derived from the work of two 17th century members of the Royal Society, John Graunt and Sir William Petty, who were interested in arriving at accurate measures of the population, income and wealth of various countries; and MacRae, in 'Between Science and the Arts', referred to the first Statistical Account of Scotland as one of the earliest of 'the great social surveys'.⁸¹

In 1960 Banks and Tropp had mentioned 'the study of population questions' (along with criminology, the sociology of religion, and politics), as one of the fields which sociology students were expected to study as an option in addition to their compulsory sociological subjects, and the 1966 CRAC Course Comparison Bulletin mentioned 'population studies' as one of the major options in sociology degrees.

In the 1970/71 CRAC guide, however, Demography was listed as a subject at English universities in seven sociology courses only, two of these being the courses at LSE and Bedford for the London degree option. A revival of interest from a standpoint other than the traditional one, was in the study of population growth as a 'social problem' - an example of this approach was the option at Brunel, 'Human Ecology and Population Problems', of which traditional demography actually formed only one small part; while 'World Population and Resources' was the title of an optional contextual

paper in the School of Social Studies at Sussex in the sixties. (Reading University's course in Social Biology included as headings: Ethology; Evolution; and Ecology. Since, however, it did not include demography as such, it has not been discussed in the present overview.)

Cambridge listed 'Population Studies' as Paper 18 in the first Social and Political Sciences Tripos regulations, but the paper was not set in 1970 or 1971, and was omitted from the scheme for the Tripos in the 1971/2 Students' Handbook.

Professor Glass, at LSE (Bedford students attended his lectures as well as their own), and Professor Grebenik, at Leeds, were both teaching the subject of demography in a traditional way, divided into two or three sections.

The first section concentrated on demographic analysis. The topics were arranged in order somewhat as follows: the sources of data on population trends and changes (with some reference to the census and the system of registration in Great Britain); the life table; marriage (or nuptiality) and divorce; fertility and its measurement, and reproduction rates; birth rates (and the limitations of crude birth rates); the construction of abridged life tables; mortality; replacement rates; standardisation; cohort analysis; the effect of vital rates on the age structure and population growth of the society; the concept of 'expectation of life'; stable population theory; and population trends and predictions. At Bedford, this section of the course was taught partly by Professor

Illersic (a statistician), and at Leeds, too, analysis formed the subject of a separate series of lectures. Barclay's Techniques of Population Analysis was recommended, among other works, for this part of the demography course.

Part II of the course might typically be headed 'Population Trends and Policies', and moved away from formal analysis to more historical and comparative approaches. On the one hand, the mortality and fertility trends in the 18th, 19th and 20th centuries might be compared, with a consideration of the changing causes of mortality. On the other hand, regions at different stages of economic and social development might be looked at from a comparative demographic standpoint, or Western societies of the 19th century might be compared with developing countries in the sixties, in terms of the initial levels of mortality and fertility, the socio-economic context, and the pace of demographic change; the concept of demographic transition, and its critics, was sometimes introduced at this stage. For demographic history, Glass's Population: Policies and Movements, and Glass and Grebenik's Royal Commission study Trends and Patterns of Fertility in Britain, were recommended, along with the Bankses' studies on Prosperity and Parenthood (by J.A. Banks) and Feminism and Family Planning in Victorian England (by J.A. and Olive Banks).

Sometimes included in this Part II section, sometimes in a separate Part III, were more world-wide

approaches to the whole subject of population policy. Birth control policies, which had already been introduced as a topic because of their effect on reproduction rates in Britain, were then discussed in relation to the population policies of the underdeveloped countries of the world, and the effect of migration was examined, as well as the possible reasons for the failure of population control movements in countries such as India, and the consequences of such failure in terms of poverty. Option outlines at Hull and Loughborough included 'religious and political implications of population theory and policies', and a proposed course at City ended with the topics 'the world population explosion and demographic revolution', and 'social and economic implications of demography'.

The 'Human Ecology' course at Brunel looked at 'population dynamics' in terms of cybernetics, and under 'Human Populations' listed the headings: biological basis, relevance of other animal behaviour; social basis, the life cycle; demographic theory; migration; competitive breeding. The course went on from 'History of Population' to the problems of the future and of forecasting. Headings then included: Population and Economics; Population and Food; Population and Resources; Population and the Welfare State; Population Control; and the problem of individual liberty.

As an undergraduate subject, Demography, like many subjects in sociology degrees, was particularly affected by lecturers' and students' awareness of changes in the 'real world', and the applications of demographic methods

to historical material, praised by Macfarlane in a
1968 paper,⁸² were chiefly important for courses with
an 'emphasis on the practical side' such as Brunel's,
because they revealed as myths, theories such as the
necessary connection between the spread of feminism and
the wider use of birth control. The 'doomwatch'
popular interest in ecology and population growth was
reflected in, for example, the topics of the Brunel
course, while the more traditional courses combined
both historical material and material on future policy
and prediction.

Group B. Option 8. Race Relations.

Race Relations was listed in the CRAC 1970/71
guide as an option for sociology degrees at four English
universities, Bristol, Cambridge, Hull and Nottingham.
It was, however, also offered as an option at Manchester
and York in 1969/70; Bedford had a course called 'Race
Relations and Ethnic Minorities in Modern Britain' in
October 1969, for students for Branch III of the London
BA/BSc degree; the new course unit scheme at LSE offered
'Race Relations' to count for half a course unit in their
1971/2 Calendar; while the Essex specialism in sociology
in the School of Comparative Studies offered a course
named 'The Contemporary Race Problem in the United States'
in 1968/9. This was similar in scope, though not
necessarily in approach, to the Cambridge paper in the
Social and Political Sciences Tripos, 'Racial Conflict
in the United States, 1960 - 1968'.

Other Race Relations courses were wider in scope:

beginning with the biological and social concepts of race and ethnic groups, some courses next discussed the scope of race relations and the history of racial ideas and ideologies, especially the scientific origins of racism and Social Darwinism and the influence of politics on scientific theories of race. The Bristol course under Banton in 1969/70, and the Essex course in 1968/9, applied the Marxist model of society to race relations. (Banton's Race Relations was recommended for all the general courses on the subject, discussed in this section.) The Bristol courses in 1968/9 and in 1969/70, although there was some change of emphasis, both considered the historical background to the Negro problem in the USA and the development of the Black Muslim movement. Then the position of race relations in South Africa, and in Brazil, was considered (the Nottingham course also covered the USA, Brazil, and South Africa), and only after this did the course come to a more detailed consideration of the position in the UK.

There were several approaches to the contemporary British situation, some of these being applicable to the whole field of race relations, not just to Britain. One approach was in terms of urban sociology: the community structure among such groups as West Indians, Gujarati, Pakistanis; the influence of housing on social relations. Bristol's course included studies of Negro families and cult movements in the USA, and a comparison of the USA and UK situations concerning these subjects.

Another approach was in terms of psychology: for instance, the Freudian view that prejudice was a consequence

of certain personality factors, in particular the authoritarian personality (York); other psychological factors considered were: white attitudes and expectations of distance; perception, and dimensions of prejudice; the analysis of interpersonal relationships with an emphasis on clubs and membership exclusion; situational discontinuity and exemptions; and specifically British attitudes towards coloured peoples as shown in surveys and election statistics.

The immigration laws in Britain, and the legislation against racial discrimination, were also considered, as were the topics of anti-semitism, apartheid, and the Black Power movement. The basic theoretical problems dealt with in Race Relations courses were various: for example, such questions as whether class conflict was equivalent to race conflict, whether race conflict could be considered part of a general theory of inter-group conflict, in terms of Marxism, neo-Marxism, functionalism, or reference group theory, or whether it was a problem apart, which must have its own theoretical perspective. Finally, the possibility of the success of integration, assimilation, and pluralism, was discussed - and, in the Essex course on the USA, the question was considered, could there ever be a solution?

Group B. Option 9. Sociology of the Family.

Sociology of the Family is the first of the Group B options discussed in this chapter which were not given separate headings in the CRAC 1970/71 guide. For this reason, the guide cannot give a true picture of the

number of universities offering the option, as it was included in such phrases as 'other options: various'. It was mentioned in the guide as being offered by Cambridge, Hull and Liverpool, but at a rough estimate, and bearing in mind that options listed in university publications were not always available for all years, eight to ten universities were offering options on 'the family' at some point during the years covered by this chapter. The title of the Cambridge paper, 'Kinship, Marriage and the Family', indicated the scope of several courses which included an anthropological approach. Other titles included 'The Family' (Bristol), 'Marriage and the Family' (Exeter) and 'Family and Kinship' (Manchester).

Most courses, whatever their title, began with a general discussion of the social structure of the family, its nature, its universal importance as a social institution, and its place in society. However, four main types of course could be discerned. One type concentrated almost exclusively on the social anthropological approach, including among its topics: the significance of legitimacy; types of family, including nuclear or elementary, composite, joint, and extended; lineage; inheritance, succession and descent; kinship networks and affinity; ceremonial and ritual in domestic groups; developmental cycles; familial roles in the division of labour; patterns of marriage; and the incidence of separation and divorce.

A second type of course, while including all these

basic concepts of family, marriage, and kinship, developed them against a pattern of urban industrial society, and discussed the function of the family in relation to the changes brought about by industrialisation. Patterns of kinship were then related to such studies as Young and Willmott's in East London; and the 'fit' and lack of 'fit' between the structure of the nuclear family on the one hand, and the needs of industrial society on the other, were discussed in terms of the family's functions in child socialisation, in the education and care of the child and adolescent, in the passing on of goals or value patterns, and in the preparation for adulthood. The changing status of women was considered, both as a fact of modern industrial society, and in relation to the economic structure of the family and to leisure patterns. The topics of separation and divorce, illegitimacy, and problem families, were included; and, in a course at Essex, for example, the question of the application of sociological research on the family to social reform, for instance divorce law reform and the introduction of family-centred social services, was discussed. A course of this type might, while concentrating chiefly on urban society in modern Britain, also make comparisons between urban and rural family patterns and kinship networks - in other words, cultural differences that the family displayed within British society were analysed with reference to empirical studies in such areas as rural

Ireland, Wales and England, the industrial areas of Britain, and suburban areas.

A third type of course made wider-ranging comparisons, often based on a study such as Goode's World Revolution and Family Patterns. The kibbutz, the traditional Chinese family, the West Indian family (with such studies as Kerr's analysis of Jamaica),⁸³ and Japanese, Indian and African family patterns under modernisation, were used for a basis of comparison with the British situation.

The fourth type of course, while touching on all or some of the areas already outlined, moved in more closely to a social psychological approach. On one level, for example, essay topics were set on the conflict between adolescents and parents, or on the changing relationship between husbands and wives in an industrialised society over the past fifty years (Leicester). However, role conflicts were also discussed in the light of Bowlby's theory of maternal deprivation (and its critics); other topics included the part played by the mother's and father's roles in the aetiology of delinquency; the growth of attitudes and behaviour in the family; the concept of the authoritarian personality and its effect on the family; and the desire for security.

While emphasis on anthropological detail from the past, and from contemporary world-wide pre-industrial or developing societies, varied in Sociology of the Family optional courses, the trend seemed to be towards a moving together of the disciplines of sociology and social anthropology in their approaches to this subject, so that

concepts which had previously been considered 'from the outside' by social anthropologists, were now seen as providing valid approaches for the study of family relationships and structures in modern industrial society. However, a series of lectures on 'Women and Children in English Society' (Exeter) was unusually specific at the turn of the decade stage in the development of the option Sociology of the Family as an undergraduate subject.

Group B. Option 10. Social Stratification.

This subject, which had made an early appearance in the London degree, was, during the period under review, usually included in compulsory courses as a section under Social Structure, Social Analysis, CSI, or Modern Britain, for example. It was, however, also offered as a separate subject at Bristol, Durham, Nottingham, Reading and Sussex at the end of the sixties, and was allotted a separate lecture course at Exeter for the CSI second year paper.

The Reading University second year course began with a fairly basic historical approach, since the subject had been covered by only one lecture in the First University Examination on Basic Concepts; but the course went on to include comparative material, and a consideration of current problems in stratification. The Sussex course, on the other hand, assumed some previous knowledge of stratification theory, and began by considering the Marxist and functionalist theories of stratification; the stratification of society in the USSR and USA as well as the UK; social mobility in France, the USA and Sweden;

and changes in stratification; and ended by discussing the possibility of the appearance of a 'new' elite, a 'new' middle class, a 'new' working class, a 'new' class in itself.

The first section of a 1969/70 course at Nottingham dealt with theories of class developed through Marx, Veblen, Weber, Lynd, C.W. Mills, Parsons, etc., and the correlates of class in terms of mortality and fertility, life styles, and politics. The second section concentrated on social mobility - as measured by occupation, and as mediated by education. (These two aspects of social mobility were also set as essay topics in the Bristol course.)

In the revised syllabus at Exeter for the sociology degree for 1969/70, the section on social stratification became part of the compulsory Modern Social Structures course, but a separate set of lectures on stratification was still given.

The Social Stratification option in 1968 at Durham was also divided into two sections. The first covered the concepts of caste, class, status, estate, rank, power, party and elite. It then considered the functionalist theory of inequality, and the Marxist, neo-Marxist and Distribution approaches. It asked 'Is theoretical integration possible? Is stratification the same as inequality? Does social stratification reduce class conflict?'

The second section, like the course at Reading University, then returned, first, to a historical approach, considering feudal society, caste society, patrimonialism;

and second, to a comparative approach - systems of industrial society in East and West, convergence, divergence, parallel change, and the problems of ethnic stratification and the charge of ethnocentrism. This option, while recommending the usual reading -
84 85 86
Bottomore, Dahrendorf, and Bendix and Lipset, for example - was cast in an open-ended and questioning manner.

The position of social stratification as a separate subject in sociology degrees was unclear at the turn of the decade. In the majority of sociology degree courses, it remained a section in Modern Britain, Social Structure, CSI, or sometimes in Political Sociology.

Group B. Option 11. Sociology of Medicine.

This newer arrival was to form a course unit in the LSE degree, and Leeds introduced a paper on Medical Sociology as an option in 1970/71 (formerly a course called 'Problems of Health and Disease' had covered some of the same ground.) Hull and Sussex had option outlines, and City devoted one long section of a course on Applied Sociology to 'Sociology and Illness', which covered the material in the options mentioned above, and added more, under headings such as: social class, illness and health; the 'sick role'; the hospital and the NHS; is mental illness a disease? social processes in mental illness (the Sussex outline proposed to concentrate here on the subject of schizophrenia); the demand for treatment; epidemiology; the 'milieu therapy' movement; the mental hospital as a total institution (with case studies); and

community care and mental subnormality.

Sussex proposed a comparative study of medical care in Britain and the USA, and Hull proposed to analyse the sociological implications of nationalised medicine.

Other topics discussed, included the evolution of the medical profession, the changing role of the medical practitioner, and the development of environmental health and medical care services.

Group C. Option 1. Sociology of Development.

Under the heading 'Social change/Sociology of development', the CRAC 1970/71 guide listed 14 universities or colleges of London University which included this subject in their courses, either as compulsory or optional (it was listed as compulsory at Essex, Exeter and Loughborough).

This heading covered a wide range of subjects and was approached in a number of different ways. Some courses concentrated on the 'underdeveloped' or 'developing' countries (e.g. Durham's 'Sociology of Developing Countries'); some considered the theory of change in relation to both modern and 'underdeveloped' society (e.g. 'Social Policy and Social Change' at Essex); some laid more stress on urbanisation as a central process in change (Loughborough's course 'Social Structure and Social Change' had a section on Urbanism and Urbanisation in Year II, followed by a section headed 'Theories of Change and Economic Development' in the final year); some concentrated on

a special area (e.g. Leeds's course on 'Problems of Development with Special Reference to East Africa'). However, a more fundamental difference was in the amount of stress laid on general sociological theories of change. This either occurred at the beginning or the end of the course. The London BA/BSc paper 'Social Structure and Social Change' was very wide in theoretical scope. According to the LSE Teachers' Guide (which included a discussion of this paper for general interest, since it was set only as an internal paper at that time), 'the title of this option is wide enough to embrace practically everything that has been written in the name of sociology, especially if one takes the view that change can only be understood in contradistinction to non-change and one must start, therefore, from a consideration of the conditions of social stability'.

However, the course actually considered evolutionary theories (but with reference to recent writers such as Sahlins and Service, Parsons, and Eisenstadt); technological determinism and the question 'are industrial societies bound to get more and more alike?'; the concept of change being promoted by ideas, opinions and social theories; functional theories and their implications for social change; the family's adaptation to industrial society; and the theory of revolution and sudden change.

The Essex course, 'Social Policy and Social Change', began with the general concepts of structural differentiation, epigenesis and adaptive structural integration; social evolution; social progress; modernisation,

industrialisation and development; conflict; real and assumed change, and 'predisposing' and 'precipitative' factors in change; and objective, normative and subjective deprivation. The first three headings on the course were 'General'; 'Social Philosophy'; 'Social History'. Students on this course, the case-studies in which were not confined to underdeveloped countries, were asked to be prepared to identify the sources of change within different parts of society. Courses which did concentrate on 'underdeveloped' or 'developing' countries also tried to identify these sources of change, through various general approaches. For example, the first five themes of the Durham 1969/70 course, 'Sociology of Developing Countries', were: Approaches to the Study of Development; Economic Theories of Development; Sociological Theory and Underdeveloped Societies; Basic Issues in the Political Structure of Underdeveloped Countries; The Psychological Approach to the Study of Development.

