

The Chicago School of Ethnography

MARY JO DEEGAN

The University of Chicago towered over the intellectual and professional landscape of sociology from 1892 until 1942.¹ It reputedly trained over half of all sociologists in the world by 1930 (and it continues to graduate large cohorts, although in a much more diversified and international arena). This large group of scholars fundamentally shaped the discipline through its faculty and their doctorally trained students who produced thousands of books and articles (see, for example, Fine, 1995; Kurtz, 1984). A powerful and prolific subgroup of these sociologists created the Chicago School of ethnography,² the focus of this chapter. This vast enterprise is the subject of considerable, often conflicting, scholarship, and I offer one way to navigate through this sea of ideas.

First, I define a set of 'core Chicago ethnographies' (hereafter referred to as 'core ethnographies') conducted by sociologists affiliated with the University of Chicago. Each sociologist analysed the everyday life, communities and symbolic interactions characteristic of a specific group. The studies were self-consciously identifiable and were based on a shared vision of the discipline and society. They were produced between approximately 1917 and 1942 and usually by the doctoral students of Robert E. Park and Ernest W. Burgess. Secondly, I present a brief overview of the intellectual apparatus underlying these ethnographies that is now called 'social ecology', (and largely indebted to the work of Park and Burgess: for example Park and Burgess, 1921; Park, Burgess and McKenzie, 1925), and 'Chicago symbolic interactionism' (that emerges primarily from the ideas of W.I. Thomas, George H. Mead, and John Dewey).³ These ideas were continued by their sociological students, especially by those who later became faculty at the University of Chicago. Thirdly, I analyse

the controversies over defining the 'Chicago School of sociology' and its stepchild, the 'Chicago School of ethnography'. Fourthly, I briefly examine some major scholars and books exploring the Chicago School ethnographic heritage between 1942 and 1970. Fifthly, I conclude with a few exemplars of this continuing tradition between 1970 and the present.

THE CORE CHICAGO SCHOOL ETHNOGRAPHIES, 1917–1942

Between approximately 1917 and 1942 Park and Burgess trained a remarkable group of students who wrote a series of now-famous ethnographies (see Tables 1.1 and 1.2). These books were often published in the University of Chicago Sociological Series and were introduced or discussed by Park or Burgess. In general, these ethnographies studied face-to-face everyday interactions in specific locations. The descriptive narratives portrayed 'social worlds' experienced in everyday life within a modern, often urban, context (Short, 1971). The investigator 'took the role of the other' (Mead, 1934) in these empirical investigations. A dynamic process incorporating social change, especially disorganizing and rapid changes in values and attitudes (Thomas and Znaniecki, 1918–1920), was emphasized. An openness to people, data, places and theory was intrinsic to the ethnographic process, so a strict set of criteria cannot and should not be applied.

The core ethnographies were significantly expanded and popularized by a related group of books I call 'the Chicago Sociology Studies' (see Table 1.3).⁴ These studies were linked to the core

Table 1.1 *Robert Park's Prefaces and Introductions to Chicago Ethnographies*

1917	'Introduction', pp. vii-xvii in <i>The Japanese Invasion</i> , by Jessie F. Steiner (Chicago: McClurg)
1923	'Editor's Preface', pp. xxiii-xxvi in <i>The Hobo</i> , by Nels Anderson
1927a	'Editor's Preface', pp. ix-xii in <i>The Gang</i> , by Frederick M. Thrasher (rev. 1936)
1927b	'Introduction', pp. ix-xiii in <i>The Natural History of Revolution</i> , by Lyford P. Edwards
1928a	'Foreword', pp. vii-ix in <i>The Ghetto</i> , by Louis Wirth
1928b	'Introduction', pp. vii-x in <i>The Strike</i> , by Ernest T. Hiller
1929a	'Introduction', pp. vii-x in <i>The Gold Coast and the Slum</i> , by Harvey Warren Zorbaugh
1929b	'Introduction', pp. vii-ix in <i>The Saleslady</i> , by Frances R. Donovan
1932	'Introduction', pp. xi-xx in <i>The Pilgrims of Russian Town</i> , by Pauline V. Young
1934	'Introduction', pp. ix-xxii in <i>The Shadow of the Plantation</i> , by Charles S. Johnson
1935	'Introduction', pp. xiii-xxv in <i>Negro Politicians</i> , by Harold F. Gosnell
1937a	'Introduction', pp. xiii-xvii in <i>The Marginal Man</i> , by Everett V. Stonequist (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons)
1937b	'Introduction', pp. xxiii-xxxvi in <i>The Etiquette of Race Relations in the South</i> , by Bertram W. Doyle
1937c	'Introduction', pp. vii-xiv in <i>Interracial Marriage in Hawaii</i> , by Romanzo Adams (New York: Macmillan)
1938	'Introduction', pp. ix-xvi in <i>An Island Community</i> , by Andrew W. Lind
1940	'Introduction', pp. xi-xxiii in <i>News and the Human Interest Story</i> , by Helen MacGill Hughes
1942	'Introduction', pp. xi-xxi in <i>Negroes in Brazil</i> , by Donald Pierson

All titles published by the University of Chicago Press, unless otherwise noted.

Table 1.2 *Ernest Burgess' Prefaces and Introductions to Chicago Ethnographies*

1930	'Discussion', pp. 184-97 in <i>The Jack Roller</i> , by Clifford R. Shaw
1931	'Editor's Preface', pp. xi-xii in <i>The Natural History of a Delinquent Career</i> , by Clifford R. Shaw in collaboration with Maurice E. Moore
1932a	'Editor's Preface', pp. ix-xiv in <i>Small-Town Stuff</i> , by Albert Blumenthal
1932b	'Introduction', pp. iv-ix in <i>The Taxi-Dance Hall</i> , by Paul Goalby Cressey
1932c	'Editor's Preface', pp. ix-xii in <i>The Negro Family in Chicago</i> , by Edward Franklin Frazier
1939/1951	'Preface', pp. iii-ix in <i>The Negro Family in the United States</i> , by Edward Franklin Frazier

All titles published by the University of Chicago Press.

ethnographies in the following way. These studies generally used more statistical data, and these data were usually combined with a series of qualitative techniques such as interviews, face-to-face interactions and life histories. These studies shared the epistemological assumptions of the core ethnographies and combined them with macro-structural patterns, such as rates of suicides [Cavan, 1928] and incarceration [Reckless, 1933]. A dynamic process was emphasized that was receptive to people's language and triangulated data. The sociologists tended to be doctoral students at the University of Chicago, studying with Park and Burgess, but especially with Burgess.⁵ Because of my focus here, I only refer to the related Chicago studies when they illustrate an important feature of the core ethnographies.

These slippery definitions of sociology and ethnography are exemplified in the core ethnography of Charles Johnson [1934], Park's student, who analysed Jim Crow segregation in the South.

This study enlarged the boundaries of 'Chicago' ethnographic sociology on important dimensions. Thus his work extended the urban focus of many Chicago ethnographies to a rural setting. More than any other book introduced by Park, Johnson's volume employed quantitative data and stressed an anthropological 'South/developing' world-view. In addition, Johnson analysed 'folk societies' within the 'natural history' framework. He emphasized marginal people' [Park, 1934: xii] and documented the plantation as a major institution in the lives of disenfranchised black farmers many years after the Civil War ended. Johnson interpreted the plantation system in an international context requiring ethnographic study and analysis. This ethnography is more political and macro in orientation than most of the core ethnographies, and it is more similar to the related Chicago sociology studies. Both sets of studies employ an analogous approach to using data and thinking about communities.

