

## Myths of the Chicago School

By Lee Harvey

<http://www.qualityresearchinternational.com/myths/index.php>

### Appendix 6

#### Survey of 42 Ph.D. theses in Sociology at Chicago 1915–1950

The sample of 42 theses was drawn at random from Appendix 5.\*

**Table 1: Usage of Methods**

The following table shows the extent to which different techniques were used in the theses. More than one technique may have been used in a thesis. Major usage refers to a technique upon which the author primarily relied. Supporting usage means that the technique(s) were adopted to provide back-up information. Minor usage means that the technique was used but played no substantial part in the final thesis.

Method	All theses (n=42)		
	Major	Support	Minor
Historical Analysis	10 (24)	9 (21)	6 (14)
Comparative Analysis	11 (26)	1 ( 2)	5 (12)
Literature Review	16 (38)	8 (19)	14 (33)
Life History	6 (14)	6 (14)	1 ( 2)
Participant Obs.	5 (12)	5 (12)	5 (12)
Document Analysis	13 (31)	2 ( 6)	6 (14)
Informal Interviews	11 (26)	4 (10)	3 ( 7)
Questionnaires	6 (14)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)
Scheduled Interviews	13 (31)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)

  

Method	Pre-1940 theses (n=22)			1940–1950 theses (n=20)		
	Major	Support	Minor	Major	Support	Minor
Historical Analysis	9 (41)	7 (32)	2 ( 9)	1 ( 5)	2 ( 2)	4 (20)
Comparative Analysis	8 (36)	1 ( 5)	3 (14)	3 (15)	0 ( 0)	2 (10)
Literature Review	12 (57)	4 (19)	3 (14)	4 (20)	4 (20)	11 (55)
Life History	6 (27)	3 (14)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	3 (15)	1 ( 5)
Participant Obs.	0 ( 0)	1 ( 5)	4 (18)	5 (25)	4 (20)	1 ( 5)
Document Analysis	9 (41)	0 ( 0)	5 (23)	4 (20)	2 (10)	1 ( 5)
Informal Interviews	1 ( 5)	2 ( 9)	3 (14)	10 (50)	2 (10)	0 ( 0)
Questionnaires	2 ( 9)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	4 (20)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)
Scheduled Interviews	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)	13 (65)	0 ( 0)	0 ( 0)

#### Historical Analysis:

10 (24%) Used Historical analysis to determine categories, models or derive theories

5 (12%) Used Historical Analysis to provide a descriptive setting

10 (24%) Concentrated on analysis in terms of 'natural history'

17 (40%) Did not use historical analysis.

**Comparative Analysis:**

- 11 (26%) Made a comparative analysis between two or more counties, states or regions
- 6 (14%) Compared methods, cases etc.
- 25 (60%) Did not use comparative analysis

**Literature Review:**

- 14 (33%) Were based on sociological texts
- 9 (21%) Were based on a mixture of sociology and psychology literature
- 12 (29%) Were based on non-sociological literature
- 4 (10%) Used a variety of sources
- 3 ( 7%) Made no use of a literature review and analysis

**Life History:**

- 12 (29%) Were collected from subjects
- 1 ( 2%) Was based on case records
- 29 (69%) Did not use life histories

**Participant Observation:**

- 2 ( 5%) Complete participant observation
- 6 (14%) Partial participant observation
- 7 (17%) Used casual observation, past personal involvement or other observers
- 27 (64%) Did not use participant observation in any sense

**Document Analysis:**

- 5 (12%) Analysed newspapers
- 5 (12%) Analysed published autobiographies
- 11 (26%) Used letters, case documents, hotel registers or a variety of such sources.
- 21 (50%) Made no use of document analysis

**Informal Interviews:**

- 11 (26%) Used a systematic approach to in-depth interviews (6 were guided interviews)
- 7 (17%) Used an unsystematic approach to in-depth interviews
- 24 (57%) Did not use informal interviewing