The courses already described, began with some kind of general theorising. Sussex and Nottingham, on the other hand, ended with a general consideration of theoretical problems. Nottingham's last topic was 'Modernisation and Sociological Thought', and Sussex ended an option outline by aiming to 'relate the analysis of development to more general sociological theories of change'.

The courses which covered underdeveloped or developing countries in general, referred most often to

Africa (including Tropical Africa, West Africa, North Africa and the Middle East, the Congo, Nigeria, Ghana), Latin America, India, and Asia. There were also, of course, lecture schemes which drew on one specific country or area for their subject-matter. Birmingham's course on 'Comparative Structure and Change in Asian Society' covered India, China, Japan and Thailand, but Birmingham also had courses specifically on Modern West African Society, and West European Society, the latter concentrating on France and Germany from the days before the First Great War to the present. As has been mentioned, Leeds ran a course on Problems of Development with Special Reference to East Africa (York also concentrated part of its course called 'Social Change in Economically Underdeveloped Societies', on a case study of the Kikuyu). A Cambridge paper headed 'Politics and Sociology of Developing Areas with Special reference to either South Asia or Tropical Africa' was set for the Social and Political Sciences Tripos, while, during the sixties, Tropp proposed a series of lectures at LSE on 'Social Structure and Social Change in Latin America'; LSE had, as a course unit in its new degree structure, 'Social Change and Development in Contemporary Africa', and East Anglia ran a course in 1968/9, under the heading 'Sociological Problems of Underdeveloped Countries', on India.

It has been established that, of those courses which concentrated on developing societies, some were eclectic geographically, while others were selective.

The courses which confined themselves to a particular society tended to begin with a more anthropological description of the basis of the society (although this also applied to some extent, to courses covering more than one developing society). They introduced, typically, first the demographical and ecological factors, the patterns of marriage and family and kinship, of caste, clan, the status of women; patterns of rural-urban migration and the growth of towns; the relationships between urban families and their descent groups of origin; the nature of peasant societies; systems of land tenure; labour migration and workers; village studies.

However, as soon as the processes of change began to be discussed, a greater emphasis on general political, economic and ideological approaches was almost always evident. For instance, Durham's section on the political structure of underdeveloped countries covered the following more general topics: nationalism; problems of legitimation and integration; corruption; 'charisma' and social change; colonialism and relations between advanced and underdeveloped countries.

This group of mainly political topics could not really be divorced from the subject of belief systems in underdeveloped countries, on the one hand, and economic development, on the other. Topics introduced under the headings of belief systems and of economic development, included: relationship between religious ideas (including millennialism), 'traditional' beliefs and

contemporary ideologies, on the one hand, and socio-economic changes, on the other hand. (Durham, in its course, examined more closely the concepts of 'traditional' and 'modern'); the conflicts between tribalism, nationalism, socialism, and religious ideology; modern education and the emergence of new types of elites in the developing societies, namely military, political, cultural and intellectual elites; the formation of an industrial labour force; changes in the class structure of developing countries; the validity in these countries of the concepts of proletarianism, entrepreneurism, populism; the effect of urbanisation on the power structure of the society, on network relationships, on systems of law and social control, and on the development of new forms of urban association (some courses, the one at Manchester on 'Urbanisation of Developing Countries', for example, focused entirely on this aspect of development).

A course given at Leeds by the Professor of Politics covered problems of national unification in developing countries, the building of viable political institutions in the new states of Africa and Asia, the impact of political conditions on economic developments and vice versa, and the subject of administrative reform and planning; the LSE course 'Social Structure and Social Change' included a section on political cohesion and political leadership; Nottingham's course concentrated, in one section, on the topic of political integration; a course at Essex had sections on health in developing countries, and on education and social change.

These last topics indicated a somewhat positive approach to the problem of political and social reform through non-revolutionary means. Yet neither the anthropological approach, nor the more purely theoretical sociological approach, could ignore the implications of the impact of political ideology on the developing countries, and the possibility of violent or rapid social change through revolution. The relevant topic headings here, included: a comparison of revolutionary change with other ways of development (the Sussex option outline); 'Revolutionary Transformation in Underdeveloped Countries. Theories of Revolution' (a heading in the Durham course); relations between rich and poor nations (Leeds); dynamism of developing societies and alternatives of modernisation and economic growth (Sheffield); and more general headings such as: international aspects; modernisation, protest, and change.

As in many syllabuses in sociology degrees, some of these headings gave little indication of the ideological emphasis of the course, and a closer examination of reading lists was another way of gaining more information. For example, a course which included A.G. Frank's Capitalism and Under-Development in Latin America, Baran's The Political Economy of Growth, Worsley's The Third World, Alavi's 'Peasants and Revolutions', and Fanon's The Wretched of the Earth (or even a selection of these) was unlikely to be neglecting the neo-marxist approach. Following Barnett's suggestion in a 1972 paper to the BSA Development Group,⁸⁷ one might also characterise a more purely structuralist course (adopting Barnett's

definition 'a course which will tend to delineate the problems faced by underdeveloped countries in quite cogent terms, and will then proceed to discuss these problems in terms of the effectiveness of aid, and the role of international agencies') as one which would include Horowitz' Three Worlds of Development, Eisenstadt's Readings in Social Evolution and Development, and Etzioni's Studies in Social Change, for example, but would not go on to emphasise the more revolutionary implications of the subject.

It was, as Barnett himself pointed out, difficult to make clear distinctions of this kind between types of courses. At the turn of the decade, the concepts of 'social change' and 'sociology of development' were broadly applied to a category of actual courses which was so wide that the common elements were limited to the very all-embracing theoretical considerations already mentioned. From there, one could arrive at such diverse destinations as: a study of a Chinese village (Birmingham); the prospect of revolutionary change in the Third World (Durham); a historical outline of the theories of development and progress in general (LSE); the progress of French and German society since the 1900s (Birmingham); or the emancipation of women in England, Scandinavia, America and China (Essex).

This group of sociology degree courses was fragmented, partly because it was so easily divided along geographical lines, and partly because it needed to draw on other social sciences - anthropology, economics and politics in particular - and had not then found a

specifically sociological focus (if indeed there could be one, in terms of undergraduate courses). As a Sheffield option outline mentioned: 'Intensive reading is particularly important in this course which brings the students into a highly complex field far removed from their average experience'.

Group C. Option 2. Sociology of Revolution.

The Sociology of Revolution (under which heading is included such titles as LSE's course unit 'The Sociology of Marxist Ideas and Movements') was most often encountered as a section in Political Sociology courses in the years covered by this chapter. For example, the Sussex course on Political Sociology contained a section which attempted to answer the question 'What is a revolutionary ideology?' Sussex also offered a contextual paper on 'Marxism' in the School of Social Studies, and in 1970/71, a contextual course on 'Social Movements and Political Action' was introduced, partly at the request of Sussex students. The Political Sociology course at Exeter contained a section on revolution, military politics and insurgency warfare (and the Department of Politics appointed a former major-general who lectured, from a rather less academic standpoint than usual, for a course on Political Violence and Revolution). The section on 'Determinant Negation' in a course at City called 'Political Sociology in Industrial Societies', also discussed the possibility that the historical alternative to a given social form must arise directly from the structural malfunctioning

of the prevailing society.

However, while there were further examples of sections in other courses (for instance, York's 'Modernisation' course had a section on Social Revolution), on the sociology of revolution, there were few courses specifically on revolution, one example being Paper 16 in the Social and Political Sciences Tripos at Cambridge in the early seventies.

This course covered: revolution in Europe and the emergence in Europe of ideas about deliberate control of social change by collective action; theorists of revolution, including historical, sociological and psychological approaches to the understanding of revolutionary situations; and the practical politics of some major European revolutions and their relation to theory. The relation between tactical and normative aims in revolutionary and counter-revolutionary theory, and the relation of Western ideas about social upheaval to instability in non-European societies, were also included, and the reading list ranged from de Tocqueville to Trotsky, from Lenin to Marcuse, from Hegel to Che Guevara.

The mass media had tended to represent sociology students, particularly from the later sixties onwards, as a group with revolutionary ideas, some of whom were bent on creating upheavals not only in the universities in which they were students, but also in society. While it was obvious that revolutionary ideas and theories were being discussed in courses on political sociology, sociology of development, and social change, among others, sociology of

revolution was rarely encountered as an option during the years under review.

Group D. Option 1. Sociology of Knowledge.

Under this section are included courses called 'Ideas in Society' (an early, 1962/3, course at Birmingham); 'Intellect in Society', Southampton, 1968/9 (called 'Ideas in Society' in the CRAC 1970/71 guide); 'The Sociology of Learning, Knowledge and Belief', a syllabus at Cambridge for Paper 10 in the Social and Political Sciences Tripos from 1969/70 onwards; and courses actually named 'Sociology of Knowledge' at Durham and Sheffield in 1968/9, and in the Sussex 1969/70 BA Syllabus. (There was also an optional half course unit with this title, in the new 'Main Field Sociology' degree scheme at LSE.)

Of these, the courses at Birmingham, Southampton, Cambridge, and Sussex, and a section of the course at Durham, were concerned with sociology of knowledge as the influence of social structure on knowledge, and the question whether knowledge was in some measure a social product. In the Southampton course, the first of four major themes was the work of Karl Mannheim; Mannheim's Ideology and Utopia was on the preliminary short basic reading list for the Cambridge paper; Sussex announced that its course would 'examine broadly the scope and methods of sociology of knowledge, beginning with the work of Karl Mannheim seen in relation to the Marxist group of ideologies'; the Durham course included 'The possibility of a Sociology of Knowledge deriving from either Hegelian-Marxist or

Durkheimian roots; Mannheim and the ideology problem'.

The Birmingham course covered 'the social origin and social influence of ideas and the institutionalisation of the various branches of belief and knowledge'. This was dealt with in greater detail in the Cambridge rubric, which, beginning with 'symbolization and communication processes' and 'the institutions, agencies and processes of socialization', went on to emphasise the importance of linguistics, the social and cultural consequences of literacy and non-literacy, and then devoted a major part of the course to the role formal education played in the sociology of knowledge.

The Southampton and Birmingham courses mentioned the irrational elements in social thought, Birmingham including the analyses of this subject by Freud and Pareto, and the Southampton outline commenting that 'our confidence in the possibility of rational action has been severely shaken by the anthropologist and Freudian critiques and changing understanding of science'.

The Cambridge, Durham and Southampton reading lists included Berger and Luckmann's The Social Construction of Reality, and this book formed the basic text for the Sheffield course, but the Sheffield outline, although given the title 'Sociology of Knowledge', stated: 'The principal emphasis will be on an examination of the epistemologies of the main figures such as Marx, Durkheim, Weber, Mannheim and the contemporary British and American positivists'. In the Durham outline, also, sociology of knowledge was one section of a course which was largely on epistemology. There seemed to be a

slight tendency, here, for the two subjects to be merged or confused under the title 'Sociology of Knowledge', but the Durham course made the separate delineation of this field quite clear in the long bibliography on 'Sociological Theory and Sociology of Knowledge' (which would have been a more accurate title for the option). This bibliography, under one main heading, 'Attempts to Construct a Sociology of Knowledge', included: 'The Hegelian-Marxist Tradition'; 'The Durkheimian Tradition'; 'General and Synthesizing Works. The Problem of Ideology in Social Systems. On Mannheim: From the Linguistic Approach: General and Contemporary:'. This last subheading included Parsons' 'The Role of Ideas in Social Action', also cited in the Birmingham reading list.

Other topics in Sociology of Knowledge courses were: the development of primitive thought systems; the rise of religions; the relationship between formal education and cultural change; the sources of innovation; the sociology of sociology; the sociology of science.

The Southampton course was concerned with the relationship between three factors in the equation, and this may serve as a summing-up: first, man, thought of as being primarily capable of intellectual activity; second, the knowledge which that activity enabled him to communicate; third, the society in which he sought to make use of that knowledge.

Group D. Option 2. Sociology of Science.

'Sociology of Science' must be distinguished as a subject from 'sociology and science' or 'sociology as science', which were courses (or sections in, for example,

theoretical sociology courses) on epistemology, courses concerned with the ways in which the methods of social enquiry could be said to be like those of the investigations of natural scientists, and the ways in which they could be said to differ from these scientific methods. The sociology of science (sometimes including, as at Bath, 'Sociology of Science and Technology') covered the social origins and institutionalisation of natural science, and included the ways in which scientists and technologists acted as groups, and the ways in which those groups interacted, as institutions, with the rest of society.

As was mentioned in the last section, the Cambridge option on 'Sociology of Learning, Knowledge and Belief' included the sociology of science as a topic, and a half-course-unit with the title 'Sociology of Science' was listed in the LSE course unit degree in the 1971/2 prospectus.

At Loughborough, in both the Human and Physical Sciences course, and the Human Relations Course, the 1968/9 schemes contained 'Sociology of Science' as a possible option in the second and third years. Some of the subject-matter had already been touched on in the Loughborough first year course on Human Ideas - for example the section on 'History, Science and Technology' included: puritanism, capitalism and science; the professionalisation of science; and the evolution of scientific institutions. Another shorter section in the same 'Human Ideas' course, named 'Science, Technology and Society', contained the following topics: the values

of science and technology; the social system of science; the professional scientist and technologist; the autonomy of science and technology.

York offered a two term option on 'Philosophy and Sociology of Science', while some courses of a more general nature, for example Birmingham's Urban Industrial Society, included a section on 'Science and Society' which dealt with scientists and politics, and the relationships between scientists and government.

It was not clear, in the courses offered up to 1972, whether this option would make headway not only in social science departments in technological universities, which might have been expected to be predisposed to develop it, but also in specialised sociology degrees in the five other university groups, where it occurred very rarely.

Group D. Option 3. Sociology of Culture.

Essex mentioned Sociology of Culture as an option in the Sociology specialisation in the School of Social Studies in the CRAC guide for 1970/71; York listed an optional course on 'Culture and Cultural Change' in a later prospectus; and Reading offered an optional course on 'Sociology and Culture' in the degree scheme proposed in 1969/70. As with other options discussed in this Group, detailed sections of larger lecture courses on more general sociological subjects, for example the 'Modern Britain' course at Surrey in 1969, also dealt with some aspects of Sociology of Culture.

The Reading University course consisted of five main sections. The first concerned the definition of

culture, including the place in it of values, attitudes, norms and symbols, language and communication, and socialisation, as well as patterns of culture, civilisations, and cultural change.

Section II, named 'The History of Sociology in its Sociocultural Context', approximated, both in topics and in reading list, to a course on the development of sociological theory, but with emphasis on the social events taking place at the time at which the theories developed. Thus, theories were seen as interrelated with, for example, revolutionary politics, and social reform.

The third section dealt with the sociology of knowledge and the theory of ideology, including case studies of Marxism and working class ideologies, liberalism, and the intellectuals. The fourth section was headed 'Popular and Mass Culture', and included a discussion of the mass media and their effects; and the course ended with a discussion of the problems of modern culture and sociology's place in this culture.

The Surrey section in the 'Modern Britain' course, 'Culture and Communications', covered much the same ground as 'Popular and Mass Culture' in the Reading University option and, as has been observed, many 'Modern Britain' courses contained sections on the mass media and their effects.

The three options in Group D were concerned with systems of ideas, but they tended to overlap, not only with one another, but also with other sections of other courses. By 1972, they had not become clearly

differentiated from, for example, history of sociological theory, epistemology, language and communications. Other subjects introduced in courses like the Sussex contextual ones (e.g. Development of Scientific Thought) and the Foundation Year courses at Keele, covered some of the same ground.

Miscellaneous Options.

The Groups A to D, discussed above, have covered the main optional areas of study which sociology undergraduates were offered, up till about 1972. There were, however, more atypical courses which should be mentioned, since they were offered in some sociology degrees.

Reading University, in 1969/70, included in its sociology degree a compulsory course on 'Analysis of Literary Sources', for the final years of the degree. Several universities (e.g. Sussex) had special options on Bureaucracy. Exeter's 'Sociology of Deviance' optional group, included a course on Sociology of Law. LSE offered a half-course-unit on Sociology of the Professions, which was also a proposed option at Sussex. Essex listed an option on The History of the Labour Movement, and Sussex included a compulsory course on 'The Artist and Public in Society' in the School of Educational Studies.

Options on Military Sociology, and on Sociology of Leisure, were proposed at Sheffield in 1967; East Anglia, in 1968/9, offered a course on 'The Social Structure of Modern China', and Essex offered an intensive study of

the sociology of the USSR, as well as a specialised course on Cross-Cultural Methodology.

This list is by no means exhaustive, and gives only a partial impression of the options being proposed for possible study by sociology undergraduates in 1972.

The Content of Sociology First Degree Courses, 1963-1972.