Table 1.3 *A Selective List of Chicago School Studies Related to the Core Chicago Ethnographies*

1927	E.R. Mowrer, <i>Family Disorganization</i> , with 'Foreword' by Ernest W. Burgess, pp. vii-xi
1928	Ruth Shonle Cavan, <i>Suicide</i> , with 'Introduction' by Ellsworth Faris, pp. xi-xvii
1928	Vivien M. Palmer, <i>Field Studies in Sociology: A Student's Manual</i> , with 'Introduction' by Ernest W. Burgess, pp. vii-viii
1929	Ernest W. Burgess (ed.), <i>Personality and the Social Group</i> , with 'Preface' by Ernest W. Burgess, pp. vii-ix
1931	Ackerson Luton, <i>Children's Behavior Problems</i> , with 'Editor's Preface' by Ernest W. Burgess, p. ix
1932	E.R. Mowrer and Harriet Mowrer, <i>Domestic Discord</i>
1932	E.R. Mowrer, <i>The Family</i> ^a
1933	Heinrich Klüver, <i>Behavior Mechanisms in Monkeys</i> , with 'Editor's Foreword' by Ernest W. Burgess, p. x
1933	Walter C. Reckless, <i>Vice In Chicago</i>
1938	Ruth S. Cavan and Katherine H. Ranck, <i>The Family and the Depression</i> , with 'Introduction' by Paul S. Schroeder and Ernest W. Burgess, pp. vii-xiii
1938	Clifford R. Shaw, Henry D. McKay and James F. McDonald with Special Chapters by Harold B. Hanson and Ernest W. Burgess, <i>Brothers in Crime</i>
1939	Robert E.L. Faris and H. Warren Dunham, <i>Mental Disorders in Urban Areas</i> , with 'Introduction' by Ernest W. Burgess, pp. ix-xx
1940	Nels Anderson, <i>Men on the Move</i>

All titles published by the University of Chicago Press.

^aDedicated to Ernest W. Burgess.

ROBERT E. PARK AND ERNEST W.
BURGESS AND THE WEAVING
OF CHICAGO SOCIOLOGY AS
A THEORETICAL TAPESTRY

Robert E. Park and Ernest W. Burgess dramatically shaped and honed the skills of their students and colleagues who contributed collectively to the identifiable theory and style of scholarship known worldwide as 'Chicago sociology' (Faris, 1967). This chapter draws attention to a defining component of that process: the seventeen influential books that Park encouraged and for which he wrote prefaces and introductions from 1917 to 1942 (see Table 1.1) and the six influential books⁶ that Burgess encouraged and for which he wrote prefaces and introductions from 1930 to 1939 (see Table 1.2). These works, and Park and Burgess' mentorship, emerged in a complex mix of intellectual trends in the city of Chicago and its leading academy: the University of Chicago. Park and Burgess were not, therefore, isolated 'great men', but worked squarely within a long, collective intellectual tradition beginning in 1892 (Deegan, 1988).

Park's and Burgess' questions, interests, criticism and support molded and enhanced the sociological labors of the authors of the core ethnographies. The works appear diverse, but Park and Burgess drew from each ethnography to generate a coherent and evolving theoretical vision. The result is a veritable tapestry of patterns that retain the individual style and distinctive interests of each sociologist while the prefaces and introductions realize the explicit

aim to place each study in a larger, ever-expanding conceptual framework.

**The Theoretical Tapestry
of the Chicago Ethnographies**

Park and Burgess, in the role of dissertation advisors, influenced the form and content of numerous sociological studies, including most of those noted in Tables 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3.⁷ Doctoral professors hold powerful positions in a *rite de passage* wherein students become professional sociologists:

The sociology dissertation process is a liminal journey, a passage characterized by ambiguity, uncertainty, and crisis in which the student self is abandoned and a new professional self claims a world of power, authority, maturity, and responsibility. (Deegan and Hill, 1991: 322)

Although each student's interests were unique, Park and Burgess held a common focus, generating a network of collegial friends who asked and answered interrelated questions. With Park and Burgess' guidance, their students wove a 'theoretical tapestry' in which patterns emerged and reinforced each other for more than four decades.⁸

Park's and Burgess' integrative style of theorizing involved numerous 'conversations'⁹ with students and colleagues that collectively generated the mind, self and community characteristic of the Chicago School of sociology. They acted as stewards, shepherding and recommending manuscripts for publication by the University of Chicago Press.¹⁰ This

dynamic, interactive and collegial process resulted in a systematic theory and method that is misunderstood by many interpreters today.

Most sociological commentators employ a 'great man' model focusing on individually defined thinkers such as Max Weber, Emile Durkheim or Karl Marx. This authoritative, patriarchal model fits neither Park and Burgess' intellectual style nor their theory of society. The Chicago ethnographies vividly depicted everyday life and revealed communities 'with unity and charm' [Park, 1929a: vii]. The books were intended for undergraduate classrooms and (unlike formal, European theorists) spurned complex, abstract theoretical language. Park and Burgess' contribution to the theoretical tapestry of Chicago sociology, their conversational insight and sociological world-view were echoed and articulated in hundreds of subsequent books and articles. The volumes discussed below are vital to the Chicago project and to an adequate understanding of Park and Burgess' theoretical vision.

Curiously, although Park and Burgess co-authored major texts together, taught the same students, created a body of interrelated ethnographies, and influenced each other over a number of years, Park is surrounded by a veritable industry (such as Gubert and Tomasi, 1994; Lal, 1990; Lindner, 1996; Matthews, 1977; Rauschenbush, 1979; Shils, 1991) while Burgess (1973, 1974) has had only two anthologies posthumously collected. Although Park provided more prefaces and introductions to the ethnographies, they shared the training of the students. Considerably more information is available on Park, therefore, than on Burgess, and much of this information is seriously biased. Accordingly, although Burgess wrote prefaces for E. Franklin Frazier's *The Negro Family in Chicago* [1932] and *The Negro Family in the United States* [1939], Hughes ([1963] 1974) wrote only about Park's influence on Frazier in the latter's obituary. Similarly, Lindner (1996: 83-4, 139-45) included Clifford Shaw's *The Jack Roller* [1930] and Paul G. Cressey's *The Taxi-Dance Hall* [1932] as examples of Park's influence, but these books were introduced by Burgess. The latter, moreover, had a particularly long and close relationship to Shaw, discussed further below.

The pattern of overlooking Burgess' contribution disconnects the core Chicago ethnographies from the broad range of related Chicago studies. When Burgess is included within the analyses of core ethnographies, a new pattern appears, revealing a greater flexibility toward combining quantitative and qualitative data; a more careful footnoting of intellectual resources and debts; a more accurate picture of the collaborative role of producing core ethnographies; and a more careful study of individual influences. In other words, if Burgess is studied in greater depth, the analyses of the core ethnographies incorporate more 'Chicago style'

theory and practices within their methodological and intellectual apparatus.

This intellectual approach was systematically influenced by Mead, whose course in 'Advanced Social Psychology' was required for sociology students. After his death in 1931 Blumer continued the course and Mead's ideas. This formed a common background of assumptions about the self, the other, interactions, language and the human possibility to be rational and take the role of the other (Mead, 1934). The majority of the Chicago faculty that strongly influenced the core ethnographies, specifically Thomas, Faris and Burgess, were Mead's students. Although Park was not directly Mead's student, his work was permeated with Meadian roots. Thus both Park and Mead studied with William James; Park studied with Mead's life-long friend and colleague John Dewey; and Park was influenced by Thomas, Mead's student. The combination of this network yielded a theory stressing human flexibility, the importance of the genesis of the self, the definition of the situation, and the role of the community in the social process.

Park's modern supporters repeatedly assert that he lacked a systematic theory (e.g., Matthews, 1994: 36; Shils, 1991: 127). In contrast, I argue that Park and Burgess' system was emphatically collaborative and that their major theoretical conversations can be located in the twenty-two core ethnographies and this dense theoretical commonality. Unlike Shils (1994: 22), I do not claim Park as a 'co-author' of any of the books in Table 1.1, but as 'something of what the Victorians called a "rattle", a nonstop talker' (Matthews, 1994: 37) who helped shape them. Park's 'rattle' reflected the theoretical world-view of Chicago sociologists, and the students and colleagues of Park and Burgess provided concrete information to support or challenge their ideas from 1917 to 1942.

Park's and Burgess' introductory essays, moreover, trace their evolution through interrelated intellectual journeys as I demonstrate below. Every essay connects their overarching ideas with each author's particular study. Taken together, Park and Burgess' essays reveal the evolving continuity and complexity of their ideas - aspects of their work readily seen when evaluated as interrelated, on-going theoretical conversations. The major themes uniting this corpus are summarized below.

Urban Society as a Locus for Social Change

Park wrote that 'human society and civilization are a consequence of the coming together of diverse races and peoples in intimate association and co-operation that we call society' [Park, 1937c: x]. Cities, he argued, emerge from ethnic and racial differences, but he held that the assimilation of these

differences becomes a vital possibility when the differences are mixed in an urban 'melting pot' [Park, 1937c: vii]. Urban life, for Park, was an inevitable movement leading to the decline of differences and diversity. Park divided the world into 'two classes: those who reached the city and those not yet arrived' [Park, 1935: xiv]. His general theory articulates the steps in this global transformation.