**Questionnaires:**

- 4 (10%) Were administered to students
- 2 ( 5%) Were mailed to respondents
- 36 (85%) Made no use of questionnaires

**Scheduled Interviews:**

- 10 (24%) Used formal schedules
- 2 ( 5%) Used flexible schedules
- 30 (71%) Made no use of scheduled interviewing

**Table 2: Attitude analysis**

	All theses	Pre-1940	1940-1950
Made no attempt at att. analysis	25 (60%)	16 (73%)	9 (45%)
Attempted some form of a. analysis	17 (40%)	6 (27%)	11 (55%)

*Of the latter:*

Constructed an attitude scale	6 (14%)	1 ( 5%)	5 (25%)
Used or adapted an existing scale	3 ( 7%)	1 ( 5%)	2 (10%)
Did not attempt to construct a scale of attitudes	8 (19%)	20 (90%)	13 (65%)

**Table 3: Case Study**

	All theses	Pre-1940	1940-1950
Case study approach adopted	17 (40%)	13 (62%)	4 (20%)
No mention of case study approach	25 (60%)	9 (38%)	16 (80%)

**Table 4: Discussion of Methods**

	All theses	Pre-1940	1940-1950
Extensive discussion	13 (31%)	6 (27%)	7 (35%)
Some discussion	19 (45%)	8 (36%)	11 (55%)
No discussion	10 (24%)	6 (27%)	2 (10%)

**Table 5: Discussion of Methodology/Epistemology**

	All theses	Pre-1940	1940-1950
Extensive discussion	11 (26%)	9 (43%)	2 (18%)
Some discussion	10 (24%)	1 ( 5%)	9 (45%)
No discussion	21 (50%)	11 (52%)	9 (45%)

**Table 6: Reformism**

	All theses	Pre-1940	1940-1950
Research directed to reform concerns	2 ( 5%)	1 ( 5%)	1 ( 5%)
Some mention of reform concerns	3 ( 7%)	3 (14%)	0 ( 0%)
Clearly opposed to reform concerns	9 (21%)	8 (36%)	1 ( 5%)
No mention of reform concerns	28 (67%)	10 (46%)	18 (90%)

**Table 7: George Herbert Mead**

	All theses	Pre-1940	1940-1950
Mead's theories/approach utilised	4 (10%)	1 ( 5%)	3 (15%)
Mead mentioned but not utilised	8 (19%)	4 (18%)	4 (20%)
Mead not mentioned	30 (71%)	17 (77%)	13 (65%)

**Table 8: Charles Horton Cooley**

	All theses	Pre-1940	1940-1950
Cooley referenced	20 (48%)	13 (59%)	7 (35%)
Cooley not referenced	22 (52%)	9 (41%)	13 (65%)

**Table 9: William Isaac Thomas**

	All theses	Pre-1940	1940-1950
Thomas referenced	21 (50%)	15 (67%)	6 (30%)
Thomas not referenced	21 (50%)	7 (33%)	14 (70%)

**Table 10: Park and Burgess (1921)**

	All theses	Pre-1940	1940-1950
Major source text	10 (26%)	5 (28%)	5 (25%)
Referenced	8 (21%)	2 (11%)	6 (30%)
Not referenced	18 (53%)	11 (61%)	9 (45%)
Missing	4	4	

**Table 11: Use of Official Statistics**

	All theses	Pre-1940	1940-1950
Extensive use inference/description	5 (12%)	4 (18%)	1 ( 5%)
Some use	12 (29%)	8 (36%)	4 (20%)
No use of official statistics	25 (59%)	10 (46%)	15 (75%)

**Table 12: Chicago references in bibliography**

	All theses	Pre-1940	1940-1950
Up to 20% Chicago references	17 (47%)	12 (71%)	5 (26%)
20 to 40% Chicago references	16 (44%)	5 (29%)	11 (58%)
Over 40% Chicago references	3 ( 8%)	0 ( 0%)	3 (16%)
Missing	6	5	1

\* Appendix 7 contains a review of sources.