The main subjects studied in specialist sociology first degrees between 1963 and 1972 were Sociological Theory, Methods, Comparative Social Institutions, Social Structure of Modern Britain, and Social Psychology.

Social Anthropology was sometimes an option, and sometimes studied in much greater depth as an integral part of the degree. Social Administration remained an option in some sociology degrees, but might also be the subject of a specialised Social Administration degree at the same university. This situation was also true of Social Anthropology. The proportion of sociology first degrees containing Social Philosophy as a compulsory subject had declined by 1972, but it remained as an optional subject in many degrees.

The range of optional subjects had increased by the end of the period under review. Industrial and Political Sociology were among the subjects most frequently offered. The subject of Criminology was more often named Sociology of Deviance as the period progressed, with a corresponding shift of emphasis and of terminology, but a less marked shift in basic subject-matter. The subject of Social Stratification was proportionately less frequently offered as a separate subject, than in previous years.

The main methods of teaching sociology were lectures, seminars and tutorials; the seminar and tutorial method was favoured by the majority of the new universities, but no generalisations could be made as to differences in teaching methods between the different groups of universities. Methods courses sometimes included a social survey carried out by sociology students; less often, an attempt was made at an approximation to laboratory techniques. The introduction of computer methods, and their place, if any, in undergraduate courses, became a matter for contention.

Sociology first degree courses with a sandwich element were introduced during this period, almost exclusively at the technological universities; some non-sandwich degree courses required the students to perform practical work in one long vacation, while other courses included visits to places outside the university.

In an effort to give prospective students an idea of sociological 'perspective' and to suggest introductory reading not too technical in nature, some preliminary reading lists recommended novels as well as introductory books on sociology, for intending students. In the majority of all sociology degrees, lecturers attempted to recommend inexpensive books (paperbacks if possible), and frequent references were made to the shortage of books in libraries. This also led lecturers to compile reading lists with alternative sources for the same information on a specific topic. The 'central textbook for the course' was seldom prescribed; on the contrary, the remark was often made that no such central textbook existed.

The dilemma over the amount of 'history of sociological thought' which should be included in specialised sociology first degree courses, was resolved by different universities in different ways; no general agreement was reached, but there was no discernible overall tendency to omit the 'founding fathers' from specialist courses. Theory and Methods were, on the whole, taught in separate courses, but an attempt to bring them together again on one course, was made in some new universities, while other universities adopted the technique of coordinating lectures on the two subjects, with the cooperation of the lecturers concerned.

Methods courses were almost universally included in sociology degrees, and statistics was considered an essential subject in the majority of sociology degree courses; special mathematics classes or lectures, to help less numerate entrants, were held in some universities. The mathematical content of sociology increased, and greater mathematical sophistication was seen by some as a growth point for the subject; there was, however, a contrary movement towards ethnomethodology, phenomenology, and the verstehen approach. These represented opposite ends of the methodological spectrum, and were seen by some sociology teachers as evidence of a growing polarisation which affected methods and theory teaching.

Comparative studies continued to be central in most degree courses, receiving special emphasis from some new universities. Courses on Modern Britain, although no longer always known by that name, also continued as a staple of the specialist sociology degrees, but were

criticised for their lack of central theoretical focus. Some degrees, particularly newer ones, included courses with names like 'Social Structure' or 'Modern Social Institutions', in which, although Britain provided most of the subject-matter, material from other societies, particularly the USA, was used.

Social Psychology courses varied in the amount of general psychology which they contained (sometimes a separate course on General Psychology was arranged for sociology specialists). The question of the effect on the personal, as distinct from the intellectual, development of the student, of studying certain aspects of social psychology, or of taking part in group experimental sessions, was raised during this period.

Optional subjects were sometimes arranged by publishing a short outline of the option; only if enough students chose it, was a more detailed syllabus then made available. This applied, of course, more to newer courses and to newer degrees and to smaller departments, where the departure of a specialist might mean the disappearance of an optional subject until the lecturer could be replaced. At the older universities, in general, the pattern was more fixed, and the basic options were offered without a break, or in alternate years; this did not, however, preclude the introduction of new options; options lists, in general, grew longer. A group of subjects variously listed under 'development', 'developing societies', or 'social change', was prominent here, being introduced more widely during this period, but opportunities for the specific study of violent social change and

revolution were provided in few sociology first degrees.

Finally, during this period, the introduction of courses which students had suggested, or which they cooperated in organising, reflected the more democratic attitudes in many sociology departments, the changing relationship between lecturers and students, and the change in attitude towards the content of degree courses; the subject-matter of a sociology first degree was no longer universally seen as received wisdom to be passed from expert to apprentice, but was sometimes seen as knowledge which could be found by a search conducted together by lecturers and students.

However, from 1963 to 1972, notwithstanding a spate of discussion and publication on the changes taking place in university teaching, in particular on the ways in which undergraduate education should be conducted, the majority of sociology first degrees continued, at least outwardly, to be structured along the broadly conventional lines of lecture, seminar, tutorial, private study by the student, essay-writing, dissertation perhaps, examinations, and finally 'results', on a scale ranging from a first to a failure.

REFERENCES
CHAPTER VI.

1. Advisory Centre for Education, 16+ Guide, Sociology, ACE, Cambridge, 1967.
2. Careers Research and Advisory Centre, Course Comparison Bulletin, Sociology and Social Administration, CRAC, Cambridge, 1966 (and subsequent editions).
3. Banks, J.A., and Tropp, A., Sociology and Social Anthropology, A Guide for Intending Students, British Sociological Association, 1960 (and subsequent editions).
4. Liggett, John, and Wakeford, John, 'Sociology as a Laboratory Subject', Sociological Review, NS, Vol.XII,2, 1964, pp.203-207; Wakeford, John, The Strategy of Social Enquiry, Macmillan, 1968.
5. Marris, Peter, The Experience of Higher Education, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1964, pp.69,70.
6. Kuhn, T.S., The Structure of Scientific Revolutions, University of Chicago Press, 1962.
7. Bottomore, T.B., Sociology: A Guide to the Problems and Literature, Unwin University Books, 1962.
8. Chinoy, E., Society (An Introduction to Sociology), Random House, New York, 1963.
9. Mitchell, G.D., Sociology; Study of Social Systems, University Tutorial Press, 1959.
10. Cotgrove, Stephen, The Science of Society, Allen and Unwin, 1967.
11. Broom, L., and Selznick, P., Sociology. A Text with Adapted Readings, Harper and Row, New York, 3rd ed., 1963.
12. Fletcher, Ronald, The Family and Marriage in Britain, Penguin Books, 1962.
13. Bottomore, T.B., Classes in Modern Society, Allen and Unwin, 1965.
14. Jackson, B., and Marsden, D., Education and the Working Class, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1962.
15. Peel, J., (ed.), 'Details of Courses Mainly Concerned with Sociological Theory and Methods in 29 British Universities' (duplicated), 15th Conference of the Sociology Teachers' Section, British Sociological Association, London, January 1968.
16. Weir, D.T.H., 'Teaching Sociological Theory' (duplicated), Text of a paper presented at the 15th Conference of the Sociology Teachers' Section, British Sociological Association, London, January 1968.

17. Martindale, D., Nature and Types of Sociological Theory, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1961.
18. Loomis, C.P., and Loomis, Z.K., Modern Social Theories, Van Nostrand, Princetown, 1961.
19. Hammond P., (ed.), Sociologists at Work, Basic Books, New York, 1963.
20. Weir, D.T.H., op.cit., p.1.
21. Newfield, J.G.H., (ed.), London School of Economics, Department of Sociology, Teachers' Guide: Notes for the Guidance of Teachers giving Courses for Branch I of the External B.A./B.Sc. (Sociology) Degrees of the University of London (duplicated), External Department, University of London, May 1969.
22. Coser, L.A., and Rosenberg, B., Sociological Theory: A Book of Readings, Macmillan, New York, 1964.
23. Rex, John, Key Problems in Sociological Theory, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1961.
24. Aron, Raymond, Main Currents in Sociological Thought, Weidenfeld and Nicholson, Vol.I, 1965, Vol.II, 1968.
25. Runciman, W.G., Social Science and Political Theory, Cambridge University Press, 1963.
26. Nisbet, R.A., The Sociological Tradition, Heinemann, 1967.
27. Timasheff, N.S., Sociological Theory: Its Nature and Growth, Random House, New York, 1957.
28. Moser, C.A., Survey Methods in Social Investigation, Heinemann, 1958.
29. Goode, W., and Hatt, P., Methods in Social Research, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1952.
30. Madge, John, The Tools of Social Science, Longmans, 1953.
31. Rex, John, 'Which Path for Sociology?', New Society, No. 210, October 6, 1966, p.529.
32. Selvin, H., 'The Teaching of Sociological Methodology in the United States of America', International Social Science Journal, Vol.XV,4,1963,pp.605,606.
33. Mitchell, J. Clyde, 'Are Methods and Techniques Teachable?' (duplicated), Text of a paper presented at the 15th Conference of the Sociology Teachers' Section, British Sociological Association, London, January 1968, p.4.

34. Ibid., p.9.
35. Cicourel, A.V., Methods and Measurement in Sociology, Free Press, Glencoe, 1964.
36. Dawe, Alan, 'The Two Sociologies', British Journal of Sociology, Vol. XXI, 3, 1970, pp. 207-216.
37. Williams, Graham, 'Teaching Sociology: A New Approach', New Society, March 8, 1973.
38. Banks, J.A., and Tropp, A., or. cit., p.8.
39. Careers Research and Advisory Centre, or. cit., p.12.
40. Epstein, A.L. (ed.), The Craft of Social Anthropology, Tavistock Publications, 1967.
41. Andrecki, B., The Elements of Comparative Sociology, Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1964.
42. Radcliffe-Brown, A.R., Structure and Function in Primitive Society, Cohen and West, 1952.
43. Sociological Society, 'Report of the Martin White Benefaction Committee', in Sociological Society, Second Annual Report of the Council for the Year 1976, 1976, Section III, p.6.
44. Ibid.
45. University of London, Regulations for Internal Students 1970/71, p.146.
46. Dawe, Alan, 'Teaching Modern Britain - Problems and Orientations' (duplicated), Text of a paper delivered at a Conference of the Sociology Teachers' Section, British Sociological Association, London, January 1966, p.1.
47. Newfield, J.O.H., (ed.), London School of Economics, Department of Sociology, Teachers' Guide (above), p.29.
48. Dawe, Alan, or. cit., p.3.
49. Boloff, L., and Rex, J., 'Is Sociology Respectable?', discussion, BBC Radio 3, September 3, 1969 (transcript of tape recording made by researcher).
50. University of Durham, Department of Social Theory and Institutions, The Sociology of Modern Britain, Supplementary Reading List 1969-70 (duplicated), p.1.
51. Carr-Saunders, A.H., and Wilson, P.A., The Professions, P. Cass, 1964 (first published 1933).
52. Runciman, W.G., Relative Deprivation and Social Justice, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966.
53. Douglas, J.K.B., The Home and the School, MacGibbon and Kee, 1964.

54. Committee on Higher Education, Report, Cmnd. 2154 (The Robbins Report), HMSO, 1963.
55. Newfield, J.G.H. (ed.), op.cit., p.26.
56. Ibid., p.27.
57. University of Sheffield, Department of Sociological Studies, An Introduction to Post-Intermediate Sociology, June 1968 (duplicated), p.21.
58. Krech, D., Crutchfield, D.R., and Ballachey, E., The Individual in Society, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1962.
59. Pahl, Raymond, 'The Self and Social Order. Thoughts on Reading Erving Goffmann', BBC Radio 3, January 10, 1973.
60. Taylor, Laurie, 'Psychology and Sociology: Interdisciplinary Teaching', Bulletin of the British Psychological Society, Vol.XX, 66, January 1967, pp.11-13.
61. Amis, Kingsley, Lucky Jim, Gollancz, 1954, pp.28 et seq.
62. Mair, Lucy, Introduction to Social Anthropology, Oxford University Press, 1965.
63. Beattie, J., Other Cultures, Cohen and West, 1964.
64. Careers Research and Advisory Centre, Course Comparison Bulletin (above), 1966, p.6.
65. Titmuss, Richard M., Essays on the Welfare State, Allen and Unwin, 1958.
66. Donnison, D.V., et al., Social Policy and Administration, Allen and Unwin, 1965.
67. Marshall, T.H., Social Policy in the Twentieth Century, Hutchinson, 1965.
68. Slack, K., Social Administration and the Citizen, 2nd ed., Michael Joseph, 1969.
69. Scott, W.H., 'Industrial Sociology in Degree Courses', in Advisory Centre for Education, 16+ Guide: Sociology (above), Item 4(c), p.3.
70. Miller, D.C., and Form, W.H., Industrial Sociology, 2nd ed., Harper and Row, New York, 1964.
71. Blau, P.M., and Scott, W.R., Formal Organisations, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1963.
72. Goldthorpe, J.H., et al., The Affluent Worker: Industrial Attitudes and Behaviour, Cambridge University Press, 1968; The Affluent Worker: Political Attitudes and Behaviour, Cambridge University Press, 1968; The Affluent Worker in the Class Structure, Cambridge University Press, 1969.

73. Rex, John, 'Which Path for Sociology?' (above), p. 530.
74. Hoggart, Simon, 'Peace or War in the Universities - 2', Guardian, October 21, 1969.
75. Cohn, Norman, The Pursuit of the Millenium, Secker and Warburg, 1957.
76. Worsley, Peter, The Trumpet Shall Sound, MacGibbon and Kee, 1957.
77. Cox, C.B., and Dyson, A.E., (eds.), Fight for Education, A Black Paper, The Critical Quarterly Society, 1969.
78. Bernstein, B., 'A Public Language: Some Sociological Implications of a Linguistic Form', British Journal of Sociology, Vol.X, 1959, pp.311-326; 'Language and Social Class', British Journal of Sociology, Vol.XI, 3, 1960, pp.271-276; 'Social Structure, Language and Learning', Educational Research, Vol.III, 3, 1961.
79. Marris, Peter, op.cit.
80. Gans, H., The Urban Villagers, Free Press, Glencoe, 1962; The Levittowners, Allen Lane, 1967; People and Plans, Basic Books, New York, 1968.
81. MacRae, D.G., 'Between Science and the Arts', The Twentieth Century, 1960, reprinted in Ideology and Society, Heinemann, 1961, p.4.
82. Macfarlane, Alan, 'Population Crisis: Anthropology's Failure', New Society, October 10, 1968, p.519.
83. Kerr, M., Personality and Conflict in Jamaica, Collins, 1963.
84. Bottomore, T.B., op.cit.
85. Dahrendorf, R., Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1959.
86. Bendix, R., and Lipset, S.M., (eds.), Class, Status and Power: A Reader in Social Stratification, 2nd ed., Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1967.
87. Barnett, A.S., 'Teaching the Sociology of Developing/ Underdeveloped Societies in the UK', paper presented to the British Sociological Association Development Group, December 1972, p.3.

CHAPTER VII

FIRST DEGREE SOCIOLOGY IN ENGLAND DURING 65 YEARS

Introduction.

It has been possible, in tracing the subject-matter in sociology first degree courses in England through the 65 years covered by this study, to show some characteristic changes in the areas of knowledge and investigation which the lecturers (or their superiors or predecessors) thought appropriate to sociology undergraduate courses at various periods of time, and to indicate some influences which particularly affected sociology degrees in England.

For example, one of the most obvious changes in subject-matter, was in the broadening of the degrees to include more empirical studies of contemporary social conditions. This was accompanied by a greater emphasis on statistical method. Theoretical development in sociology had been less rapid and far-reaching.

Of the influences which affected sociology degrees, examples were: vocational demands, particularly in the early years; social changes in England, and in the relationship between the United Kingdom and the Third World; and changes in the number and types of universities in England, which made it easier for sociology to find a place in the university curriculum.

In order to fill out the picture in greater detail, in the sections of this chapter which follow, first, there are discussions of the six specific questions

raised at the outset of the research, and the extent to which it has been possible to answer them.

After these, follow sections on two brief points of interest which emerged in the course of the investigation: the relationship between synthesis and specialisation in sociology degrees; and the effect of studying sociology, on students' personal development. Next, some questions for future research are suggested. Lastly, as a conclusion to the thesis, there is a general indication of the stage of development reached by sociology first degrees in 1972.

1. How had sociology come to be included in the subjects taught at English universities?

1(a) The first chairs in sociology, LSE, and the University of London.

The beginning of university sociology first degree courses in England coincided with the endowment of the first chairs. It was a happy chance that at that time, the London School of Economics and Political Science was beginning to be established as a centre for the university teaching of the social sciences, and that London University was able to provide the backing of a large and, even then, fairly complex organisation, so that once sociology degree subjects were established in the London University regulations, they had achieved a kind of security. The fact that the Bachelor of Science in Economics degree existed, and that its structure allowed for optional subjects after the first year, provided a means of introducing the new subject

of sociology without having to create a specialised degree from the outset. This meant that students could choose the BSc Econ at First, and did not have to opt for the 'unknown' of sociology from the beginning of their university BSc course. (This possibility, of delaying one's choice of social science specialisation, was still emphasised as an advantage by some English universities in the 1970s.)