The 'natural areas' of the city Research on the 'natural areas' of Chicago was a hallmark of the core ethnographies. They were 'local studies' that documented unique parts of the midwestern metropolis. To Park and Burgess, 'natural areas' were transitional urban structures in which social differences maintained themselves as distinct patterns in a larger, undifferentiated society. Park and Burgess saw these careful, local studies within a comprehensive tapestry pointing from the specific to the general. Park wrote, for example: 'Every great city has its bohemia and its hobohemias; its gold coast and little Sicilies; its rooming-house area and its slums' [1929a: ix].

Chicago's 'gold coast and slum' [Zorbaugh, 1929] abutted each other physically, but created immense social distances such that the respective residents 'cannot, even with the best of good will, become neighbors' [Park, 1929a: ix]. Such 'natural areas' were ecological 'zones' sheltering different lifestyles and customs. Each subsequent ethnography refined Park and Burgess' understanding of Chicago's social mosaic. Zorbaugh's study, for example, linked 'hobos' [Anderson, 1923] who lived in 'the rialto of the Underworld' with gangs in 'little hell' [Thrasher, 1927]. Chicago's 'natural areas' were important pieces in an unfolding intellectual and empirical exploration in Park's and Burgess' analyses of the city as a social form.

Cressey repeated and extended this pattern in his study of *The Taxi-Dance Hall* [1932]. There he cited Zorbaugh's [1929] concept of 'the rialto of the Underworld' that was based on the work of Anderson [1923], as well as Anderson's study of 'the main stem' of the hobo district. Thrasher's 'social disorganization' in 'interstitial areas' was reflected in the spatial location of dance halls [Cressey, 1932: 231]. Thrasher also relied on the maps generated by the Local Community Research Committee (see Map II, p. 59 in [Cressey, 1932]).

Park pushed and coordinated these studies, yet he did not control or directly participate in them (Matthews, 1994: 37), and this was probably true for Burgess, too. This independence of thought appears, for example, in Nels Anderson's [1923] report on homeless men. Anderson (who was in fact a 'hobo' for more than a year before studying with Park and Burgess [Anderson interview with author, 1979]), was sympathetic with his population. Anderson was less judgemental than Park concerning

what constituted the 'inside' and 'outside' of urban society. To Park, however, the homeless man was an 'outcast' who lived in a 'natural area' where his lifestyle was acceptable [Park, 1923: xxv].

The intellectual distance between Park and his students was tangible and is reflected also in Louis Wirth's [1928] volume on the Jewish ghetto in Chicago. To Park, 'the ghetto' was simply another 'natural area'. It was 'a term which applied to any segregated racial or cultural group' [Park, 1928a: viii]. Wirth, however, depicted the Jewish ghetto in its unique historical, cultural, religious and political context. The transplantation of the ghetto from Europe to the United States was unlike other segregated groups, Wirth argued. Anderson's 'hobohemia' could never have been just another 'ghetto' to Wirth, as it was to Park.

The 'natural history' of collective behavior Lyford Edwards' [1927] study of revolution and Ernest Hiller's [1928] analysis of strikes evidence Park's interest in the collective transformation of society. These violent forms of social change established tactics and 'natural patterns' that could be analysed and typified [Park, 1927b: x]. Labor 'strikes' were one step in a series of radical social changes [Park, 1928b: ix] that could result in more encompassing social change. In searching for mechanisms of collective change, Park pointed also to the 'natural history of the career of the African in Brazil', a course Donald Pierson [1942] saw resulting in assimilation within the larger society of the nation [Park, 1942: xxi].

Burgess [1932b: iii] also noted that one of the major goals of Cressey's analysis of taxi-dance halls 'was to trace the natural history of the taxi-dance hall as an urban institution, to discover those conditions in city life favorable to its rise and development, and to analyse its function in terms of the basic wishes¹ and needs of its patrons'. Thus Cressey used symbolic interaction, social ecology and triangulated data to determine the natural history and functions of an urban institution.

Juvenile delinquency Clifford Shaw produced a series of remarkable studies on juvenile delinquency. *The Jack Roller* [1930] is acknowledged as a core ethnography, but Shaw's *The Natural History of a Delinquent Career* (written in collaboration with Maurice E. Moore, [1931]) is often not considered a core ethnography (it is considered a core ethnography here). The multi-authored [Shaw, McKay, McDonald, Hanson and Burgess, 1938] follow-up book is a longitudinal, familial, triangulated study continuing the analyses of the other books (the third book is considered a related Chicago school study here). In the latter book, *Brothers in Crime*, the original jack roller and his four felonious brothers comprised a familial group of criminals whose crimes began in their youth.

By 1938, Shaw had produced two books on the 'original' delinquent and had known this person for sixteen years [Shaw, 1938: x]. Multiple, longitudinal methods were used in the last, most complex study, and an array of Chicago institutions supported the work. Burgess wrote a separate chapter, instead of a preface, for this text.

Shaw is widely recognized for his central role in the 'life history' or 'biographical' (e.g., Lindner, 1996: 139–45) method, but most of these critiques are reductionistic. Lindner (1996: 144) exemplifies this type of view: 'Essentially, however, Shaw's findings boil down to sociological "translations" of psychological prejudices.' The use of 'case histories ... from the records of case-work agencies, courts, correctional institutions, schools, behavior clinics, from interviews with friends and relatives of the brothers, and from autobiographical documents and personal interviews with the boys themselves' [Shaw et al., 1938: x] are 'outside' ethnography or 'sociological theorizing' while other, similar works are 'inside' this circle. Here, Shaw's first two books are considered core ethnographies and are directly linked to the third, related volume. All were deeply influenced by Burgess.

Women and the changing division of labor

Frances Donovan's [1929] study was the only Parkian monograph focused on social changes affecting women. *The Saleslady* (together with *The Woman Who Waits*: Donovan, 1920), examined the new woman who entered 'into the broader fields of economic life' [Park, 1929b: viii]. Donovan was not a doctoral student, but she earned a Bachelor's degree at the University of Chicago in 1918 and interacted with Chicago sociologists in the 1920s. Park judged *The Saleslady* was not an academic work, but surmised it would sell and, perhaps, inspire other 'insider' books by occupational practitioners.¹² Park's resistance to 'the new woman'¹³ was consistent with his ambivalent response to Donovan's clearly excellent work (Deegan, 1988: 199). When a woman wrote on a topic more central to Park's interests, however, he could be enthusiastic, like he was with the work of Helen MacGill Hughes, discussed next.

Newspapers

Information is crucial to modern society, and newspapers fascinated Park, a former reporter. He strongly supported Helen MacGill Hughes' [1940] attempt to define 'news' and distinguish it from other types of information, 'rumor and gossip, for example, and propaganda' [Park, 1940: xii]. Newspapers are part of popular culture, together with movies and popular literature, wrote Park [1940: xxiii]. Newspapers worldwide actively change how events are chronicled and remembered, a point Park [1940: xxii] found significant.

The 'human interest story' is an especially influential medium of change. Such stories reflect:

... a universal element in the news. It is what gives the news story its symbolic character. It is the ability to discover and interpret the human interest in the news that gives the reporter the character of a literary artist and the news story the character of literature. It is in the human interest story that the distinction between the news story and fiction story tends to disappear. [Park, 1940: xxi]

To Park, newspapers recorded – and sometimes fabricated – the life history of a person and people. Human interest stories present 'natural areas' to people who live outside their boundaries. Nonetheless, wrote Park, it is sociologists – not reporters – who write 'the big news' and have the time and privilege to thoroughly examine a social question or behavior.

Small town life Albert Blumenthal's study of *Small Town Stuff* [1932] is a fascinating contrast to the frequent urban emphasis of other core Chicago ethnographies. Blumenthal followed the participant observation model and lived in his small community for an extended period. Introduced by Burgess, Blumenthal's work is often overlooked in discussions of these ethnographies. Thus the books on Park (e.g. Lal, 1990; Rauschenbush, 1979) have ignored Blumenthal's work and even work intending to study the sociological methods of the ethnographies (e.g. J. Platt, 1996) have done so.

Race and the Nation-State

A major theme in Park's outlook was the race question. Social isolation and inbreeding created the worldwide diversity of people and culture [Park, 1937a: x]. Park held that segregation ends abruptly when faced with changing technology and new social customs. Patterns of difference combine and mingle in modernizing nations. The initial clash of peoples, exacerbated by visible physiological differences, could result in either 'a nation within a nation' (à la Booker T. Washington [Park, 1942: xx]), exemplified by the situation of African Americans; or in a 'melting pot,' as in Brazil [Park, 1942: xvi]. Harold Gosnell's [1935] study of 'Negro politicians' showed how African Americans were then entering the 'wider' civic domain. A new middle class created 'a transfer of political power' [Park, 1935: xxiv]. This was also a 'human interest story' that captured the popular imagination [Park, 1935: xxv; Park, 1940].

'Race relations have everywhere so largely determined the structure of human society,' wrote Park [1937a: viii], that race itself is an organizing rule for social order. Park thereby analysed race as a 'macro-level' process embodied in individuals who live in specific groups. Park's conception surpasses the limitations of a face-to-face, social psychology of race. His sociology of race relations contains important epistemological assumptions that deserve

consideration in modern evaluations of his work. Frazier's series of studies of American race relations, especially his work on the Negro family [1932, 1939/1951], connected patterns of discrimination with family patterns, one of the most pressing areas of research in race relations. Burgess [1939/1951: iii] explicated Frazier's work as an important international landmark similar to Thomas and Znaniecki's (1918–1920) research on the Polish peasant.

Creating the urban melting pot Park idealized homogenous cultures wherein differences between racial and cultural groups disappear. In Park's mind, this 'melting pot' has interim stages where differences are maintained, bounded and cherished. Everett Stonequist's [1937] 'marginal man', however, crosses cultures within his personal experience, becoming a micro-level force for macro-level change and 'advancement' of the differing groups he represents. The 'mulatto' is an exemplar of a person between two worlds who helps society move toward mutual understanding and more homogeneity [Park, 1937a].

Park conceived that understanding between the demarcated worlds within the melting pot would dissolve its internal boundaries. In this context, Hawai'i and Brazil were, for Park, models of assimilation, whereas the rural South in the United States was a backwater of prejudice and social stagnation. Hawai'i, to Park, was 'the most notable instance of a melting-pot of the modern world' [1938: xiv]. Andrew Lind [1938] traced the 'cycle' of social changes in Hawai'i as a function of changes in land use: a 'succession' in an ecological model of change. In Donald Pierson's [1942] study of Brazil, the African 'diaspora' [Park, 1942: xx] resulted in intermarriage and 'assimilation': 'the Aryanization of the African' [Park, 1942: xvii]. Both Hawai'i and Brazil, Park observed, exhibited a dramatically different acceptance of racial differences than was evidenced by racial patterns in the southern United States.

Barriers to the melting pot in the United States E. Franklin Frazier's [1939] study of the Negro family was comparable to W.I. Thomas and Florian Znaniecki's *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America* (1918–1920), according to Ernest Burgess [1939/1951: iv]. The influence of neighborhood yielded family patterns that were 'not a matter so much of race as of geography' [Burgess, 1932c: xi]. Variations in behavior arose from the community situation, not from innate traits [p. xi]. Frazier [Burgess, 1939/1951: v] also documents the mother/child bond as the primary one in African American life and the family as a social product. Unlike Park, Burgess [1939/1951: vi, viii] emphasizes democracy and government policy, namely social security, as factors shaping the family and community.

In the rural South Jim Crow segregation obstructed the blending of black and white society. Johnson's [1934] study of the southern plantation, noted above, documented this regional difference from the North. Bertram Doyle [1937] described yet another regional barrier to the melting pot process: the legacy of Southern etiquette in the American South. Doyle showed the persistence of these demeaning rituals and the 'social distance' that they maintained [Park, 1937b: xxx]. Although society changed its formal laws, interpersonal segregation remained. The themes outlined above – social change, urbanization and the race question – were Park's forte, but not his individual creation. His evolving perspective was but part – an important part – of a large, community tapestry of mid-western design.

The Larger Theoretical Tapestry at the University and in the City

Park and Burgess were heirs to a stable tradition of empirical research, focused on the city, passed on by their predecessors (Schutz, 1967) at the University of Chicago. Albion W. Small, the first chair of the Department of Sociology, defined the city as a 'sociological laboratory' as early as 1896 (Deegan, 1988: 37). From Charles Zueblin, Park inherited established courses on the city. The Chicago mapping tradition was institutionalized in coursework by Charles Henderson, whose early students charted cities and villages in the field (Deegan, 1988). Burgess was a student of Small, Mead, Thomas and Henderson; while Thomas, who brought Park to the University of Chicago, profoundly influenced Park's thought.¹⁴ Park, Burgess and Ellsworth Faris (the latter a 'silent' Chicago-trained partner/colleague) comprised the selection committee for the University of Chicago sociology series. Further, John Dewey (Park's professor at the University of Michigan) strongly influenced his former student (Matthews, 1977). As Dewey was central to 'Chicago pragmatism' (Rucker, 1969), his epistemological assumptions tied Park to a powerful line of social thought in which Burgess and Faris were trained.

Several University of Chicago departments also supported the work of Chicago ethnographers. For many decades, political scientists, such as Charles Merriam, social workers, such as Edith Abbott and Sophonisba Breckinridge, philosophers, such as George H. Mead, and geographers, such as Paul Goode, encouraged students and fostered the ideas associated today with 'Chicago sociology'. The massive interdisciplinary project at Chicago is at best only partially understood and documented today (Deegan, 1988; Rucker, 1969; Shils, 1994).

Outside the academy *per se*, Jane Addams and the numerous colleagues who shared her life at

Hull-House, the famous social settlement,¹⁵ also shaped the intellectual and empirical traditions of the Chicago School of sociology (Deegan, 1988). For example, Mary McDowell, a former Hull-House resident, sponsored Anderson's initial work.¹⁶ Organizations founded and maintained by Hull-House residents provided data for many authors (Wirth, Shaw, Anderson and Zorbaugh, among others). More broadly, Chicago ethnographers (with little or no acknowledgement) used records provided by entities with Hull-House ties: the Institute for Juvenile Research, the Juvenile Court, various Chicago social settlements, and myriad social welfare agencies. Hull-House and its residents contributed directly to the Chicago ethnographies sponsored by Park – albeit recognition of this fact is muted in most scholarship on the Chicago School (Deegan, 1988; Platt, 1996).

Other important influences on the core ethnographies must also be noted. These include the School of Social Service Administration and its faculty, especially Edith Abbott and Sophonisba Breckinridge (Deegan, 1988, 1991, 1996). Chicago philanthropists, especially Helen Culver and Ethel Sturgess Dummer (Platt, 1992), financed numerous research endeavors of Chicago sociologists. The Chicago Urban League was vital to Park's students who studied African Americans (Matthews, 1977: 176–7). Finally, the 'literary realism' movement gave energy and form to Chicago sociology (Cappetti, 1993). This broad conglomeration of cultural, social welfare, urban, and civic forces influenced the Chicago school of sociology in virtually countless and complex ways. Another dimension of the core ethnographies is found in the Chicago graduates who deliberately extended the original corpus, discussed next.

Core Chicago ethnographies and a selective group of related Chicago School studies A large, fascinating group of books and articles were generated by Park and Burgess and their students that were related to the core ethnographies. Only a few of these related studies are examined here, but they show the pattern of expanding the influence of the core ethnographies (Table 1.3;¹⁷ see Kurtz, 1984 for a longer list). Burgess, for example, edited a collection of papers presented in 1928 at the American Sociological Society meetings. Thomas was then president of the society, and the papers continued his theoretical and methodological work. Many Chicago allies were included, for example, Thomas, Reuter, Park, Hughes, Hayner, R.E.L. Faris, Gosnell, Shaw and Reckless.

Similarly, Walter C. Reckless authored a complex and comprehensive book on *Vice In Chicago* [1933], extending the work of the Chicago ethnographers and, in particular, the 1911 report of the Chicago Vice Commission, *The Social Evil in*

Chicago, submitted by Thomas among others (Deegan, 1988: 207). With five maps and seventy-eight tables, this quantitative, qualitative, historical study was a *tour de force*, drawing on more than twenty years of research on the city of notorious gangsters such as Al Capone and John Dillinger.

Robert E.L. Faris (son of Ellsworth Faris) and H. Warren Dunham conducted a massive ecological study of schizophrenia and other psychoses in their tome *Mental Disorders in Urban Areas* [1939]. Their first chapter summarizes and reviews many core ethnographies sponsored by their teachers (including the senior Faris), fellow students and colleagues. Faris and Dunham [1939] explicitly connect quantitative and qualitative analyses into a unit of analysis.