It was obvious in the early years, that students opting for the subject were having difficulties, and there was concern over this, and, later, over the small numbers of students opting for sociology, compared with the larger numbers who wished to study for the more practical Certificate in Social Administration. But the fact (emphasised at London Boards of Studies meetings) that the professors were there, ready to teach sociology and experienced in doing so, had a certain holding power. Sloman has written 'appoint a professor, in whatever circumstances and for whatever reason, and you have probably accepted his subject for all time. The professor¹ will die but his department may well live on for ever'. One can think of exceptions (for example Hogben's Chair of Social Biology at LSE), but, setting aside for the moment the influence of Westermarck (whose chair was a personal one and died with him), Hobhouse, and, after his death, Ginsberg, were instrumental in preserving and improving sociology as a university subject in England until, as circumstances changed, more interest began to be shown in the subject, more students were recruited, and a separate degree was established.

1(b) Hobhouse and Ginsberg.

The calibre of these two men may have been a key factor. Although they had both had a grounding in philosophy, they were capable of dealing with sociology with both a philosophical and a psychological approach, and were insistent that sociological theory should be based on empirical fact. Hobhouse, as we have seen, was a fluent lecturer, and attracted audiences; his classes found him a congenial and sometimes inspiring person. Ginsberg had everywhere a solid reputation as a cogent, logical thinker, an encyclopaedic writer, and an enthusiastic defender of sociology against its many opponents. A strong team of personalities at LSE, and its growing prestige in the academic world in England, meant that sociology was associated from the outset with an institution with high standards of social science teaching. The fact, lamented by outside observers, that sociology was not taught in the ancient universities, may have been a blessing in disguise. There, its status would have been that of an extremely lowly newcomer.

Had English undergraduate sociology come under the influence of a more charismatic personality than Hobhouse, at the outset, its development as a university subject might have been different. There can, it is obvious, be no firm conclusions to this speculation, but the messianic approach of, for example, a Geddes, in the setting up of an academic discipline which aspired to some sort of scientific status, could have been counter-productive. There was then, as has been demonstrated, already enough

hostility to the subject of sociology; the fervour aroused by the antagonism of rival schools could only have served to increase this.

1(c) Bedford College and the BA Sociology Degree.

The existence of Bedford College, whose lecturers devoted themselves to developing the social emphasis of their own specialist subjects, in order to teach their students for the London sociology degrees, was another factor in keeping alive the London sociology first degree courses during the difficult inter-war years. When the separate BA degree was established, it was taken largely by women from Bedford College. The introduction of this degree coincided to some extent with the general desire of women to attain academic status equivalent to that which had previously been offered only to men. The Certificate in Social Administration, which had been, before the degree, and still remained, the social science qualification most frequently taken by women, did not have the status of an Honours degree.

1(d) The London External Degree System.

The external degree system of London University also helped, in the long term, to spread sociology to other English universities. Because some university colleges had been teaching sociology for the London external degree, they had staff and facilities ready, when they received their charters, to set up degrees of their own. Had the external degree system not existed, the spread of university sociology in England

might well have been slower.

Above all, the London internal and external sociology degrees, their component subjects, and their structure, were being debated at Boards of Studies meetings during this time, and this gave impetus and focus to the development of the subject as an undergraduate discipline, even at a time when sociological research in England was in a period of relative stagnation.

1(e) The need for more social research.

It is generally agreed that the impetus for introducing sociology into the curriculum of those universities which did not provide it, may indirectly have come first from the need for more social research, which, during and after the Second Great War, was beginning clearly to be seen. Where were these researchers to come from? Clapham looked, and found that there were not enough being trained. Teaching and research, because they tended to be done by the same people, often went hand in hand at English universities; to increase research, teaching must be increased. The Government Social Survey, market research organisations, opinion polls, privately financed research institutes, were dissatisfied with the calibre of researchers they were recruiting. A definite need was established, in the end, for more social science graduates. LSE and its degrees were there ready to answer this need, and this included providing more sociology graduates if these were required. Interest in the study of society, not only from the angle of social reform, but also from an academically more rigorous standpoint, was

being aroused. Hence, possibly, some of the 'wave after
wave of students'² which beat a path to the door of
Professor Ginsberg's office in October 1945 on his
return to LSE from the wartime evacuation in Cambridge.

1(f) Post-war sociology degrees in England.

At this time, the London sociology degree was seen as serving functions in training researchers and new university lecturers, in training social workers and administrators, in training what were still called colonial administrators. It was later, in the 1950s and 1960s, that stronger arguments for the function of sociology degrees as a liberal education began to be put forward. Various hypotheses have been advanced to account for the sudden upsurge of sociology degrees in England in the 1960s and 1970s. The dissatisfactions with the 'ivory tower' image of arts subjects, and with the 'nuclear-bomb-producing' image of science, have been put forward as explanations for the swing to social science. None of these hypotheses has been proved. Whatever the cause, undergraduate sociology proliferated, and was included in some form in the new universities and technological universities by 1972, as well as in the universities already existing before 1960.

2. Who decided what was to be included in a first degree sociology course, and what was to be left out?

Two facts became obvious about this question, as the present investigation proceeded. First, the answers could not be found only in published material. Second,

there were at least two basic levels at which decisions about subject-matter were made, once it was agreed to set up a first degree in sociology at all.

At the first level was the question, which subjects were to be included in the degree structure? Obviously, other factors entered here. For example: which subjects were to be taught in which years of the degree; how many examination papers were to be allotted to each (if they were to be examined by written papers); and if examination methods other than written papers were to be used, which were they to be? Were all subjects to be taught by the sociology department (or equivalent), or were other departments to be involved? The areas of knowledge to be included in the various subject categories, and the formal syllabuses, also had to be outlined at this stage, unless the degree had been running for so long that the subject titles were sufficient to indicate the areas of subject-matter involved.

At the second level was the question, which topics were to be discussed or covered in lectures, seminars, or tutorials, designed to prepare students for the subjects concerned; which books or articles were to be recommended for reading by the student? Sometimes this second level included decisions which overlapped with the first level; if a lecturer were outlining a new option, he might be responsible, in the first place, for delineating the area of knowledge to be covered by the subject. In general, however, there was, at all universities, some distinction between the levels at which the two sets of

decisions were made.

It is not claimed that the description in Chapters II and III of the early setting up of the first sociology courses, could be regarded as at all typical of decision-making at other English universities, about what was to be included in sociology first degrees. In the early descriptions, a fairly small organisation (LSE), itself part of a large organisation (the University of London), was involving almost all the lecturers who were to be concerned with the sociology degree at that stage, in decisions about the subjects included. In fact, the similarity between formal syllabuses for examination regulations, and the syllabuses for individual courses of lectures, has been noted (see Chapter II, page 43).

As LSE grew larger, and Bedford College became involved in the decisions about sociology degrees, by sending representatives to the Board of Studies in Sociology, the lines of communication were already lengthening. Then, two sets of lecturers were preparing students for the same examination, and decisions at the second level were bound to differ, as one lecturer emphasised one topic, one another topic, in courses for the same formal syllabus.

It began to be obvious, by that stage in the present investigation, that a description of the processes of decision-making about what was to be included in a first degree sociology course, would have to be at a simple level for all universities, and that no detailed typology could be arrived at here, of the processes of decision-making at different universities.

No clear distinctions presented themselves, between

types of university, but some broad generalisations could be made. These, also, will be divided into two groups: (a) generalisations about decisions on overall sociology degree structure; and (b) generalisations about individual lecture courses, seminars, or tutorials, on subjects for sociology degrees.

(a) decisions on overall degree structure.

Decisions on overall sociology degree structure were made, in the majority of universities, by committees composed of staff of the faculty or department responsible for the subject, and typically these decisions had to be ratified by Senate, before being incorporated into the formal regulations of the university. Obviously, in a small department or faculty, a larger proportion of the lecturers concerned, could be involved. In a large organisation, decisions were more likely to be taken without directly involving some of the lecturers who were to teach the subjects included.

Three types of university provided variations on this 'basic' situation. The first was the ancient collegiate university. At Oxford and Cambridge, the colleges, and the tutorial system, meant that the introduction of a new degree subject was administratively far more difficult, and that decisions at the second level, taken by individual tutors or supervisors, might be far removed from decisions at the first level, taken by faculty boards. It was entirely possible that a college tutor might never have consulted the members of the university staff who set the examination papers. (This was also true, of course, of the London external

degree system.) The complicated ramifications of the Oxford and Cambridge system have been well described in Rose and Ziman's Camford Observed.³

The second type of university which provided a variation on the 'basic' situation was the federal university, the University of London, whose constitution meant that several college departments were involved in sociology degree decisions, and that faculty, college and departmental procedures were more formalised. (Some reversal of this trend, to more college-based degrees, was taking place in sociology in the later years of the period under review.)

The third type of university which varied from the 'basic' situation was the new university, where the impression was sometimes gained that a professor of sociology, newly appointed, perhaps the first member of a new department, was obliged to sit down and 'write the sociology degree' almost as an act of individual authorship. Obviously, this situation was not entirely novel, as each newly-appointed professor who was the first in his university in a chair of sociology, had some such task to perform, but in the already established universities, there were usually some relevant subjects already on the timetable; in the new universities, this was less likely to be so. Where sociology was introduced at the outset in a new university in situations such as those at Essex and Sussex, the sociology degree was part of a much wider plan which involved a large number of members of the relevant schools or departments of the university, from the beginning.

Student representation on committees concerned with degree structure and the curriculum was beginning to be introduced by 1972, but at some universities was considered a 'reserved area' along with such areas of decision as those on examinations and on staff appointments and promotions.

(b) decisions at the second level.

Published material mentioned in the present investigation has supported the view that the individual lecturer had, in some cases, great freedom to develop his course and to choose his topics at his own discretion (always, of course, having an eye to the examination syllabus, if one already existed). Klein⁴ noted restrictions on the approach she would have liked to make to the teaching of some subjects, but also made⁵ the point, echoed by Carter, that young lecturers fresh from their first degrees had a hard task to prepare their first sets of lectures - which implied⁶ that they were given a free hand in doing this. Broady⁷ outlined his own approach, Wakeford described innovations⁸ he had introduced in teaching techniques, Dawe asked for help in designing a new course when transferring from one subject in the sociology degree to another. All these writers implied freedom of choice for the lecturer at the second level, in the design of the lecture or seminar course.

Nevertheless it would be unwarranted to assume that total freedom of decision was always possible at this level. The amount of direction from professors or senior lecturers, the amount of constraint from syllabuses,

has not been ascertained, but is presumed to have varied widely.

The demand for sociology lecturers in social work courses, in colleges of education, in technical colleges and colleges of further education, may have helped in the recruitment of sociology undergraduates, although the general impression given by the research done on choice of first degree subject was, the students chose with less definite career plans than some educational administrators, intent on manpower flow, would have liked to think. However, the increase in the number of sociology degrees obviously meant that more lecturers were needed; it was still the case that some of them had been trained in other disciplines (particularly those from Oxbridge), but the increasing interpolation of the PhD, B Phil, MA, MSc, or postgraduate Diploma, between the granting of the first degree and the appointment to the first post as (Assistant) Lecturer, meant that conversion from a non-sociology first degree to a position as sociology lecturer had become easier and more feasible.

However, for the sociology graduate going straight from first degree into lecturing (and presumably still more for the graduate in another discipline), difficulties in decision-making about subject-matter were encountered. M.P. Carter reported, after conducting a survey for the BSA and the SSRC on sociological research in Britain, based on material gathered in 1966/7:

'Heavy teaching loads were reported by many respondents, in the universities and colleges. This is a special problem for young lecturers, preparing their first courses after having been thrust straight into a teaching programme after graduating. Expansion in Sociology and shortage of staff has meant that many lecturers - of all ages - have had to take on new courses for which they have no special expertise: they have accordingly had to devote much time to preparation. There are special problems in some institutions where the "sandwich" approach is used - the lack of time is then in terms of number of weeks in the year rather than hours in the week.'⁹

Sociology lecturers and professors at English universities had been a cosmopolitan group. Some were from Europe, some from countries once (or still) in the Commonwealth, some from the United States (or having made the journey there and back, from Britain); some had come to Britain as refugees displaced by the Second Great War. An eminent member of the profession, A.H. Halsey, characterised them in 1964 as being typically of working class origin, foreign, and outside the mainstream of English academic life.¹⁰

Perhaps this description was becoming out of date, by 1972. The leftwing tendencies of sociology lecturers in English universities also seem to have been over-emphasised by the media in comparison with those of lecturers in other subjects, although there was a possibility that some of the younger lecturers, in particular, suffered a crisis of role-definition in the 1968 'troubles' and thereafter.

One result of the changing situation between students and lecturers indicated by the 'troubles' was greater student participation in decision-making about sociology degree subject-matter at the second level. As has been

mentioned in Chapter VI, some influence was exerted by students on what was being included in their courses. The Keele experiment,¹¹ and the course on Social Movements and Political Action, at Sussex,¹² were two examples which were cited. In answering the question 'who decided what was to be included in a first degree sociology course?' the student would not have entered into the situation, except in so far as choosing options was concerned, in 1907. By 1972, this assumption that the student should have no say was no longer universally made. The course unit degree design, and other degree structures with numbers of alternatives, also left larger areas of decision open to the student, in the design of an individual degree course.

3. Was the knowledge which was transmitted in sociology first degrees, more or less the same at universities all over the country? If not, how did the content of first degrees differ at different universities?

This research has conclusively shown that the answer to the first part of this question was 'No'. Sociology degrees varied widely at different universities, both in the subjects they included, and in the way in which those subjects were treated at lecture and seminar level. Again, no strict relationship has been shown between type of degree and type of university, except in the broadest possible terms. Technological universities were less likely to have specialised sociology degrees and more likely to have sandwich courses, than the other five groups of universities.

The variations in treatment in Methods, Theory, and Sociology of Development teaching, mentioned in Chapter VI, were examples of the variations in the approach by different lecturers to the same subject title, which were encountered. Viewing the situation from a national standpoint, however, a greater broad similarity might have been observed than the details given in Chapter VI have indicated. No clear picture of relationship between content of sociology first degree and type of university, emerged.

4. How did the knowledge selected to be transmitted in first degree courses in sociology change over time?

4(a) The main subjects of sociology first degrees.

There had been a linear pattern in the main subjects of sociology first degrees since 1906 when the first syllabus was published. It cannot, it is obvious, be argued that the content of the courses had stayed the same, but the extraordinary tenacity with which some course titles had persisted, is worth noting. 'Comparative Social Institutions' was still, in the seventies, a core subject - and it was one of the original subjects. The 'savage tribes' were, by the seventies, 'non-literate societies' whose members, some sociologists thought, might have solved the problems of living, in a more efficient way than some complex industrial societies. But the study of their ways of life was still there in sociology degrees, and courses in 1972 used the researches of Malinowski, Radcliffe-Brown, and others, as the lecturers did in the 1920s, although with a somewhat

different theoretical approach.

Social Psychology, on the other hand, had moved from emphasis on instincts and on the concept of the 'group mind', through the advent of Freud, Homans, Mead, Adorno, Skinner, Goffmann and others, and was, by 1972, mainly concentrated on people in groups, socialisation, attitudes, symbolic interactionism and role theory. The content of the courses here had changed fundamentally, since the start of the London degree, and the fact that the subject still retained the same title was only the result of that title's very wide and general meaning.

'History of Sociological Thought' had also changed more, as a university course. This was a matter of the building up of material which did not exist in 1906. Then, fewer European sociologists had been translated into English, and Parsons, for example, had not yet written. Comte and Spencer loomed more closely in 1906, but were seen less as 'origins' to be dispassionately discussed, more as partly false prophets, some of whose theories must be questioned with some heat.

The proliferation of empirical research had also transformed 'the descriptive study of one society', so that 'Modern Britain', and the Group B options discussed in Chapter VI, had emerged in the intervening years since 1906. As each section of the 'Modern Britain' course - education, religion, politics, industry - began to build its own body of sociological literature, the 'Modern Britain' syllabus could devote less and less time to it and still stay within the limits of a practical lecture or seminar course, in terms of teaching hours. The

topics on which much research had been done, began to appear as second or third year options where, lecturers typically remarked, 'a fuller treatment will be given to this subject than was possible in the introductory course'.

4(b) Sociology options at the new and technological universities.

Most of the new English universities had already enshrined the subject of sociology in their sometimes highly complex degree patterns - and a number of new options began to emerge. These followed, chiefly, the interests of researchers. Where a body of research had built up in a specific field of sociology, the material for an optional course lay ready to hand. There was sometimes discernible another pattern by which a sociology graduate, interested in a certain subject at the end of his first degree, researched into it, and then offered an option in the subject, when given the opportunity, at the university where he was subsequently appointed. Alternatively, he might be appointed specifically because he could provide the optional course required. Nevertheless, this good 'fit' between lecturers' interests and the courses they were required to take was by no means universal, as has been indicated above (p.387).

The English technological universities found it convenient to set up social science degrees (with varying amounts of specialisation in sociology) because they already had some social science staff, whereas they would have found degrees in pure arts more difficult to establish, since they had fewer arts resources already

available. Optional subjects concerned with relating sociology (and other social sciences) to science and technology, and to management, were introduced in some technological universities.