Ruth Shonle Cavan's study of *Suicide* [1928], with an introduction by Ellsworth Faris, also utilizes quantitative and qualitative analyses and sensitively reprints large selections from the diaries of two women who killed themselves. Although Cavan does not explicitly draw on gender, her perspective was gendered and supportive to women. Since Cavan could never have face-to-face interaction with the deceased subjects, technically she did not conduct an ethnography. Her style of analysis, however, closely followed that of the core ethnographies.

The family studies of Ernest Russell Mowrer and Harriet Mowrer – *Domestic Discord* [Mowrer and Mowrer, 1932] (the only volume to explicitly acknowledge her collegial and substantial work),¹⁸ *The Family* [E.R. Mowrer, 1932] and *Family Disorganization* [E.R. Mowrer, 1927] – provide a 'Chicago' analysis of a stable yet changing social relationship. Their work counterbalances the emphasis on delinquents, migrants and anonymous relations often found in the core ethnographies. These books emerge primarily from the influence of Burgess and Thomas.

By 1940 Anderson had critically and prematurely described his 1923 book on hoboes as dated. In 1931 he wrote a cynical satire about himself and his research: 'I cleansed my soul by transferring all the old emotions about *The Hobo* to one Dean Stiff, anonymous author of the parody' [Anderson, 1940: 2]. Rejuvenated by his disavowal of ideas and style, he once again began studying migrant men.

Most of the authors of the core Chicago ethnographies were prolific and critical. Their many volumes often directly extended or reflected on their earlier ethnographies. In general, other scholars were no more critical of their works, although many scholars act as if these doctoral students never wrote again or never changed and matured. The sample studies included here only hint at this vast, largely unexamined resource for studying Chicago ethnographies. Almost all were sponsored by Burgess through introductory essays.

The 'Chicago School' as a Continuing Theoretical Tapestry

Taken together, the authors listed in Tables 1.1 and 1.2 launched what became a substantial academic industry producing literally hundreds of honorifics, glosses, commentaries, explications, revisions and extensions. The dense, interconnected literature of Chicago scholarship created a powerful, integrated vision of sociology – its practice and concepts – that shaped the discipline from the 1920s to the present (Kurtz, 1984).

The corporate character of this enterprise is not always recognized. A few scholars give little weight to the intellectual skills of Park's students. Shils (1994: 33), for example, asserts that 'practically none of them wrote anything of any consequence after they passed out of the presence of Park'. Instead of this 'isolated great man' interpretation, I view Park's work as more collaborative and his teaching as more durable and effective. As an adviser and conversational partner to Chicago social scientists, particularly doctoral students, Park helped them take what was 'only the first liminal journey during a lifetime of full-fledged academic and scholarly adventures' (Deegan and Hill, 1991: 330). I posit that Park and Burgess' theoretical vision winds its way through the vast and often sophisticated work of the authors of the core ethnographies. Hence, these works, together with Park's and Burgess' introductory essays, are essential to an analysis of the Chicago ethnographic legacy.

THE THEORETICAL FOUNDATION OF THE CHICAGO ETHNOGRAPHIES

Although there are myriad explicit references to Park, Burgess and Thomas in the core ethnographies, the common world-view also emerges from Dewey and Mead, who worked within a large network of academicians, students, activists, family, friends and community and educational organizations in which they implemented their ideas. This vast interconnecting group and associated institutions were anchored at the University of Chicago but included other people, cities and academic institutions such as William James at Harvard University in Boston and Charles H. Cooley at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor. I call this 'the world of Chicago pragmatism', and for our purposes, I focus on Mead here.

Mead's most important book, *Mind, Self and Society* (1934), establishes the social nature of the self, thought and community as a product of human meaning and interaction. Each person becomes human through interaction with others. Institutional patterns are learned in communities dependent on shared language and symbols. Human

intelligence is vital for reflective behavior, and social scientists have a special responsibility to help create democratic decision-making and political action, especially in the city. The scientific model of observation, data collection and interpretation is fundamentally a human project. Sociologists can learn to take the role of others because this is how all humans learn to become part of society (Deegan, 1987, 1988; for a more extensive review of Mead's bibliography, see Mead, 1999).

This powerful and elaborate model of human behavior is usually implicit rather than explicit in the core Chicago ethnographies. Although the Meadian model permeates these writings and social thought, many scholars in this school claimed, or scholars studying their work claim, that the ethnographies were atheoretical. Almost all the authors of the core ethnographies, moreover, were students of Mead (see student list in Lewis and Smith, 1980).

Herbert Blumer called Mead's social psychology symbolic interaction or 'Chicago symbolic interactionism' (for example, Blumer, 1969; Manis and Meltzer, 1980), and it is now a significant specialty within the discipline. This group has a separate organization, journal and approach to training sociologists.¹⁹ Other important theoretical resources were Thomas and Znaniecki's ground-breaking *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America* (5 vols, 1918–1920) as well as other work by Thomas on the definition of the situation (see Thomas, 1923; Thomas and Thomas, 1928; see also Blumer, 1939).

The Introduction to the Science of Sociology, nicknamed the 'Green Bible' for its near-sacred status, was edited by Park and Burgess and first published in 1921. This book guided all Chicago ethnographies, and most sociologists, between 1921 and 1941. This compendium of serious, scholarly writings bears little resemblance to today's slick, corporate product. Other central Park and Burgess writings included their analysis of the city (for example, Park, Burgess and McKenzie, 1925), the press, collective behavior (Park, 1950, 1955) and demographic patterns found in urban life (for example, Burgess 1973, 1974).

The combination of Mead, Dewey, Thomas, Park and Burgess, as well as the other Chicago scholars such as Small, Vincent and Henderson, created a vibrant and flexible theory of everyday life that undergirded the Chicago ethnographies. This theory interacted with the ethnographic methods, discussed next.

THE METHODOLOGICAL FOUNDATION OF THE CORE ETHNOGRAPHIES

Each core ethnography discusses its methods for data collection. Usually these involved multiple

methods (now called 'triangulation') and drew on the methodological textbook of Vivien M. Palmer, *Field Studies in Sociology: A Student's Manual* [1928]. This text was developed under the guidance of Burgess who also wrote an introduction for it (see Table 1.3). Palmer [1928: ix] also thanked Park and the Hugheses, among others, for their help in its development.

Palmer's book complimented the Green Bible, but the centrality of her work is rarely acknowledged in print today. But the book flap for the 11th edition of the Green Bible described Palmer's work as a manual like a 'laboratory manual is to the physical sciences'. It was 'keyed to the principle textbooks in sociology – including *An Introduction to the Science of Sociology*'. Palmer drew frequently on the core ethnographies for her examples, showing the interconnectedness of students, faculty, quantitative and qualitative methods. Thus she presented Anderson's book on *The Hobo* [1923] as an example of mapping (a quantitative technique) that was done under Park's guidance [Palmer, 1928: 73–4]. Palmer [1928: 129–56] also stressed the importance of Thomas' 'life history method', the use of observation [pp. 161–7], diaries [pp. 106–7; 180–2], interviews [pp. 168–79], and case analyses [pp. 200–7].

Mapping had a central role in the core ethnographies as well as an important role in the theory of social ecology. The large maps plotted for the city of Chicago – the sociological laboratory – were stored with other data in a room where students learned about methods, used census data and coordinated their different interests and experiences. Creating a map was often a student assignment, and interpreting its data was stressed (for example, see Palmer [1928: 218–27]).

'The Methodological Note' in Thomas' and Znaniecki's *Polish Peasant* (1918–1920) was also frequently assigned as a way to learn about data collection, especially how to create cases to analyse and to generate a life history document. Blumer (1939) stated that this book and its note were the most central resource in sociology between 1917 and 1939, the peak era for the core ethnographies.

Finally, the student sociologists often lived in the settings studied, walked the streets, collected quantitative and qualitative data, worked for local agencies, and had autobiographical experience emerging from these locales or ones similar to them. Thus Chicago students and faculty employed triangulated methods.

THEORETICAL CONTROVERSIES: WHAT IS A SCHOOL? A METHOD? WHO IS IN A SCHOOL?

The Chicago School of sociology once dominated the discipline and continues to influence it, but this presence was clearly choreographed and dramaturgically

presented. Many contemporary scholars, especially in Britain, are confused by this sociological pattern and are trying to create order out of a method intended to be associated with literary metaphors, human understanding and a bit of flair (Carpetti, 1993) – or maybe 'hype' would be less respectful but more accurate.

Three of these British analyses are summarized here. First, Martin Bulmer (1984) discussed Burgess' place in a 'forgotten' quantitative tradition but neglected his role in a qualitative tradition while his collaborative stance with Park was downplayed. Bulmer's interpretation stresses a dichotomous view of Park as the leader and quantitative work as distinct from the overall project in Chicago sociology.²⁰ Jennifer Platt has a more careful series of critiques of Chicago school ethnologies and qualitative methods (see especially Platt, 1996). Despite her attempt to be exhaustive, however, she overlooked most of Burgess' writings on methods and undervalued the significance of Palmer's work. These crucial errors led her to assert that participant observation methods did not emerge at Chicago until the 1940s and 1950s, but Burgess [1932a: x] was training students in this technique, documented by Albert Blumenthal's ethnography of a small town [1932], that Platt did not examine. By adopting a quantitative framework that counted the number of studies rather than a comprehensive view analysing a person as an embodied researcher, Platt did not find a unique qualitative tradition at Chicago. But deciding if work is quantitative or qualitative is a distinction that fails in a number of cases. Thus John Landesco (1933) used quantitative methods in his study of crime, but he was also a convicted and incarcerated felon. Landesco had a deep understanding of the everyday life of criminals that made him an active participant and a longitudinal observer.

Lee Harvey (1987) tried to debunk the 'myths of the Chicago school' including the myth of 'Chicagoans as ethnographers' (pp. 74–108). Although Harvey is correct in pointing to an exaggeration of the single-minded qualitative approach and the contemporary form of participant observation, he repeats this type of error by denying the recognizable, substantive, unique characteristics of the Chicago ethnographers and suggests that they be called a 'unit' or some other diminutive term as an improvement (pp. 213–20). His reductionistic understatement muddies an already mixed pool of ideas and politics.²¹

Other scholars are engaged in re-cutting the historical pie in such a way that Columbia and their quantitative research methods get a bigger piece. Two examples of this revisionist thought are found in the writings of Dorothy Ross (1991), and Stephen Park Turner and Jonathan H. Turner (1990).

Most of the controversies noted in the section are hotly contested. Less attention is focused on the

more important questions that concern the relation of the core ethnographies to the larger society and the validity of their depictions. In particular, the role of women in the ethnographies – as subjects, authors and colleagues – is problematic. Women as half the population in everyday life are severely understudied and underrepresented in the core Chicago ethnographies. The topic selections are also male-biased, focusing on populations in which men predominate: hoboes, juvenile delinquents, the male patrons of dance halls and gang members. Park and Burgess, moreover, had equivocal ideas about women and politics and actively separated themselves from women as sociologists (Deegan, 1988). The often ambivalent, if not conservative, politics of Park and Burgess is underexamined, as well.

In comparison to the era between 1890 and 1920, Park and Burgess, and their colleagues, ushered in a 'dark era of patriarchal ascendancy' in which the study of women was eclipsed. The critique of sexist ideas and practices in this school (summarized in Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley, 1998) has resulted in little internal analysis or critique. Some Chicago scholars vehemently deny that this pattern ever existed (Deegan, 1995).

Park's loyalty to Booker T. Washington profoundly shaped the political agenda of the race relations analyses, and Park's animosity toward the great sociologist W.E.B. Du Bois limited the application of the latter's more egalitarian and militant ideas within the discipline, especially in the core ethnographies. John Stanfield (1985) demonstrated that archival evidence denies the commonly held view that Park was a significant ghostwriter for Washington or an important advisor to him. The ostracism of African American critics from within the school is clearly documented in the response by the Chicago ethnographers, Park, and Everett C. Hughes to the work of Oliver C. Cox (Hunter, 2000; Hunter and Abraham, 1987). Finally, the legacy of Frazier's Victorian criticism of African American women has been profoundly negative. In particular, *The Moynihan Report* (reprinted in Rainwater and Yancy, 1967) used Frazier's writings to justify stereotyping African American mothers as too strong and independent to be endured by the African American father.²²

The conservative, accommodationist position of the core Chicago ethnographies has been the subject of many debates in African American literature (e.g. Cox, 1944; Green and Driver, 1976; Stanfield, 1985). Despite this voluminous scholarship, largely condemnatory, many sociologists studying the Chicago school of race relations, including Park and his famous African American students, continue to unreflectively praise the Chicago literature and Park's role in it.

Finally, the methodological techniques of collecting and interpreting data are far more sophisticated

today than they were prior to the Second World War. Major qualitative texts refined these procedures and a few are particularly notable. Most recently, and more frequently in disciplines other than sociology, unquestioned assumptions made by ethnographers are under critique. The white, male, middle-class perspective of many Chicago sociologists raises many obvious issues, but more subtle questions, often complex theoretical problems, need to be considered. Thus how does anyone understand the experience of another? How many ways can the same action be defined? Can a stranger ever understand an insider or an 'alien' culture? What is the role of observation and its distinctiveness from voyeurism or spying? What is reality? How important are differences between a sociologist and a subject if they vary by age, race, class, gender, sexual preference, able-bodiedness, or weight? Can anyone be objective? Why should an observer be objective? Each of these questions has been answered by different theorists and in different disciplines (as other chapters in this volume demonstrate).

Continuing the Core Ethnographic Tradition, 1942 to the Present

An easy way to refute the disputed and muddled claims over the existence of the Chicago School, its method and its theory is to read the hundreds of Chicago-style ethnographies. One could devote years to reading thousands of these studies in books and articles, but discovering the pattern, resources and contributions of the school can be garnered by reading the relatively small set of core ethnographies noted here. The tradition established by the early ethnographers was continued in various universities throughout the United States. This was particularly evident after Hughes left Chicago for Brandeis (Reinharz, 1995) and Blumer left Chicago for Berkeley.

An excellent summary of the legacy of the core ethnographies is found for various specialization in Gary A. Fine's (1995) book on the Chicago legacy between 1945 and 1960. Major figures such as William F. Whyte, Erving Goffman, Anselm Strauss, Gregory Stone, Howard S. Becker, and Fred Davis are all discussed there.

The University of Chicago Press institutionalized Chicago ethnographies originally, and it persists in this support through reprints with new introductions. Thus many of the books in Tables 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 remain available to new readers and students. The introductions often provide an overview of the book's reception, audiences and role in sociology and occasionally the larger society. The late Morris Janowitz took an especially active role in this process by editing the *Heritage of Sociology* series. In many ways – in terms of its broad scope, support for Chicago graduates in the

past and the then-present, and its stature within the discipline – Janowitz created a series modeled after the original sociological series sponsored by Park, Burgess and Faris. He continued to teach this tradition in his classes until his retirement in 1979, training new cohorts of Chicago sociologists in the process.

In addition to the *Heritage of Sociology* series, produced on a smaller scale and edited by Donald L. Levine in the 1980s and 1990s, Chicago ethnographies are flourishing in many universities and being published by many presses, especially by the University of California Press. John Van Maanen's qualitative sociology series for Sage Publications, for example, has published qualitative methods books every year, for many years. Not too surprisingly, Van Maanen (1988) is himself a product of the Chicago ethnographic tradition. Norman Denzin and Helen Znaniecka Lopata also edit annual book series often supporting the ethnographic tradition. Similarly, the *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* (founded in 1971 as *Urban Life*) continues to support and publish new ethnographic literature that is produced at a steady and prolific rate.

New departments continue to emerge as institutional resources for ethnographies and these vary by personnel and eras. Thus the University of California–San Diego, the University of Georgia, the University of Nevada–Las Vegas, the University of New York–Syracuse, the University of California–San Francisco, the University of Texas–Austin, the University of California–Berkeley, and the University of California–Los Angeles have been home to such enterprises. The University of Trento in Italy, and sociologists in Poland are two international resources for the elaboration of core ethnographies, as well.

CONCLUSION

The Chicago ethnographers were central figures in the development of a unique Chicago School. They generated a vital picture of urban life grounded in local studies and a sympathetic eye on human behavior. Their contributions to scholarship and a reflexive society are now classics recognized by sociologists throughout the world.

As teachers, mentors, critics, faculty members and gatekeepers to the University of Chicago Press, Park and Burgess structured and abetted the formation of the Chicago ethnographers, their worldviews and their writings. Their students continued Park and Burgess' influence throughout their own careers, and, in time, the next generation of students continued and augmented this tradition.

The theoretical tapestry undergirding the core ethnographies took form in a rich intellectual and social milieu that included other Chicago

sociologists who were Park and Burgess' predecessors and contemporaries. Faculty and students from cognate departments and disciplines, especially philosophy and social work, were also part of this environment. In addition, social agencies and social settlements, principally Jane Addams and Hull-House, contributed fundamental ideas and data to this intellectual project and, importantly, also challenged the men of the University of Chicago.