4(c) The reflection of social events in the 'outside world' in the content of sociology first degree courses in England.

The nature of some parts of sociology first degree syllabuses was such, that events in the 'outside world' were reflected there with less delay than in courses of a purely theoretical or historical nature. This process can be partially traced through the 65 years of the undergraduate study in England. In courses on pure theory, new ideas seem to have taken longer to permeate in the earlier years of the degree (possibly because the network of academic communication was less elaborate and well-developed). For example, the time-lag mentioned in Chapter IV, before the Parsonian group of theories began to be included in English university courses, could be seen as a result of a lack of response, on the English side of the Atlantic, to American ideas about sociological theory, even where these concerned European sociologists.

There was, at the start of sociology undergraduate teaching in England, a strong feeling that not enough empirical and fact-finding research had been done to 'fill out' the subject, and as soon as this situation began to be remedied, empirical studies were seized upon and included in courses on, for example, Contemporary Social Conditions, Industrial Sociology, and Sociology

of Education. In subject areas such as these, there was a strong tendency to keep up with the latest empirical research.

Aside from deliberately sociologically oriented research, there were other researches, particularly in the earlier period of the subject's development as an undergraduate study, which were undertaken with the aim of solving 'social problems', and these, and actual legislation concerned with 'social problems', were incorporated into degree courses. (Booth's work was an early example.) The question of poverty, and of the principles underlying its solution in terms of government administration, formed some of the basic sections of Social Economics papers which were part of sociology undergraduate courses in the thirties and forties. Although the impetus for the initial research and legislation lay in the problem in society, it eventually gave rise, first, to work of a more theoretical nature on the definition of poverty, and second, to greater statistical refinement in its measurement.

During the Second Great War, social psychology and social survey research were two subjects which received great impetus from the progress of 'outside' events. As far as social psychology was concerned, the facts of the war led, in the first place, to a re-questioning of the basis of moral judgments, which Freudian psychology had already stimulated. In the second place, the testing of large numbers of recruits for the armed forces, and the need to maximise industrial

efficiency, provided sets of data on which theories on such subjects as work motivation and attitude formation, were based, and from which later work on attitude scaling and measurement, and other statistical refinements, derived.

Support for the concept of relative social deprivation was found in the fact that, although, after the war, affluence increased, a sense of deprivation was felt among certain sections of the community, and appeared to be greater than in the earlier years of wider social distress.

Social surveys received impetus from the war situation in England, because there was suddenly a need to know far more about the population in general. Sampling methods had by that time developed to a stage where their use was accepted as valid statistically, while a population at war more readily accepted the necessity for answering official questions and being interviewed. The administration needed to know more about, for example, the effects of education or lack of it, the best ways of improving work output, the effects of propaganda, to take some examples at random.

The 'Contemporary Social Conditions' paper in the 'Modern England' option in the London BA Sociology had been introduced between the wars, as had the 'Social Economics' paper in the London BSc Econ, and 'method' had been introduced as a subject in sociology. After the war, statistics became, increasingly, a compulsory subject, foreshadowing the later even greater emphasis on its importance. Perhaps a connection can also be

seen between the concern over the prediction of changes in population trends, and over the control of the size of the population, the necessity to rebuild towns, and to build new towns, after the destruction of war, and the introduction of Demography and Urban Sociology, for example, as options in sociology degrees. On the other hand, where Urban Sociology was concerned, the influence of research in this field in the USA may also have been a factor. (The influence of American sociology theory and research on British sociological degree patterns was evident, directly or indirectly, as well as the more obvious influence of the writings of the great European sociologists on courses on theory, in particular.)

The changing situation of the colonies was another 'outside world' situation which seems to have influenced sociology courses. In the fifties, for example, Leeds had an early course on Sociology of the Colonies (later, Sociology of Developing Countries), and we have seen the proliferation of 'development' courses in the sixties and early seventies, when the idea of 'development', which, in the original English sociology first degrees, meant evolution from 'primitive' society to 'civilisation', took on a different emphasis, until, by the early seventies, it had, in many courses, political and economic ramifications chiefly concerned with countries less developed industrially than those of the West, but undergoing immense political, economic and social upheavals.

In England, the fifties and sixties saw tremendous technological advance and growth, and rapid changes in

social patterns. This was partly the reason for the general questioning of social institutions in England - marriage, the family, patterns of child rearing, formal education systems, religion, the shape of towns, penal reform, immigration, race relations, the treatment of illness, and the proliferation of the mass media, not to mention such obvious areas of conflict and change as class relationships, trade unionism, the mixed economy, and the distribution of wealth. It is possible that sociologists and sociology students, in seeking answers to some of this questioning, were bringing about, not only the further development of sociology as an undergraduate subject in England, by the permeation into degree courses, through the educational process, of the research done by lecturers and others, but also the fragmentation of which some sociologists complained, in that they felt it held up the progress of sociology as an integrated theoretical discipline. This was not necessarily the same complaint as the complaint that sociology, as an undergraduate subject, was becoming too 'applied' and not 'pure' enough. It was possible for an undergraduate sociology degree course to react quite sensitively (as, for instance, many sections of 'Modern Britain' courses did) to research into situations in the 'outside world', without necessarily adopting a 'social engineering' attitude toward them. A research team could set up a piece of 'pure' empirical research into, say, the lives of old people - and then leave it to the administrators to take the action they

thought necessary or possible, in the light of the research findings. It should be emphasised that, although in the earlier years of the discipline in England, some sociology was based on 'social engineering' investigations, as the discipline became more academically oriented, in particular as more degrees were introduced, there was more 'pure' research available which could be included in reading lists without turning the lecture course in question into something more resembling an 'applied' course.

5. Was sociology taught as a vocational subject or as an academic subject?

5(a) The 'liberal education' and academic approach.

Martin White started the sociology chairs at London University partly because he had been appalled by the ignorance of 'social facts' which he observed among the country's government and administrators. Sociology undergraduate courses in England in the 1960s and 1970s, far from emphasising the vocational aspects of their syllabuses (i.e. the 'study sociology and you will become an expert social administrator, politician, social statistician' approach), were still, in many cases, making the point with some weight, that their courses were theoretical, non-vocational, a liberal education. This, where it occurred, bore out Young's thesis¹³ that the less a subject could be seen to be directly useful and practical in the 'outside world', the higher its academic status was likely to be. True, Young was

indicating a model for subjects in a school curriculum (presumably a secondary school curriculum) where, he contended, one of the characteristics of high status knowledge was that it had 'a minimum direct relation to non-school situations', but his general argument was also concerned with the stratification of the university curriculum, where the word 'vocational' continued to have pejorative associations. The 'girl who wanted to help people' was not the most desirable applicant for the specialised sociology degree, and was channelled, if possible, into a more vocational social administration or social work course. This still seemed to be the general situation, despite the protests of lecturers like Broady¹⁴ that the 'desire to help people' should be canalised to good effect academically. The male student who looked likely, on the basis of his university application form, to be awarded a good degree, to go into research, and to become a university lecturer or work in a research department or institute, might sometimes be seen as the more desirable candidate, and this might be partly because he would help to raise the academic status of the department, and, more widely, of the sociology profession in the country.

Prospectuses also represented sociology as an opening to professions not connected directly with the academic content of the course studied - journalism was a typical example. (An education committee in 1973 proposed to appoint 'someone with a sociology degree')

to teach good manners to children in its local schools.)¹⁵

5(b) 'Pure' and 'applied' sociology in undergraduate courses.

The 'pure' and 'applied' aspects of sociology were both included by Martin White in his first letter to the Principal of the University of London about sociology as a degree subject. The study of the subject was to have the object 'not only of constructing a scientific theory of society, but also of associating such theory with the highest philosophical thought, and of indicating the bearing of such knowledge on practical life'.¹⁶

The division of the study of society into these two categories, 'pure' and 'applied', had different meanings, and had adopted different institutional patterns, in England, over the 65 years covered by this research. When the London sociology option in the BSc Econ began, emphasis in the sociology lectures was on 'pure' sociology rather than on 'social reform' (despite Hobhouse's desire to do something positive to reform society), and the 'bearing of such knowledge on practical life' was associated at LSE with the Certificate in Social Science and Administration. As has been described, there were, later, diploma courses, or other equivalent courses, in social administration, at many English provincial universities.

However, by 1972, two important changes had taken place in this situation. First, Social Administration had become a degree subject in England. It could conceivably have been argued that someone who studied social

administration objectively, obtained a degree in it, and lectured on it at a university, had studied nothing but 'pure' social administration. Nevertheless, it was generally thought of as an 'applied' social science.

Secondly, empirical research in sociology in England had developed very considerably. The term 'applied' sociology had been borrowed from natural science, but had not acquired a clear-cut definition, at least in English sociology first degrees in 1972. It certainly did not apply merely to Social Administration or Social Problems courses. To give three examples: at Sheffield it included courses in Criminology, Race Relations, Sociology of Education, Sociology of the Family, Industrial Organization, Sociology of Religion and Political Sociology. At Leicester it included, to quote the rubric from the Students' Handbook, 'social policy and practice social changes in under-developed countries, and, with reference to industrial societies, management and labour in industry and commerce, urban development, administration of social services, occupational selection and guidance'.¹⁷ At City, the Applied Sociology course covered four main areas: 'The problems of a normative social science. Sociology and illness. Sociology and crime. Sociology and deprivation.' The students taking any of these courses at these three universities, were not necessarily going on to be social workers or social administrators, or to work in other fields of 'applied' sociology.

There were two other institutional patterns which might have been said to combine 'pure' and 'applied'

sociology. First, there were courses such as that at Keele, where a fourth year could be taken in a predominantly sociological honours degree, the last year of which was angled more towards professional training for social administration and social work. Second, there were universities where postgraduate (diploma) courses in the 'applied' parts of the subject could be taken by sociologists or graduates in other social sciences.

In 1972, the distinction between 'pure' and 'applied' sociology in English first degrees was not clearly defined. It is doubtful whether the concepts themselves were capable of clear definition, since the boundary between pure theory and application was itself not clearcut.

5(c) 'Value-Freedom'.

In almost every chapter of this present work, the problem of value-freedom in sociology as a degree subject, has been raised. The debate was still continuing in English universities in 1972. There were those who thought that the social sciences, sociology among them, would make no progress until value-freedom was assured. There were others who thought that complete value-freedom for sociology was intrinsically impossible. In the meantime, this topic occurred in many courses on Sociological Theory and on Epistemology and Methods, and was also discussed in trying to arrive at a sociology of sociology and a professional code for the sociologist.

This division of opinion had not changed basically since 1907. Some lecturers to undergraduates held one view, some the other. The general impression had sometimes seemed to be, that the lecturer wished to take the

'value-loaded' sociology entrant and turn him or her, after three years, into a totally objective, sophisticated, 'value-free' sociologist able to go out into the world, evaluate research findings, and pass judgment without feeling strongly about the social consequences of the results, so long as the work itself was professionally unexceptionable. At the other end of the scale, there were some who saw the sociology lecturer as taking the willing, socially conformist, student, and turning him or her into a wild intellectual rebel, or a starry-eyed reformer. In between, there were those who saw sociology degrees in England as helping students to acquire knowledge which would make them more socially helpful, and at a more powerful level, than they were when they entered university.

6. How was the growth of sociology as an academic discipline related to its development as a university subject?

18

King and Brownell have suggested that a subject becomes an academic discipline when it has the following:

- i. a method of inquiry
- ii. a specialised language or symbols
- iii. well-related concepts
- iv. books, articles and research reports on the subject
- v. a communication system
- vi. people practising the subject who can take pleasure in sharing the excitement of discovery
- vii. its own style in its search for truth
- viii. either an explicit or an implicit concept of man
- ix. teachers and researchers in the field.

Each academic discipline can also be considered as a community, and the members of this community are, as a rule, members of a professional society. A member of a discipline is someone who is recognised as a colleague by a substantial number of other members. Another way of defining an academic discipline is that it is a specialised university study terminating in one or more degrees.

One may disagree with some of King and Brownell's criteria (for example, 'well-related concepts' cannot be defined objectively), but this collection of criteria does build up a recognisable picture of an academic discipline as it has come to exist in western societies.

The progress of sociology as an academic discipline in England was hampered, because it attained the different criteria mentioned above, at widely scattered points in time. In the early years of the 1900s, the subject was established in a university degree, and there was a Sociological Society, although, admittedly, an eclectic one. However, sociology's methods of inquiry were various, and some, particularly the statistical methods, were poorly developed. There was endless argument about the specialised language, with complaints that some writers on sociology used terms in one sense, some in another. Books, articles and research reports on the subject were in existence, but, in England, were few in number. Sociology in England had not one 'style', but many, in its search for truth. Its systems of communication were imperfect, and there were many different definitions of the term 'sociology' in, for

example, the contributions to Sociological Papers and the early issues of the Sociological Review.

It has been demonstrated in the present study that, along some, at least, of the lines of development indicated, sociology in England remedied its early deficiencies. By 1972, it fulfilled more of the criteria suggested above as essential to an academic discipline. It had several learned journals, a plethora of books and articles, and a learned society (which was, admittedly, not by any means all-embracing of the profession, in its membership, but which was less eclectic than the Sociological Society had been, and had, in 1972, a professional sub-group in the Sociology Teachers' Section). In the language of sociology, some specialised terms, at least, had ceased to be matters for argument. There was a certain community spirit which was, as in most established academic disciplines, reinforced, rather than destroyed, by dissensions between rival factions.

Where sociology in England was weak, was in its definition of its field; but as we have seen, as an undergraduate discipline it was beginning to acquire, by 1972, a very broad overall recognisable shape. This shape may have seemed somewhat fragmented because of the large number of different degree patterns at English universities, and the large number of optional subjects in different sociology degrees. A closer look at the content of the degree courses, however, revealed some measure of homogeneity.

Synthesis and specialisation in the development of undergraduate sociology.

Synthesis, the interdisciplinary approach, the

crossing of subject 'boundaries', had all progressed and found favour in English secondary education in the sixties. The degree pattern of Keele, and those of some of the new English universities, seemed to be bringing this approach into higher education. However, the high status of specialisation died hard. Mace,¹⁹ Bernstein,²⁰ and Carter²¹ have all described the secure feeling of the 'scholar in his discipline', safe in the knowledge that he was one among a number of colleagues who also called themselves historians, or mathematicians, or biologists. That it was still felt necessary, in 1969, to reassure students taking cross-disciplinary degrees, was shown by the remarks in the prospectus of the University of Surrey concerning their Human and Physical Sciences degree (of which Sociology formed a part):

'it has been said that the shortcomings of some general honours courses are that they are not combined as a whole, but consist of unrelated courses given by specialist departments; that their prestige is low partly because the teaching is given only by junior staff; that students are at a disadvantage compared with students reading for single honours degrees in that they are not associated with a particular department To avoid these disadvantages, students . . . belong to one department, the Humanities and Social Science department, which is responsible for the overall organisation of the course and for teaching the social sciences. The teaching which is given by many different departments, is co-ordinated by a Course Board of Studies. Those teaching include three professors and five readers or senior lecturers.'

22

The emphasis on synthesis in sociology degree structure proposals ran counter, in the thirties, to the development of faculties and departments in English universities. While, as far as is known, nobody went

to the lengths of the 'transatlantic disciples of Comte' who, 'in the early days of American sociology, . . . seriously suggested in a memorandum to the president of Brown University that all the departments of the latter should be reorganized under the department of sociology',²³ there were, as has been noted, conferences and discussions on the synthesis of the social sciences (with sociology sometimes seen as the link between them all). The progress of English degree structure was, on the whole, in the other direction. As English universities increased in size, social science faculties separated into departments, departments of sociology among them, and these departments in turn grew in size. This process was not bound to continue indefinitely, and at any time the status of the single subject honours degree might begin to be lowered in relation to joint or combined degrees, or degrees of the Essex and Sussex type. Since, however, the status of the single subject honours degree had not been eroded in England by 1972, it is fair to allow the existence of single honours degrees in sociology as evidence of the increased academic status of the subject.

The place of joint sociology/social anthropology degrees in this pattern is an interesting one. Social anthropology had had, if anything, higher academic status in England than sociology (it had had a longer history at Oxbridge, for example), and nobody had accused social anthropologists of being typically working class and/or immigrant. On the contrary, their designation as social anthropologists retained something

of the sunburnt colonial image, even when they were researching the villages of Wales or Ireland. The effect, if any, that the mingling of the two disciplines in English first degrees would eventually have on either one of them, was not clear in 1972, but it must be admitted that these degrees ran counter to the proliferation of the single specialist degree.

The effect of sociology undergraduate courses on students' personal development.

A brief comment must be made on the general topic of the effect of sociology courses in England on students' personal development. The subject of the student's personal, as distinct from intellectual, development, had come more to the forefront of educational writing in England only in the fairly recent past, as regards higher education. Before that, there seemed to have been a tacit assumption that no respectable academic subject could have anything other than beneficial effects - i.e. those of broadening mental horizons, or sharpening intellect, or encouraging curiosity and investigation, or improving the student's stature as a scholar - to name a few of the commonly quoted presumed end results.

In more recent years there had been studies which had tried to measure the effects of, for example, different learning and teaching techniques at university (Ruth Beard's overview²⁴ gave examples of the methods used and the kinds of results obtained in studies of this kind) but there had been very few attempts to assess the effects of whole courses. Studies of the effect on attitudes of

shorter courses on specific subjects, were hampered by the difficulty of eliminating intervening variables. Thus it was unlikely that a valid test could be made of, for example, Pahl's hypothesis²⁵ about the effect on students of studying Goffmann. Pahl postulated that some students (possibly wrongly) took Goffmann's message to be that all formality and much other social interaction was 'seen through' as mere role-playing. These students might therefore eschew positions of responsibility, because these positions might involve them in placing themselves in situations where they had to assume a formal authority which was, to them, only a transient role-playing, and was seen to be such by their associates.

Could the motivation of the student who came to study sociology with 'the desire to help people' and the belief that help was possible, survive the possible change to the conviction that piecemeal social engineering was useless? By 1972, such questions were increasingly being asked, but firm answers had not been established.

Questions for future research.

In 1967, 'Astryx', in an article called 'Salute the Degree-Writer', half-humourously raised the question of the origins of the subject-matter of first degrees. 'If,' he wrote, 'you had asked an old-type Oxford don who had written the English degree, his reaction would be not so much indignation as bewilderment. One does not, he would have felt, write degrees One

comes to university to study a subject . . . and a subject is a great big fact out in the real world, outside the control of examiners'.²⁶ 'Astryx' felt that the contrast between this attitude, and the attitude of the professor who had to sit down and 'write' a degree for a new course at a new university, was at the basis of many interesting questions which did not yet seem to have been answered, either in general, about the subject-matter of higher education, or in particular, about the subject-matter of degree course X at university Y.

The present research has attempted to describe the nature of sociology degree courses at English universities, and to answer some of the basic questions, but there are many questions which cannot be answered without considering the interaction between the university, learned societies, learned journals, the publication of books, the holding of conferences - in general, the institutions for the transmission of knowledge - interaction which is crucial to what is finally included in the university lecturer's course outline, or in the seminar topic or discussion. Feedback and learning theory become involved, as soon as the student's part in the process is included.

A number of questions, therefore, still remain to be answered. For example:

1. Do large complex universities teach sociology in different ways from small universities with shorter lines of communication, and can a cause and effect hypothesis be tested here?

2. How can the influence (already considered to

vary widely from department to department) of a professor or professors, on the teaching of sociology in his/her/their department, be evaluated?

3. Can lines of transmission of knowledge be traced from lecturer's own first degree (possibly through other degrees, diplomas, research, courses or employment he or she has undergone) to the subject-matter he or she includes in courses for his or her own students?

4. When degree courses in sociology rapidly multiplied, those involved in the profession became disturbed about the 'dilution' or 'distortion' of their subject through the shortage of qualified lecturers and the rapid promotion of lecturers to chairs, or the leaving vacant of chairs advertised. Can the hypothesis that this 'dilution' or 'distortion' took place be proved, and if it did take place, can its cause be traced to the rapid proliferation of sociology degrees at institutions where they did not exist before?

5. Where are the sources of innovation in the subject-matter for sociology first degrees?

Conclusion

In 1972, there were broad relationships between some categories of universities in England and some sorts of sociology degrees; for example, as has been mentioned, technological universities were less likely to offer specialised sociology degrees, and more likely to offer sandwich courses. However, the life span of the degrees in question had by then been so short, that no conclusions could be drawn about future development,

and conclusions about cause and effect could be only tentative. It seemed more likely that the lack of specialisation was the result of the newness of the departments, and of the predominance in the universities concerned, of technological faculties, than of any deliberate decision against specialisation on academic grounds.

Aside from LSE, whose degree as a special case had gone through ramifications unlike any of the others, and this was also true of Bedford College, the main trend in sociology degrees at English universities up to 1972, seems to have been one of consolidation, and of establishing traditions. Many of the sociology professors had been very recently appointed; to give advice to a would-be sociology student on the 'flavour' of any sociology course or department would have been difficult (as the course guides pointed out); the experience of a student already taking the degree course in question, was often quoted as the most reliable guide, once the information in the calendar or prospectus had been absorbed. In 1972, the course unit plans for LSE were just being introduced; Bedford and Goldsmith's were preparing to run a revised degree; even a degree which looked, on paper, a fairly fixed constant situation, might lose or gain an option or a key member of staff before the student's three or four years had elapsed, while some of the new universities were still making it a deliberate policy to retain as much flexibility as possible in

degree course structure.

In the earlier years of the period covered, at the time when the universities were in a relatively unchanging position, in England, sociology was not being taught in them (except in London). By a coincidence of educational history, the arrival of sociology first degree courses at universities was more or less coterminous, at first, with a period of the granting of charters to already existing institutions (the university colleges) and the setting up or expansion of social science departments at the older civic universities; and later, with a period of rapid expansion and change in the universities themselves, with the creation of completely new universities, with changes in the nature, origins and size of the student body (the 'more means worse' phrase was introduced during the years of sociology's rapid development as a degree subject), and with changes in attitudes in England towards higher education, and what its functions should be.

The shape of the development of sociology first degree courses at English universities in the 65 years between 1907 and 1972 was like a tree. The roots were at LSE. The topmost twigs on the branches which broadened out after 1945, and after 1962, were, in 1972, the courses at Lancaster and Warwick, which were still not completely developed. In 1972, what most sociology degree courses needed, was time to mature. The situation was one of a university subject full of new, if not integrated, discovery, one in which the prospect of academic fossilisation seemed extremely remote.

REFERENCES
CHAPTER VII.

1. Sloman, A.E., 'The Pursuit of Learning', Listener, November 21, 1963, p.823, reprinted in A University in the Making (Reith Lectures 1963), British Broadcasting Corporation, 1964.
2. Marshall, T.H., 'Sociology at the Crossroads', (Inaugural Lecture), in Sociology at the Crossroads and Other Essays, Heinemann, 1963, p.3.
3. Rose, Jasper, and Ziman, John, Camford Observed, Gollancz, 1964.
4. Klein, Josephine, 'The Teaching of Sociology', Universities Quarterly, Vol.VII, 1952/3.
5. Carter, M.P., 'Survey of Sociological Research in Britain', Sociological Review, NS, Vol.XVI, 1968.
6. Broady, Maurice, 'The Academic Tension in Student Life', Universities Quarterly, Vol.XXI, 4, September 1967.
7. Wakeford, John, The Strategy of Social Enquiry, Macmillan, 1968.
8. Dawe, Alan, 'Teaching Modern Britain - Problems and Orientations' (duplicated), Text of a paper presented at a Conference of the Sociology Teachers' Section, British Sociological Association, London, January 1966.
9. Carter, M.P., 'Report on a Survey of Sociological Research in Britain' (duplicated), 1968, p.14.
10. Halsey, A.H., 'Education and Mobility', in Fyvel, T.R. (ed), Frontiers of Sociology, Cohen and West, 1964, p.9.
11. Bellaby, Paul, 'Sociology Without a Syllabus: The Keele Workshop Experiments', Network, British Sociological Association, March 1975, pp.8-10.
12. University of Sussex, BA Syllabus 1969/70, p.151.
13. Young, Michael F.D., 'Curricula and the Social Organisation of Knowledge' (duplicated), paper presented at the British Sociological Association Annual Conference, Durham, April 1970, pp.12,13.
14. Broady, Maurice, op.cit., p.408.
15. Wade, Nigel, '£60 a Week to Teach Manners', Daily Telegraph, January 5, 1973.

16. London School of Economics, Archives, Martin White Benefaction Committee, File 320/17, Document 1, Letter from J. Martin White to Sir Arthur W. Rucker, 29 June, 1903.
17. University of Leicester, Students' Handbook 1967/8, p.81.
18. King, A.R., and Brownell, J.A., The Curriculum and the Disciplines of Knowledge, Wiley, 1966, p.68.
19. Mace, C.A., The Idea of a Faculty (An Inter-Faculty Lecture delivered on 17th March 1948), Birkbeck College, London, 1948, p.9.
20. Bernstein, B., 'Open Schools, Open Society', New Society, September 14, 1967, p. 353.
21. Carter, C.F., Introduction to Hall, S., (reporter), 'Towards a Reconsideration of Curricula and Patterns of Study' (The Gulbenkian Educational Discussion, 1964), Universities Quarterly, Vol.XIX, 1964/5, p.119.
22. University of Surrey, Prospectus 1968/9, p.73.
23. Berger, Peter, Invitation to Sociology, Penguin Books, 1966, p.17.
24. Beard, Ruth, Research into Teaching Methods in Higher Education, Society for Research into Higher Education, 1967.
25. Pahl, Raymond, 'The Self and Social Order. Thoughts on Reading Erving Goffmann', BBC Radio 3, January 10, 1973.
26. 'Astryx', 'Salute the Degree-Writer', Times Educational Supplement, June 23, 1967.

APPENDIX I

University Departments written to individually by the investigator in June 1969, asking for examples of course material for first degree sociology

(The six groups of universities correspond to those discussed in Chapter V)

Group 1. Oxford and Cambridge.

Department of Social and Administrative Studies, University of Oxford

Faculty Board of Politics and Economics, University of Cambridge

Management Studies Sub-Division, Department of Engineering, University of Cambridge

Social and Political Sciences Committee, University of Cambridge (in 1970)

Group 2. Constituent Colleges of the University of London.

Department of Sociology, Bedford College

Department of the Humanities, Chelsea College of Science and Technology

Department of Sociology, Goldsmith's College

Department of Sociology, London School of Economics and Political Science

Group 3. The Older Civic Universities.

Department of Sociology, University of Birmingham

Department of Sociology, University of Bristol

Department of Social Theory and Institutions, University of Durham

Department of Social Studies, University of Leeds

Department of Social Science, University of Liverpool

Department of Social Anthropology and Sociology, University of Manchester

Department of Management Sciences, University of Manchester

Institute of Science and Technology

Department of Social Studies, University of Newcastle

Department of Sociological Studies, University of Sheffield

Group 4. The Younger Civic Universities.

Department of Sociology, University of Exeter.

Department of Sociology and Social Anthropology, University of Hull

Department of Sociology, University of Leicester

Department of Sociology, University of Nottingham

Department of Sociology, University of Reading

Department of Sociology and Social Administration, University of Southampton

continued . .

Group 5. The New English Universities.

School of Social Studies, University of East Anglia
Department of Sociology, University of Essex
Department of Sociology, University of Keele
Department of Sociology, University of Kent at Canterbury
School of Social Studies, University of Sussex
Department of Sociology, University of York

Group 6. The English Technological Universities.

Department of Industrial Administration, University of
Aston in Birmingham
Sociology Group, School of Humanities and Social Sciences,
University of Bath
School of Studies in Social Sciences, University of
Bradford
Department of Social Institutions, Brunel University
Department of Social Science and Humanities, The City
University
Department of Social Sciences and Economics, Loughborough
University of Technology
Department of Sociology, Government and Administration,
University of Salford
Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, University
of Surrey

APPENDIX II

Suggested Scheme of Examination for BA and BSc in Sociology

[dated June 8th, 1914]

I. Compulsory.

- 1 & 2. "Social Institutions". Two papers, expanding the one now set in the B.Sc.
3. "Social Philosophy". Roughly corresponding to the paper of that name in the B.A. Philosophy at present.
4. "Method". Comprising questions of the scope of Sociology and its relation to other subjects.

II. Alternative Special Subjects.

1. Graeco-Roman Civilisation, 3 papers.
 - (a) Political and Social Institutions.
 - (b) Religion and Ethics.
 - (c) Political Ideas.
2. Structure of some simpler societies, three papers, to be drawn up in consultation with the Board of Anthropology.
3. Some Oriental Civilisations, similarly treated to (1).
4. Modern English Social Structure.
 - (a) Social and Industrial Development since 1760.
 - (b) Contemporary Social Conditions.
 - (c) Special Study of a Contemporary Social or Economic question, to be selected by the student.
5. Essay.
6. Optional subject; Eugenics; Psychology - History of Philosophy, and others.

[University of London, Board of Studies in Sociology,
'Memorandum on Proposed Degree in Sociology']

APPENDIX III

Preliminary Syllabus

The Measurement of Social Phenomena

A non-mathematical analysis of the objects, conditions and nature of such measurements, with some reference to existing data.

I. Areas. Political, administrative, and economic, also measurement of density.

II. Classes. Delimitation of social classes and of economic groups.

Totals of the laws of great numbers. The unit in relation to the total.

III. Production and income; expenditure and consumption by groups, and by typical individuals.

IV. Measurement of the standard of living.

V. Measurement of economic progress.

[Copy of MS of draft syllabus by A.L. Bowley, December 1913, 'to be five lectures', original in File 500A of Board of Studies in Economics documents of the University of London.]

APPENDIX IV

BA Honours in Sociology in the Faculty of Arts,
University of London [University of London Regulations
for Internal Students, 1920/21, p.146]

Sociology. 8 papers.

I. Compulsory.

1. & 2. Social Institutions.

3. & 4. Social Philosophy (One paper predominantly
on Ethics, and one on Social Philosophy).

5. Social Psychology (i.e. Psychology, with especial
reference to the psychological basis of social
relations and the effect of social interactions).

6. Principles of Method (i.e. relation of Sociology
to other sciences and questions of scientific and
philosophic treatment of the subject).

II. Optional. A. Some of the Simpler Societies.

1. Social Institutions and Cultural Relations.
2. Religious Ideas and Practices.
3. Arts and Crafts.

OR B. either (i) An Oriental Civilisation,
Ancient or Mediaeval or Modern (details
to be specified later)
or (ii) Graeco-Roman Civilisation
or (iii) Civilisation of the Middle Ages
or (iv) A Modern Community (details
to be specified later)

[For each of the above, three papers:]

1. Political and Social Institutions.
2. Religion and Ethics.
3. Political and Social Ideas.

OR C. Modern England.
1. Social and Industrial Development, with
some reference to Town Planning.
2. Contemporary Social Conditions.
3. Social and Political Theories.

[Candidates also had to take a subsidiary subject -
Economics or Geology or Physics or History (economics -
the pass degree syllabus).]

APPENDIX V

B.A. Social Sciences, Liverpool University (Liverpool University Calendar 1937/8, p.198)

School of Social Science

Candidates for admission will be required to have passed the First Year Examinations in French or German, in British Political and Economic History, and in General Economics, and to have attended a 1st year course in Modern Political Institutions.

Examination.

First Part.

Oral examination.

(1) Three of the following:

Social structure and legislation, 1 p.

Ethics, 1 p.

Economic structure and public finance, 1 p.

Either Comparative social institutions or
Theory and practice of modern government, 1 p.

Second Part.

Oral examination.

Political philosophy, 1 p.

Either 3 courses chosen from the following:

A. Social Science

Labour Problems, 1 p.

Social Statistics, 1 p.

Population Problems, 1 p.

B. Political Science

Public Administration, 1 p.

International Relations, 1 p.

British Constitutional History, 1 p.

or 2 courses chosen from the above together with a dissertation in the field of Social or of Political Science.

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF PUBLICATIONS
AND OTHER SOURCES REFERRED TO IN TEXT

- Abbott, Joan, Employment of Sociology and Anthropology Graduates 1966-1967, British Sociological Association, 1970.
- Abrams, Philip, The Origins of British Sociology, 1834-1914, University of Chicago Press, 1968.
- Abrams, Philip, 'The Trouble with School Sociology', New Society, October 31, 1968.
- Advisory Centre for Education, After the Vith - Where?, ACE, Cambridge, 1962.
- Advisory Centre for Education, 16+ Guide: Sociology, ACE, Cambridge, 1967.
- Amis, Kingsley, Lucky Jim, Gollancz, 1954.
- Anderson, Perry, 'Components of the National Culture', in Cockburn, A., and Blackburn, R. (eds.), Student Power, Penguin Books, 1969.
- Andreski, S., The Elements of Comparative Sociology, Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1964.
- Andreski, S., Social Sciences as Sorcery, Andre Deutsch, 1972.
- Arnold, Eric, A Guide to English Courses in the Universities, John Murray, 1965.
- Aron, Raymond, Main Currents in Sociological Thought, Weidenfeld and Nicholson, Vol.I, 1965; Vol.II, 1968.
- 'Astryx', 'Salute the Degree-Writer', Times Educational Supplement, June 23, 1967.
- Banks, J.A., 'The Employment of Sociologist Graduates, 1952 and 1953', British Journal of Sociology, Vol.V, no.2, 1954.
- Banks, J.A., 'Employment of Sociology and Anthropology Graduates, Final Report', British Journal of Sociology, Vol.IX, no.3, September 1958.
- Banks, J.A., Sociology as a Vocation (Inaugural Lecture), Leicester University Press, 1971.
- Banks, J.A., and Banks, O., 'Employment of Sociology and Anthropology Graduates, 1952 and 1954', British Journal of Sociology, Vol.VI, 1956.
- Banks, J.A., and Tropp, A., Sociology and Social Anthropology, A Guide for Intending Students, British Sociological Association, 1960 (and subsequent editions).