Today's heirs to the Chicago sociological tradition continue to weave a tapestry in what is now a considerably more complex and diverse discipline. Contemporary sociology is a more national and international endeavor with multiple visions and actors. Within this vast enterprise, however, Park and Burgess and their vision of sociology remain catalysts for the study of human behavior and its embeddedness in specific people and places.

NOTES

1 These dates encompass the start of the Department of Sociology at the University of Chicago and end with the last publication date of the core Chicago ethnographies. Other dates for other topics could be selected and are the subject of considerable discussion. See Fine, 1995 and Harvey, 1987 for examples of this type of debate.

2 The group studied here did not formally call themselves 'Chicago school ethnographers' between 1892 and 1942. They did, nonetheless, consciously self-identify as a group with a specific method. They often called this a 'hands on' or 'getting one's hands dirty' method and contrasted this scornfully to merely quantitative methods or 'armchair philosophy' involving only library research. I asked Everett C. Hughes, a Chicago ethnographer as both a student and a faculty member, specific questions on self-identification and research methods in an oral history interview, April, 1972, held at the University of Chicago for students there. When I tried to get more specific information and probed on their ability to know these things at the time they were emerging as ideas and methods, he gruffly replied: 'Do you think we were a pack of idiots who didn't know what we were doing?' Herbert Blumer, another Chicago ethnographer as both a student and a faculty member, verified this information as well.

3 The effect of W.I. Thomas, George H. Mead and John Dewey is multidimensional and multigenerational. Thus Burgess studied with Mead and Thomas, and the latter studied with Dewey. Dewey trained Park, at the University of Michigan, and Thomas mentored Park at the University of Chicago. See a partial chart of these relationships in Deegan, 1988: 16 and a partial list of Mead's sociology students in Lewis and Smith, 1980: 192–3.

4 Throughout the text the use of square brackets denotes citations of references to be found in Table 1.1 (introductions by Park), Table 1.2 (introductions by Burgess) or Table 1.3 (studies related to the core ethnographies). The

works listed in the Tables are not subsequently included in the list of references at the chapter's end.

5 Burgess sponsored a study of two- and three-year-old children at play that was directed by Dorothy Van Alstyne (1932). Burgess wrote a preface to this fascinating analysis that combined participant observation and quantitative measurement of how small children play. This project was not called sociology and was sponsored by the Behavior Research Fund headed by Burgess. This book is not included in the Tables here but fits the pattern of Chicago school ethnographies.

6 Park's larger number of ethnographic books can be interpreted as an indicator of Park's greater power, the most common interpretation, or of a collegial division of labor between Park and Burgess. In the latter case, they divided the work into two parts with different, compatible emphases.

7 The confused published record makes it difficult – without further archival research – to state accurately which authors in Tables 1.1 and 1.2 were Park's or Burgess' doctoral advisees. There are errors even in the more public records, such as catalogs or lists of staff. I err on the side of caution and see both Park and Burgess as interacting colleagues in the production of the core ethnographies. For some, Park or Burgess may have been a doctoral committee member, a classroom instructor, or simply a like-minded colleague. In all cases, however, Park and Burgess' imprint and acknowledged influence is clear. Lists of doctoral degrees granted at the University of Chicago from 1893 to 1935 are found in Faris, 1967: 135–40 and from 1946 to 1965 in Fine, 1995: 387–403.

8 My theoretical analysis of the ritual collage across time and space is more fully drawn in Deegan, 1998: 151–67.

9 I am using the term 'conversations' as Mead (1934) used it. Conversations are part of the process of creating a self, in this case a professional self (see discussion in Deegan and Hill, 1991).

10 See numerous letters and documents to this effect in the University of Chicago Press Records, Department of Special Collections, University of Chicago.

11 The reference here is to Thomas' concept of 'wishes' as the inborn impulses to have new experiences, security, recognition and response. These wishes generated a large bibliography summarized and used in Park and Burgess, 1921 (e.g., definitions, pp. 488–90; bibliography, pp. 500–1).

12 Park to Laing, 22 November 1928, University of Chicago Press Records, box 154, folder 4.

13 Park's antipathy to women as equals and colleagues is analysed in Deegan, 1988 (discussion, pp. 213–16); Deegan, 1992 (distortion in concepts); Deegan, 1991 (role in generating the 'dark era of patriarchal ascendancy'), and summarized in Deegan, 1995.

14 See, for example, Park [1942].

15 More information on the theory and praxis of Hull-House can be found in Jane Addams' sociological autobiographies (1910, 1930). Charlene Haddock Seigfried (1996) and I (Deegan, 1999) link this work to the ideas of Mead and Dewey as well.

16 Anderson interview, 30 August 1979.

17 Some scholars might argue that some of these books are 'core' Chicago ethnographies, too. Again, I took a cautious definition where the core ethnographies are widely recognized by many scholars, although I have generated this particular term in this chapter.

18 E. Mowrer [1932: x] wrote in the preface of *The Family* that: 'For constant encouragement, stimulus, and assistance the author is under obligation to Harriet R. Mowrer.' The professional collegial status of his wife, who specialized in the same area and was trained at the same school, is not mentioned nor is her assistance specified. He [E. Mowrer, 1927: xv] wrote in the preface of *Family Disorganization* that: 'Harriet R. Mowrer, who contributed to the case-study section both in analysis and materials'. This is the substantive portion of the book, pp. 127–265. The total book is 308 pp. long.

19 Many Meadian scholars interpret Mead's thought very differently from Blumer's interpretation, and this is only one of many controversies in Chicago scholarship (e.g. Deegan, 1988; Lewis and Smith, 1980).

20 For a more detailed critique of Bulmer, see Deegan, 1985.

21 For a more detailed critique of Harvey, see Deegan, 1990.

22 Anthony Platt (1991) believes that Moynihan misinterpreted Frazier, but I do not (Deegan, 1992).

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READING

Unpublished Materials

University of Chicago Press Records. Department of Special Collections, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.

Personal Interviews

Personal interview with Nels Anderson by Mary Jo Deegan. Boston, Massachusetts, 30 August 1979.

Personal interviews and conversations with Ruth Shonle Cavan by Mary Jo Deegan between 1976 and 1993.

Books and Articles

Park's and Burgess' prefaces and introductions, and bibliographic citations of the core ethnographies and related Chicago School studies, are found in Tables 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 respectively.

Addams, Jane (1910) *Twenty Years at Hull-House*. New York: Macmillan.

Addams, Jane (1930) *The Second Twenty Years at Hull-House*. New York: Macmillan.

Blumer, Herbert (1939) *An Appraisal of Thomas and Znaniecki's The Polish Peasant*. New York: Social Science Research Council.