- Barker, Sir E., 'Foreword' in Dugdale, J.E. (ed.), Further Papers in the Social Sciences: Their Relations in Theory and in Teaching, Report of a Conference under the auspices of the Institute of Sociology, London, September, 1936, Le Play House Press, 1937.
- Barnes, Harry E., 'The Fate of Sociology in England', Publications of the American Sociological Society, Vol.XXI, 1927.
- Barnes, Harry E. (ed.), An Introduction to the History of Sociology, University of Chicago Press, 1948.
- Barnett, A.S., 'Teaching the Sociology of Developing/ Underdeveloped Societies in the U.K.', (duplicated), paper presented to the British Sociological Association Development Group, December, 1972.
- Barnett House Papers, No.1, 1916.
- Bartlett, F., Ginsberg, M., Lindgren, E.J., and Thouless, R.H. (eds.), The Study of Society, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1939.
- Bates, A.P., 'Undergraduate Sociology: a Problem for the Profession', Sociology Quarterly, Vol.VI, 1965.
- Beard, Ruth, Research into Teaching Methods in Higher Education, Society for Research into Higher Education, 1967.
- Beattie, J., Other Cultures, Cohen and West, 1964.
- Bedford College, Calendars: 1939-40; 1951-52; 1961-62.
- Bellaby, Paul, 'Sociology Without a Syllabus: The Keele Workshop Experiments', Network, British Sociological Association, March 1975.
- Beloff, M., and Rex, J., 'Is Sociology Respectable?' discussion, BBC Radio 3, September 3, 1969 (transcript of tape recording made by the researcher).
- Bendix, R., and Lipset, S.M. (eds.), Class, Status and Power. A Reader in Social Stratification, 2nd ed., Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1967.
- Berger, Peter, Invitation to Sociology, Penguin Books, 1966.
- Bernstein, B., 'Language and Social Class', British Journal of Sociology, Vol.XI, no.3, 1960.
- Bernstein, B., 'Open Schools, Open Society', New Society, September 14, 1967.
- Bernstein, B., 'A Public Language: Some Sociological Implications of a Linguistic Form', British Journal of Sociology, Vol.X, no.4, 1959.

- Bernstein, B., 'Social Structure, Language and Learning', Educational Research, Vol.III, no.3, 1961.
- Beveridge, W., 'Economics as a Liberal Education', Economica, Vol.I, 1920.
- Beveridge, W., The London School of Economics and its Problems, 1919-1937, Allen and Unwin, 1960.
- Beveridge, W., 'The Place of the Social Sciences in Human Knowledge', Politica, Vol.II, 1936/7.
- Beveridge, W., 'Science and the Social Sciences', Universities Quarterly, Vol.II, 1947/8.
- Blackstone, T., Gales, K., Hadley, R., and Lewis, W., Students in Conflict: LSE in 1967, Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1970.
- Blau, P.M., and Scott, W.R., Formal Organisations, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1963.
- Boardman, Philip, Patrick Geddes, University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 1944.
- Boston, Richard, 'Cambridge and Sociology', New Society, June 12, 1967.
- Bottomore, T.B., Classes in Modern Society, Allen and Unwin, 1965.
- Bottomore, T.B., Sociology. A Guide to the Problems and Literature, Unwin University Books, 1962.
- Bowley, A.L., 'Early Days at LSE' (typescript), 1945, in London School of Economics, LSE: Reminiscences of former students, members of staff and governors, 1922-1947 (unpublished MS collection).
- Branford, Victor, Interpretations and Forecasts, Duckworth, 1914.
- Branford, Victor, 'On the Origin and Use of the Word Sociology', Sociological Papers, Vol.I, 1905.
- Briggs, Asa, 'University Social Studies: The Sussex Idea', New Society, October 18, 1962.
- British Council, Higher Education in the United Kingdom, Longmans Green, 1966.
- British Sociological Association, Annual General Meeting, 1959, Summary of Proceedings.
- Broady, Maurice, 'The Academic Tension in Student Life', Universities Quarterly, Vol.XXI, no.4, September 1967.

Broom, L., and Selznick, P., Sociology. A Text with Adapted Readings, 3rd ed., Harper and Row, New York, 1963.

Burton, Nancy, 'A Sandwich Course in Sociology', Universities Quarterly, Vol.XXV, no.3, 1971.

Butcher, H.J., and Rudd, E., (eds.), Contemporary Problems in Higher Education, McGraw-Hill Book Company (UK), Maidenhead, 1972.

Caine, Sir Sidney, 'Economics and Social Science', in Advisory Centre for Education, After the Vith - Where?, ACE, Cambridge, 1962.

Caine, Sir Sidney, Preface to Ginsberg, Morris (ed.), Sociology and Philosophy, A Centenary Collection of Essays and Articles by L.T. Hobhouse, London School of Economics and G. Bell and Sons, 1966.

Campbell, Malcolm B., Non--Specialist Study in the Undergraduate Curricula of the New Universities and Colleges of Advanced Technology in England, University of Michigan School of Education, 1966, . . .

Careers Research and Advisory Centre, Course Comparison Bulletin, Sociology and Social Administration, CRAC, Cambridge, 1966 (and subsequent editions).

Carr-Saunders, A.M., and Wilson, P.A., The Professions, F. Cass, 1964 (first published 1933).

Carter, C.F., Introduction to Hall, S. (reporter), 'Towards a Reconsideration of Curricula and Patterns of Study' (The Gulbenkian Educational Discussion, 1964), Universities Quarterly, Vol.XIX, 1964/5.

Carter, M.P., 'Report on a Survey of Sociological Research in Britain', Sociological Review, NS, Vol.XVI, 1968.

Charity Organisation Society, 'Annual Report of the Council', Reports, 1901.

Chinoy, E., Society (An Introduction to Sociology), Random House, New York, 1963.

Christopherson, D.G., The Engineer in the University, English Universities Press, 1967.

Cicourel, A.V., Methods and Measurement in Sociology, Free Press, Glencoe, 1964.

Clare Market Review (letter on student tutorials), Vol.I, no.3, 1921.

'Clare Market Seen Through', May 1914, quoted by Bowley, A.L., in 'Early Days at LSE', in London School of Economics, LSE: Reminiscences of former students, members of staff and governors, 1922-1947 (unpublished MS collection).

Cockburn, A., and Blackburn, R., (eds.), Student Power, Penguin Books, 1969.

Cohn, Norman, The Pursuit of the Millenium, Secker and Warburg, 1957.

Cole, G.D.H., Essays in Social Theory, Macmillan, 1950.

Cole, G.D.H., 'Review of the Report of the Committee on the Provision for Social and Economic Research, Cmnd.6868 (The Clapham Report)', Universities Quarterly, Vol.I, 1946/7.

Cole, G.D.H., 'Scope and Method in Social and Political Theory' (Inaugural Lecture), in Essays in Social Theory, Macmillan, 1950.

Cole, G.D.H., 'The Social Sciences - A Symposium', Universities Quarterly, Vol.II, 1947/8.

Cole, G.D.H., 'Sociology and Politics in the Twentieth Century', in Essays in Social Theory, Macmillan, 1950.

Cole, G.D.H., 'The Teaching of the Social Studies in British Universities', Universities Quarterly, 1947/8, reprinted in Essays in Social Theory, Macmillan, 1950.

Collison, P., and Webber, Susan, 'British Sociology 1950-1970: A Journal Analysis', Sociological Review, Vol.XIX, no.4, 1971.

Committee on Higher Education, Report, Cmnd.2154 (The Robbins Report), HMSO, 1963.

Committee on the Provision for Social and Economic Research, Report, Cmnd.6868 (The Clapham Report), HMSO, 1946.

Coser, L.A., and Rosenberg, B., Sociological Theory: A Book of Readings, Macmillan, New York, 1964.

Cotgrove, Stephen, The Science of Society, Allen and Unwin, 1967.

Cotgrove, Stephen, 'Sociology in Schools' (letter), New Society, November 7, 1968.

Cox, C.B., and Dyson, A.E. (eds.), Fight for Education. A Black Paper, The Critical Quarterly Society, 1969.

Dahrendorf, R., Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1959.

Dawe, Alan, 'Teaching Modern Britain - Problems and Orientations' (duplicated), Text of a paper presented to a Conference of the Sociology Teachers' Section, British Sociological Association, London, January, 1966.

Dawe, Alan, 'The Two Sociologies', British Journal of Sociology, Vol.XXI, no.2, 1970.

Department of Education and Science, Report of the Committee on the Social Studies, Cmd.2660, (The Heyworth Report), HMSO, 1965.

Department of Education and Science, Statistics of Education, 1965, Part Two, HMSO, 1966.

Donnison, D.V., The Development of Social Administration, (Inaugural Lecture), London School of Economics and G. Bell and Sons, 1962.

Donnison, D.V. et al., Social Policy and Administration, Allen and Unwin, 1965.

Douglas, J.W.B., The Home and the School, MacGibbon and Kee, 1964.

Dugdale, J.E. (ed.), Further Papers on the Social Sciences: Their Relations in Theory and in Teaching, Report of a Conference under the auspices of the Institute of Sociology, London, September 1936, Le Play House Press, 1937.

Elias, Norbert, 'Problems of Involvement and Detachment', British Journal of Sociology, Vol.VII, no.3, September 1956.

Epstein, A.L. (ed.), The Craft of Social Anthropology, Tavistock Publications, 1967.

Ezard, John, 'Sociologists Win the Day at Cambridge', Guardian, June 11, 1969.

Farmer, Mary, 'The Positivist Movement and the Development of English Sociology', Sociological Review, NS, Vol.XV, 1967.

Fawcett, C.W., 'Faculty Organisation and First Degrees', University Bulletin, Vol.III, no.3, 1924.

Fletcher, Ronald, Auguste Comte and the Making of Sociology, (Auguste Comte Memorial Trust Lecture 7), University of London, The Athlone Press, 1966.

Fletcher, Ronald, The Family and Marriage in Britain, Penguin Books, 1962.

Fletcher, Ronald, The Making of Sociology, Vol.II, Developments, Michael Joseph, 1971.

Flexner, Abraham, Universities English, American, German, Oxford University Press, New York, 1930.

Fyvel, T.R. (ed.), Frontiers of Sociology, Cohen and West, 1964.

Gaitskell, H., discussion in Marshall, T.H., 'Summary of the Discussion of the Report on the Teaching of Social Sciences at British Universities', in Institute of Sociology, The Social Sciences: Their Relations in Theory and in Teaching, Report of a Conference held under the joint auspices of the Institute of Sociology and the International Student Service (British Committee), London, September, 1935, Le Play House Press, 1936.

Gans, H., The Levittowners, Allen Lane, 1967.

Gans, H., People and Plans, Basic Books, 1968.

Gans, H., Urban Villagers, Free Press, Glencoe, 1962.

Ginsberg, Morris, 'The Claims of Eugenics' (1932), in Essays in Sociology and Social Philosophy, Vol.I, On the Diversity of Morals, Heinemann, 1956.

Ginsberg, Morris, Essays in Sociology and Social Philosophy, Vol.I, On the Diversity of Morals, Heinemann, 1956.

Ginsberg, Morris, 'Psychology and Society' in Dugdale, J.E. (ed.), Further Papers on the Social Sciences: Their Relations in Theory and in Teaching, Report of a Conference under the auspices of the Institute of Sociology, London, September, 1936, Le Play House Press, 1937.

Ginsberg, Morris, Reason and Unreason in Society, Longmans, 1947.

Ginsberg, Morris, 'Social Science and Philosophy in the Universities', paper read to Section L of the British Association, September, 1937, reprinted in Reason and Unreason in Society, Longmans, 1947.

Ginsberg, Morris, (ed.), Sociology and Philosophy. A Centenary Collection of Essays and Articles by L.T.Hobhouse, London School of Economics and G. Bell and Sons, 1966.

Glass, D.V., and Gluckman, M., 'The Social Sciences in the British Universities', Advancement of Science, July, 1962.

Goldthorpe, J.H., et al., The Affluent Worker: Industrial Attitudes and Behaviour, Cambridge University Press, 1968.

Goldthorpe, J.H. et al., The Affluent Worker in the Class Structure, Cambridge University Press, 1969.

Goldthorpe, J.H., et al., The Affluent Worker: Political Attitudes and Behaviour, Cambridge University Press, 1968.

Goode, W., and Hatt, P., Methods in Social Research, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1952.

Green, V.H.H., The Universities, Penguin Books, 1969.

'A Guide for Applicants' in 16+ Guide: Sociology, Advisory Centre for Education, Cambridge, 1967.

Halliday, R.J., 'The Sociological Movement, the Sociological Society and the Genesis of Academic Sociology in Britain', Sociological Review, NS, Vol.XVI, 1968.

Halmos, P. (ed.), The Teaching of Sociology to Students of Education and Social Work, Sociological Review Monograph No.4, 1961.

Halsey, A.H., 'Education and Mobility', in Fyvel, T.R. (ed.), Frontiers of Sociology, Cohen and West, 1964.

Halsey, A.H., 'Sources for the Teaching of Sociology of Education', in Halmos, P. (ed.), The Teaching of Sociology to Students of Education and Social Work, Sociological Review Monograph No. 4, 1961.

Hammond, P. (ed.), Sociologists at Work, Basic Books, New York, 1963.

Harper, Ernest B., 'Sociology in England', Social Forces, Vol.XI, no.3, 1933.

Harrisson, Tom, The Future of Sociology, Pilot Papers No.4, March 1947.

Hilken, T.J., Engineering at Cambridge University, 1783-1965, Cambridge University Press, 1967.

Himmelweit, Hilde, 'Teaching Social Psychology to Students of Education and Social Work', in Halmos, P. (ed.), The Teaching of Sociology to Students of Education and Social Work, Sociological Review Monograph No.4, 1961.

Hobhouse, L.J., and Westermarck, E., Inauguration of the Martin White Professorships of Sociology, University of London, John Murray, 1908.

Hobson, J.A., and Ginsberg, Morris, L.T. Hobhouse, His Life and Work, Allen and Unwin, 1931.

Hogben, L., Political Arithmetic, Allen and Unwin, 1938.

Hoggart, Simon, 'Peace or War in the Universities - 2', Guardian, October 21, 1969.

Hughes, C.S., Consciousness and Society. The Reorientation of European Social Thought 1890-1930, MacGibbon and Kee, 1959.

Institute of Sociology, Dugdale, J.E. (ed.), Further Papers on the Social Sciences: Their Relations in Theory and in Teaching, Report of a Conference under the auspices of the Institute of Sociology, London, September 1936, Le Play House Press, 1937.

- Institute of Sociology, The Social Sciences: Their Relations in Theory and in Teaching, Report of a Conference held under the joint auspices of the Institute of Sociology and the International Student Service (British Committee), London, September 1935, Le Play House Press, 1936.
- Jackson, B., and Marsden, D., Education and the Working Class, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1962.
- Jahoda, Marie, The Education of Technologists, Tavistock Publications, 1963.
- Jobling, R.G., 'The Sociology of Education: A Traditional Theme in General Sociology and Its Relevance for the Study of Universities', paper presented at the British Sociological Association Conference, Durham, April 1970.
- Joint Universities Council for Social Studies, Report: Social Study and Training at the Universities, 1918.
- Kelsall, K., Sociological Research in Britain (Inaugural Lecture), Sheffield University Press, 1960.
- Kerr, M., Personality and Conflict in Jamaica, Collins, 1963.
- King, A.R., and Brownell, J.A., The Curriculum and the Disciplines of Knowledge, Wiley, 1966.
- Klein, Josephine, 'The Teaching of Sociology', Universities Quarterly, Vol. VII, 1952/3.
- Krech, D., Crutchfield, D.R., and Ballachey, E., The Individual in Society, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1962.
- Kuhn, T.S., The Structure of Scientific Revolutions, University of Chicago Press, 1962.
- Leubuscher, Charlotte, (ed.), Training for Social Work, Papers given at the Nuffield College Conference on the Training of Social Workers, Oxford, September 1945, Oxford University Press, 1946.
- Levy, Hyman, 'Doing their Practicals', (letter), Observer, February 23, 1969.
- Liggett, John, and Wakeford, John, 'Sociology as a Laboratory Subject', Sociological Review, NS, Vol. XII, no. 2, 1964.
- Lindsay, A.D., 'Proposed University in North Staffordshire. Note for the Meeting Between the Exploratory Committee and the Representatives of Oxford, Manchester and Birmingham Universities on June 10th, 1947, at Stoke-on-Trent', quoted in Campbell, Malcolm B., Non-Specialist Study in the Undergraduate Curricula of the New Universities and Colleges of Advanced Technology in England, University of Michigan School of Education, 1966.
- Little, Alan, 'Sociology in Britain since 1945', Social Sciences Information, Vol. II, no. 2, July 1963.

Lockwood, D., 'Some Remarks on the Social System',
British Journal of Sociology, Vol.VII, no.2, June 1956.

London School of Economics, Archives, Academic Board,
1951-52, Agenda for Meeting November 28, 1951, Statistics
for Sociology Degrees.

London School of Economics, Archives, Economics Committee
of Professorial Council, 1925-1927, Memorandum,
'Curriculum for the Final B.Sc. Economics', February 19,
1925.