Blumer, Herbert (1969) *Symbolic Interactionism*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- Bogue, Donald (1974) 'Introduction', in *The Basic Writings of Ernest W. Burgess* (ed. Donald J. Bogue). Chicago: Community and Family Study Center, the University of Chicago. pp. ix-xxiv.
- Bulmer, Martin (1984) *The Chicago School of Sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Burgess, Ernest W. (ed.) (1929) *Personality and the Social Group*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Burgess, Ernest W. (1973) *On Community, Family, and Delinquency* (ed. Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr, Albert Hunter and James F. Short). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Burgess, Ernest W. (1974) *The Basic Writings of Ernest W. Burgess* (ed. Donald J. Bogue). Chicago: Community and Family Study Center, the University of Chicago.
- Burgess, Ernest W. and Bogue, Donald J. (eds) (1964) *Contributions to Urban Sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Cappetti, Carla (1993) *Writing Chicago*. New York: Columbia.
- Cox, Oliver C. (1944) 'The racial theories of Robert E. Park and Ruth Benedict', *Journal of Negro Education*, 13 (Fall): 452-63.
- Deegan, Mary Jo (1985) 'Book Review of Martin Bulmer, *The Chicago Tradition*', *Contemporary Sociology*, 14 (May): 365-6.
- Deegan, Mary Jo (1987) 'Symbolic interaction and the study of women', in Mary Jo Deegan and Michael R. Hill (eds), *Women and Symbolic Interaction*. Boston, MA: Allen and Unwin. pp. 3-15.
- Deegan, Mary Jo (1988) *Jane Addams and the Men of the Chicago School, 1892-1920*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.
- Deegan, Mary Jo (1989) *American Ritual Dramas: Social Rules and Cultural Meanings*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Deegan, Mary Jo (1990) 'Book Review of *The Chicago School* and *Myths of the Chicago School of Sociology*', *British Journal of Sociology*, 41 (December): 587-90.
- Deegan, Mary Jo (ed.) (1991) *Women in Sociology: A Bio-Bibliographic Sourcebook*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Deegan, Mary Jo (1992) 'Professional life behind the veil', Keynote address at the Hawai'i Sociological Association meetings.
- Deegan, Mary Jo (1994) "'The marginal man" as a gendered concept', in Renzo Gubert and Luigi Tomasi. (eds), *Robert E. Park and the 'Melting Pot' Theory*. Trento, Italy: Reverdito Editizioni. pp. 55-71.
- Deegan, Mary Jo (1995) 'The second sex and the women of the Chicago School, women's accounts, knowledge, and work, 1945-1960', in Gary Fine (ed.), *A Second Chicago School?* Chicago: University of Chicago Press. pp. 322-64.
- Deegan, Mary Jo (1996) 'Dear Love, Dear Love: feminist pragmatism and the Chicago female world of love and ritual', *Gender and Society*, 10 (October): 590-607.
- Deegan, Mary Jo (ed.) (1998) *The American Ritual Tapestry: Social Rules and Cultural Meanings*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Deegan, Mary Jo (1999) 'Play from the perspective of George Herbert Mead', in George H. Mead, *Play, School and Society* (ed. and intro. by Mary Jo Deegan). New York: Peter Lang.
- Deegan, Mary Jo and Hill, Michael R. (1991) 'Doctoral dissertations as liminal journeys of the self', *Teaching Sociology*, 19 (July): 322-32.
- Donovan, Frances (1920) *The Woman Who Waits*. Boston, MA: Gorham.
- Faris, Robert E.L. (1967) *Chicago Sociology: 1920-1932*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Fine, Gary A. (ed.) (1995) *A Second Chicago School?* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Goffman, Erving (1959) *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, Doubleday.
- Green, Dan S. and Driver, Edwin D. (1976) 'W.E.B. Du Bois', *Phylon*, 38 (4): 308-33.
- Gubert, Renzo and Tomasi, Luigi (eds) (1994) *Robert E. Park and the 'Melting Pot' Theory* (Sociologia, No. 9). Trento, Italy: Reverdito Editzioni.
- Harvey, Lee (1987) *Myths of the Chicago School of Sociology*. Aldershot: Gower.
- Hughes, Everett Cherrington ([1963] 1974) 'E. Franklin Frazier: a memoir by Everett C. Hughes', in E. Franklin Frazier, *The Negro Church in America*. New York: Schocken.
- Hunter, Herbert (2000) *The Sociology of Oliver C. Cox: New Perspectives* (ed. Herbert Hunter). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Hunter, Herbert and Abraham, Sameer V. (eds) (1987) *Race, Class, and the World System*, by Oliver C. Cox (intro. by Herbert M. Hunter and Sameer V. Abraham). New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Kurtz, Richard (1984) *Evaluating Chicago Sociology*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Lal, Barbara Ballis (1990) *The Romance of Culture in an Urban Civilization*. London: Routledge.
- Landesco, John (1933) 'Member of the 42 Gang', *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, March: 967-80.
- Lengermann, Patricia and Niebrugge-Brantley, Jill (1998) *The Women Founders of the Social Sciences*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lewis, J. David and Smith, Richard L. (1980) *American Sociology and Pragmatism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lindner, Rolf (1996) *The Reportage of Urban Culture*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lyman, Stanford M. (1990) *Civilization*. Fayetteville, AR: University of Arkansas Press.
- Manis, Jerome and Meltzer, Bernard (1980) *Symbolic Interactionism*, 3rd edn. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Matthews, Fred H. (1977) *Quest for an American Sociology*. Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press.
- Matthews, Fred H. (1994) 'The roles of Robert E. Park in the Chicago School', in Renzo Gubert and Luigi Tomasi (eds), *Robert E. Park and the 'Melting Pot'*

- Theory* (Sociologia, No. 9). Trento, Italy: Reverdito Editzioni.
- Mead, George H. (1934) *Mind, Self and Society* (ed. and intro. by Charles Morris). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Mead, George H. (1999). *Play, School, and Society* (ed. and intro. by Mary Jo Deegan). New York: Peter Lang.
- Park, Robert E. (1928) 'Human migration and the marginal man', *American Journal of Sociology*, 33 (May): 881-93.
- Park, Robert E. (1931) 'Personality and cultural conflict', *Publications of the American Sociological Society*, 25 (May): 95-110.
- Park, Robert E. (1937) 'Cultural conflict and the marginal man', introduction to *The Marginal Man*, by E.V. Stonequist. New York: Scribner's. pp. xiii-xviii.
- Park, Robert E. (1941) 'Methods of teaching', *Social Forces*, 20 (October). Reprinted in *Militarism, Imperialism, and Racial Accommodation* by Stanford M. Lyman. Fayetteville, AR: University of Arkansas Press (1992). pp. 306-18.
- Park, Robert E. (1950) *Race and Culture*. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.
- Park, Robert E. (1955) *Society*. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.
- Park, Robert E. and Burgess, Ernest W. (1921) *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Park, Robert E., Burgess, Ernest W. and McKenzie, Robert D. (1925) *The City*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Persons, Stow (1987) *Ethnic Studies at Chicago, 1905-1945*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Platt, Anthony (1991) *E. Franklin Frazier Reconsidered*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Platt, Jennifer (1992) "'Acting as a switchboard": Mrs Ethel Sturgess Dummer's role in sociology', *American Sociologist*, 23 (Fall): 23-36.
- Platt, Jennifer (1996) *A History of Sociological Research Methods in America, 1920-1960*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rainwater, Lee and Yancy, William (eds) (1967) *The Moynihan Report and the Politics of Controversy*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Rauschenbush, Winifred (1979) *Robert E. Park*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Reinharz, Shulamit (1995) 'The Chicago School of sociology and the founding of Brandeis University graduate program in sociology', in Gary A. Fine (ed.), *A Second Chicago School?* Chicago: University of Chicago Press. pp. 273-321.
- Ross, Dorothy (1991) *The Origins of American Social Sciences*. New York: Cambridge.
- Rucker, Darnell (1969) *The Chicago Pragmatists*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Schutz, Alfred (1967) *The Phenomenology of the Social World* (trans. G. Walsh and F. Lehnert, intro. by G. Walsh). Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Seigfried, Charlene Haddock (1996) *Pragmatism and Feminism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Shils, Edward (1991) 'Robert E. Park, 1864-1944', *American Scholar*, 60 (Winter): 120-7.
- Shils, Edward (1994) 'The sociology of Robert E. Park', in Renzo Gubert and Luigi Tomasi (eds), *Robert E. Park and the 'Melting Pot' Theory* (Sociologia, No. 9). Trento, Italy: Reverdito Edizioni. pp. 15-34.
- Short, James F., Jr (1971) *The Social Fabric of the Metropolis*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Smith, Dennis (1988) *The Chicago School: A Liberal Critique of Capitalism*. New York: Macmillan.
- Stanfield, John (1985) *Philanthropy and Jim Crow in American Social Science*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Thomas, W.I. (1923) *The Unadjusted Girl: With Cases and Standpoint for Behavior Analysis*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown.
- [Thomas, W.I.], Park, Robert E. [listed erroneously as first author] and Miller, Herbert A. (1921) *Old World Traits Transplanted*. New York: Harper and Brothers. [Reprint, with the authorship of 'W.I. Thomas together with Robert E. Park and Herbert A. Miller', and a new introduction by Donald R. Young. Montclair, NJ: Patterson Smith, 1971.]
- Thomas, William I. and Swaine Thomas, Dorothy (1928) *The Child in America: Behavior Problems and Programs*. New York: Knopf.
- Thomas, W.I. and Znaniecki, Florian (1918-1920) *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America*, 5 vols. Boston, MA: Richard G. Badger. (Vols. 1 and 2 originally published by University of Chicago Press, 1918.)
- Turner, Ralph H. (1967) 'Introduction', *Robert E. Park: On Social Control and Collective Behavior*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Turner, Stephen Park and Turner, Jonathan H. (1990) *The Impossible Science*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Van Alstyne, Dorothy (1932) *Play Behavior and Choice of Play Materials of Pre-School Children*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Van Maanen, John (1988) *Tales of the Field: On Writing Ethnography*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Whyte, William Foote (1981) *Street Corner Society*, 3rd rev. edn. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.