London School of Economics, Archives, Economics Committee
of Professorial Council, 1925-1927, 'Report of the
Economics Sub-Committee on the Amendment of the Curriculum
for the B.Sc. Economics Degree', December 13, 1926.

London School of Economics, Archives, Faculty of
Economics, 1901-1904, 'Memorandum on the Scope of the
School', n.d.

London School of Economics, Archives, Martin White
Benefaction Committee, File 320/17, Document 1, Letter
from J. Martin White to Sir Arthur W. Rucker, 29 June,
1903.

London School of Economics, Archives, Martin White
Benefaction Committee, File 320/17, Letter to the
President of the Board of Education from the London
School of Economics, December 1918.

London School of Economics, Archives, Professorial
Council Agenda and Minutes, 1902-1914.

London School of Economics, Archives, Professorial
Council Minutes, 1914-18, Set 1.

London School of Economics, Archives, Professorial
Council Minutes 1917-1918.

London School of Economics, Archives, Professorial
Council, Minutes of Meeting on December 1, 1926.

London School of Economics, Archives, The Sociological
Society (pamphlet), n.d.

London School of Economics, Archives, Sociology (B.A.
with Honours in Sociology) 18 May 1925 - 28 July 1925,
File 876:

Letter from Miss Tuke, Principal of Bedford College
for Women, to Sir William Beveridge, May 18th, 1925.
Professor Hearnshaw, King's College, 'Tables of
Classes' sent to London School of Economics, June
25, 1925.

Letter from E.M. Hayden, Registrar of Bedford
College for Women, to W.C. Dickinson, Secretary of
the London School of Economics, listing 'B.A. Hons.
in Sociology Courses Provided at Bedford College
for Women', July 21, 1925.

Letter from W.C. Dickinson, Secretary of the London
School of Economics, to Dr. Eileen Power, July 29, 1925.

London School of Economics, Archives, 'Survey of Sociology Undergraduate Opinion on methods of teaching and Assessment' (duplicated), Sociology Department, LSE, May 1968.

London School of Economics, Archives, 'Recommendations made by the Staff/Student Committee of the Sociology Department, L.S.E., to the Sub-Committee of the Board of Studies in Sociology on the question of the assessment for the degree of B.A. and B.Sc.(Sociology), Branch I' (duplicated), Sociology Department, LSE, 1969.

London School of Economics, Calendars: 1904/5; 1905/6; 1912/13; 1918/19; 1928/9; 1932/3; 1937/8; 1946/7.

London School of Economics, Department of Sociology, Teachers' Guide: Notes for the Guidance of Teachers giving courses for Branch I of the External B.A./B.Sc. (Sociology) Degrees of the University of London (duplicated), External Department, University of London, May 1969.

London School of Economics, 'Director's Report for the Year 1936/7', in Calendar 1937/8.

London School of Economics, LSE: Reminiscences of former students, members of staff and governors, 1922-1947 (unpublished MS collection).

London School of Economics, Prospectus, 1943.

London School of Economics, Review of the Activities and Development of the London School of Economics, 1923-1937, LSE, 1937.

Loomis, C.P., and Loomis, Z.K., Modern Social Theories, Van Nostrand, Princetown, 1961.

LSE Student Union, Interdepartmental Committee Report on Degree Reform, Replies to Questions asked by Staff 7.8.47, University of London, Archives, Board of Studies in Economics, Senate House, File 500A.

Lynes, Tony, 'Personal Service' (review of Titmuss, Richard M., Social Policy: an Introduction), New Society, Vol.31, no. 640.

Mace, C.A., The Idea of a Faculty (An Inter-Faculty Lecture delivered on 17th March 1948), Birkbeck College, London, 1948.

MacFarlane, Alan, 'Population Crisis: Anthropology's Failure', New Society, October 10, 1968.

MacRae, D.G., 'Between Science and the Arts', Twentieth Century, 1960, reprinted in Ideology and Society, Heinemann, 1961.

MacRae, D.G., 'The Crisis in Sociology', in Plumb, J.H. (ed.), Crisis in the Humanities, Penguin Books, 1964.

- MacRae, D.G., 'The Development of Sociology in Britain', in Ideology and Society, Heinemann, 1961.
- MacRae, D.G., Ideology and Society, Heinemann, 1961.
- MacRae, D.G., 'Social Theory: Retrospect and Prospect', British Journal of Sociology, Vol.VIII, 1957, reprinted in Ideology and Society, Heinemann, 1961.
- MacRae, D.G., 'The Teaching of Sociology, Social Anthropology and Social Psychology', in UNESCO, The Teaching of the Social Sciences in the United Kingdom, UNESCO, Paris, 1953.
- Madge, John, The Origins of Scientific Sociology, Tavistock Publications, 1963.
- Madge, John, The Tools of Social Science, Longmans, 1953.
- Mair, Lucy, Introduction to Social Anthropology, Oxford University Press, 1965.
- Mannheim, Karl, 'The Function of the Refugee', New English Weekly, April 19, 1945.
- Mare, Florence (untitled typescript), in London School of Economics, LSE: Reminiscences of former students, members of staff and governors, 1922-1947 (unpublished MS collection).
- Marris, Peter, The Experience of Higher Education, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1964.
- Marshall, T.H., 'The Basic Training for all Types of Social Work', in Leubuscher, Charlotte, (ed.), Training for Social Work, Papers given at the Nuffield College Conference on the Training of Social Workers, Oxford, September, 1945, Oxford University Press, 1946.
- Marshall, T.H., 'Report on the Teaching of the Social Sciences at British Universities', in The Social Sciences: Their Relations in Theory and in Teaching, Report of a Conference held under the joint auspices of the Institute of Sociology and the International Student Service (British Committee), London, September 1935, Le Play House Press, 1936.
- Marshall, T.H., Social Policy in the Twentieth Century, Hutchinson, 1965.
- Marshall, T.H., Sociology at the Crossroads and Other Essays, Heinemann, 1963.
- Marshall, T.H., 'Sociology at the Crossroads' (Inaugural Lecture, London School of Economics, 1946), in Sociology at the Crossroads and Other Essays, Heinemann, 1963.
- Martindale, D., Nature and Types of Sociological Theory, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1961.

- Mercer, B.E., and Pearson, J.B., 'Personal and Institutional Characteristics of American Sociologists', Sociology and Social Research, April 1962.
- Miller, D.C., and Form, W.H., Industrial Sociology, 2nd edn., Harper and Row, New York, 1964.
- Mitchell, G.D., A Hundred Years of Sociology, Duckworth, 1968.
- Mitchell, G.D., Sociology: Study of Social Systems, University Tutorial Press, 1959.
- Mitchell, J. Clyde, 'Are Methods and Techniques Teachable?' (duplicated), Text of a paper presented at the 15th Conference of the Sociology Teachers' Section, British Sociological Association, London, January 1968.
- Moser, C.A., Survey Methods in Social Investigation, Heinemann, 1958.
- Mumford, Lewis, 'Patrick Geddes, Victor Branford and Applied Sociology in England', in Barnes, Harry E. (ed.), An Introduction to the History of Sociology, University of Chicago Press, 1948.
- Neustadt, I., The Teaching of Sociology (Inaugural Lecture), Leicester University Press, 1964.
- Newfield, J.G.H., (ed.), London School of Economics, Department of Sociology, Teachers' Guide. Notes for the Guidance of Teachers giving courses for Branch I of the External B.A./B.Sc. (Sociology) Degree of the University of London (duplicated), External Department, University of London, May 1969.
- Nisbet, R.A., The Sociological Tradition, Heinemann, 1967.
- Onions, C.F. (ed.), Shorter Oxford English Dictionary, Third Edition Revised, Oxford University Press, 1947.
- Pahl, Raymond, 'The Self and Social Order. Thoughts on Reading Erving Goffmann', BBC Radio 3, January 10, 1973.
- Palmer, D.J., The Rise of English Studies. An Account of the Study of English Language and Literature from its Origins to the Making of the Oxford English School, Oxford University Press, 1965.
- Palmer, Vivien M., 'An American's Impression of Sociology in Great Britain', Sociological Review, Vol.XIX, 1927.
- Parsons, T., et al., (eds.), Theories of Society, Free Press, New York, 1961.

- Peel, J. (ed.), 'Details of Courses Mainly Concerned with Sociological Theory and Methods in 29 British Universities' (duplicated), 15th Conference of the Sociology Teachers' Section, British Sociological Association, London, January 1968.
- Platt, Jennifer, 'Sociology at Sussex', in 16+ Guide: Sociology, Advisory Centre for Education, Cambridge, 1967.
- Plumb, J.H. (ed.), The Crisis in the Humanities, Penguin Books, 1964.
- Radcliffe-Brown, A.R., Structure and Function in Primitive Society, Cohen and West, 1952.
- Rex, John, Key Problems in Sociological Theory, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1961.
- Rex, John, 'Which Path for Sociology?', New Society, No. 210, October 6, 1966.
- Riesman, David, Constraint and Variety in American Education, Doubleday Anchor Books, New York, 1958.
- Rose, Jasper, and Ziman, John, Camford Observed, Gollancz, 1964.
- Rudd, E., 'Student unrest: can we get the facts straight?' in Butcher, H.J., and Rudd, E. (eds.), Contemporary Problems in Higher Education, McGraw-Hill Book Company (UK), Maidenhead, 1972.
- Runciman, W.G., Relative Deprivation and Social Justice, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966.
- Runciman, W.G., Social Science and Political Theory, Cambridge University Press, 1963.
- Scott, W.H., 'Industrial Sociology in Degree Courses', in Advisory Centre for Education, 16+ Guide: Sociology, ACE, Cambridge, 1967.
- Selvin, H., 'The Teaching of Sociological Methodology in the United States of America', International Social Science Journal, Vol. XV, 4, 1963.
- Shils, Edward, 'The Calling of Sociology', in Parsons, T. et al., (eds.), Theories of Society, Free Press, New York, 1961.
- Sibley, E., The Education of Sociologists in the United States, Russell Sage Foundation, New York, 1963.
- Simey, T.S., Principles of Social Administration, Oxford University Press, 1937.
- Simey, T.S., Social Science and Social Purpose, Constable, 1968.

- Simey, T.S., and Simey, M.B., Charles Booth, Social Scientist, Oxford University Press, 1960.
- Simon of Wythenshawe, Lady (Shena D. Simon) (untitled MS) in London School of Economics, LSE: Reminiscences of former students, members of staff and governors, 1922-1947 (unpublished MS collection).
- Slack, K., Social Administration and the Citizen, Michael Joseph, 1966.
- Sloman, A.E., 'The Pursuit of Learning', Listener, November 21, 1963.
- Sloman, A.E., A University in the Making (Reith Lectures 1963), British Broadcasting Corporation, 1964.
- Smith, Marjorie, Professional Education for Social Work in Britain, Allen and Unwin, 1952.
- Sociological Papers, Vols. I-III, 1905-1907.
- Sociological Society, 'Report of the Martin White Benefaction Committee', in Sociological Society, Second Annual Report of the Council for the Year 1905, 1906.
- Spencer, Herbert, The Study of Sociology, Kegan Paul, 1908.
- Sprott, W.J.H., Review of Parsons, T., The Structure of Social Action, British Journal of Sociology, Vol. I, 1950.
- Sprott, W.J.H., Sociology at the Seven Dials, (L.T. Hobhouse Memorial Lecture No. 32), London School of Economics, 1967.
- Steen, J. (ed.), The Random House Dictionary of the English Language, Random House, New York, 1967.
- Stone, F.S., 'Research in the Social Sciences', Universities Quarterly, Vol. II, 1947/8.
- Taylor, Laurie, 'Psychology and Sociology: Interdisciplinary Teaching', Bulletin of the British Psychological Society, Vol. XX, 66, January 1967.
- Thouless, R.H., General and Social Psychology, 2nd ed., University Tutorial Press, 1937.
- Timasheff, N.S., Sociological Theory: Its Nature and Growth, Random House, New York, 1957.
- Times Literary Supplement, Review article, 'Sociological Studies', August 25, 1960.
- Titmuss, Richard M., Essays on the Welfare State, Allen and Unwin, 1958.

Tropp, Asher, 'The Present State and Development of Professional Sociology', Report of a Conference of the British Sociological Association, London, 1956, BSA Bulletin, No.1, October 1956.

UNESCO, The Teaching of the Social Sciences in the United Kingdom, UNESCO, Paris, 1953.

Universities Bureau of the British Empire, Facilities Available at University Institutions of Great Britain and Ireland, London, 1936.

Universities Grants Committee, Returns from Universities and University Colleges in Receipt of Treasury Grant, Academic Year 1959/60, Cmnd.1489, HMSO, 1961.

Universities Quarterly, Editorial Notes, 'The Scarborough Report', Vol.I, no.3, May 1947.

University of Aston in Birmingham, Faculty of Social Sciences, Prospectus 1969/70.

University of Birmingham, Calendar 1908/9.

University of Birmingham, Faculty of Commerce and Social Science, Examination Papers 1953, Sociology III, Social Structure.

University of Birmingham Guild of Undergraduates, Lecture System Enquiry Report, 1936.

University of Cambridge, Calendar 1889.

University of Cambridge, Student's Handbook 1960/61, Cambridge University Press, 1960.

University of Durham, Department of Social Theory and Institutions, The Sociology of Modern Britain, Supplementary Reading List, 1969/70 (duplicated).

University of Essex, Prospectus 1969/70.

University of Kent at Canterbury, Faculty of Social Sciences Part II Courses, June 1969.

University of Kent at Canterbury, Prospectus 1968/9.

University of Lancaster, Prospectus 1971/2.

University of Leeds, Annual Reports: 1937/8; 1956/7.

University of Leeds, Calendar 1909/10.

University of Leicester, Annual Report 1965/6.

University of Leicester, Student's Handbook 1967/8.

University of Liverpool, Calendars: 1906; 1919/20.

- University of London, Archives, Board of Studies in Economics, LSE Student Union, Interdepartmental Committee Report on Degree Reform, Replies to Questions asked by Staff, 7.8.47, Senate House, File 500A.
- University of London, Archives, Board of Studies in Economics, 1939-June 1948, Notes on the Reform of the Degrees: Carr-Saunders, A.M., 'General Nature of a Degree Course', 28.1.47, Senate House, File 500A.
- University of London, Archives, Board of Studies in Economics, June 1949-December 1950, Ginsberg, M., 'Proposal for the Revision of the B.A. Degree in Sociology and the Institution of a B.Sc. in Sociology', November 17, 1949, Senate House, File 500B.
- University of London, Archives, Board of Studies in Economics, January 1950-September 1951, Letter from Professor T.H. Marshall to Professor L.G. Robbins, 26 December 1949 (duplicated), Board of Studies in Economics Document L.
- University of London, Archives, Board of Studies in Sociology, 'Memorandum on Proposed Degree in Sociology', June 8, 1914, and October 16, 1914, Senate House, File 500A.
- University of London, Archives, Board of Studies in Sociology, Minutes, 1913.
- University of London, Calendars: 1902-3, Vol.II; 1906/07, Vol.II: 1913/14.
- University of London, Faculty of Economics, Examination Papers, BSc (Honours) Examination, October 1907 (Internal Students).
- University of London, Regulations for Internal Students: 1920/21; 1927/28; 1939/40; 1949.
- University of Sheffield, Department of Sociological Studies, An Introduction to Post-Intermediate Sociology, June 1968 (duplicated).
- University of Surrey, Prospectus 1968/9.
- University of Sussex, BA Syllabus 1969/70.
- University Teachers' Section, British Sociological Association, Report of a Committee set up to consider Sociology as a School Subject (duplicated), 1964.
- Vulliamy, Graham, 'Teaching Sociology: a New Approach', New Society, March 8, 1973.
- Wade, Nigel, '£60 a week to Teach Manners', Daily Telegraph, January 5, 1973.

Wakeford, John, The Strategy of Social Enquiry, Macmillan, 1968.

Webb, Sidney, interview in London School of Economics, LSE: Reminiscences of former students, members of staff and governors, 1922-1947 (unpublished MS collection).

Webb, Sidney, and Webb, Beatrice, Methods of Social Study, Longmans, 1932.

Weir, D.T.H., 'Teaching Sociological Theory' (duplicated), Text of a paper presented at the 15th Conference of the Sociology Teachers' Section, British Sociological Association, London, January 1968.

Wenley, R.M., 'Sociology as an Academic Subject', Sociological Papers, Vol.III, 1907.

Westermarck, E., trans. Barwell, Anna, Memories of My Life, Allen and Unwin, 1929.

Westermarck, E., 'Sociology as a University Subject', in Inauguration of the Martin White Professorships in Sociology, University of London, John Murray, 1908.

Wootton, Barbara, In a World I Never Made, Allen and Unwin, 1967.

Wootton, Barbara, Testament for Social Science, Allen and Unwin, 1950.

Worsley, Peter, The Trumpet Shall Sound, MacGibbon and Kee, 1957.

Young, Michael F.D., 'Curricula and the Social Organisation of Knowledge' (duplicated), paper presented at the British Sociological Association Annual Conference, Durham, April 1970.