ARTICLES

THE CONVERGING LANDSCAPE OF HIGHER EDUCATION: PERSPECTIVES, CHALLENGES, AND A CALL TO THE DISCIPLINE OF SOCIOLOGY*

Across the field of higher education and within the discipline of sociology, several important reconceptualizations of academic work have emerged. While not absolutely in sync, there is a striking overlap across three of the most visible of these: Boyer's Scholarship Reconsidered, Carnegie's Stewardship of the Discipline, and Burawoy's Public Sociology. Putting the development of these conceptualizations into the larger context of shifts in higher education, I briefly review each, putting special emphasis on the synergy among them. However, despite these overarching guides and a number of other noted innovations (particularly in the scholarship of teaching and learning), new challenges have arisen. I end by discussing these new developments, drawing from basic sociological research to provide insights for maintaining gains and pushing these efforts forward. In particular, SoTL and the aging of the cohort of leaders who pioneered these redefinition efforts emphasize the importance of Preparing Future Faculty (PFF) programs, and the placement of new PhDs with this broad vision in PhD-granting departments, as well as in liberal arts colleges and universities.

BERNICE A. PESCOSOLIDO
Indiana University

OVER THE LAST TWO DECADES, higher education has weathered a series of particularly damning attacks. Concerns about the nature and utility of the research we do, questions about the subject matter and manner in which we teach, and doubts about the value of our offerings in the face of the rising cost of enrollment, have all been raised (see Pescosolido and Aminzade 1999 for a review). While most colleges and universities have managed to survive these critiques, what is more interesting and exciting are the ways in which many institutions, disciplines and supporting organizations (e.g., private foundations, professional associations, federal agencies) responded by sometimes embracing, and sometimes capitulating to, pressures to change the organization of the work of the professoriate (Boyer 1990), to shift the classroom paradigm from teaching to learning (Shulman 1999; 2004; 2004), and to create a successful movement in the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) (Becker and Andrews 2004; Hatch 2005; Hutchings 2000, 2002).

As sociologists, we understand that neither the attacks leveled in such colorfully titled books as *Profscam* (Sykes 1988), *Dry*

*Based on the Hans O. Mauksch Award Presentation, Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, New York, NY, August 14, 2007. I thank Carla Howery for her vision and support through the years; Michael Burawoy, Brian Powell, Whitney Schlegel, Jennifer Robinson, and George Walker who have always been ahead of the curve; Jack K. Martin for his role as a sounding board; the ASA Section on Teaching and Learning for leadership; the Department of Sociology, College of Arts and Sciences, and Office of the Vice Chancellor, Indiana University for supporting the development and continuation of the Preparing Future Faculty Program, Department of Sociology, at Indiana University. Please address all correspondence to the author at Department of Sociology, 1022 E. Third Street, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47405; e-mail: pescosol@indiana.edu.

Editor's note: The reviewers were, in alphabetical order, Ed Kain and Kathleen McKinney.

Rot in the Ivory Tower (Campbell 2000), and *Killing the Spirit* (Smith 1991), nor the guides for solutions presented in the more conservatively titled, but nonetheless powerful, books such a *Scholarship Reconsidered* (Boyer 1990), *Women's Ways of Knowing* (Belenky et al. 1973), or *The Courage to Teach* (Palmer 1998) arise haphazardly or randomly. Both Calhoun (1999) and Sullivan (1999) have described the social, political, economic and cultural forces that shaped the structures and processes of higher education up to the turn of the twenty-first century.

Perhaps we know less about our recent history because much relevant contemporary work aims to change what we do rather than put it in the larger, social context. Of course, some disciplines specialize in thinking about higher education or teaching, and those so engaged have lent their voices to the debate (e.g., Bok 2006 on both a critique and proffered solutions). But sociological theories on social movements, stratification, and the professions have given us a sense of the importance of identity politics, critical leadership, and organizational resources that matter in successful institutional social change (Armstrong 2002; Pescosolido and Martin 2004; Tilly 1984). Certainly, anyone aware of these changes will recognize the role and impact of the Carnegie and Pew Foundations, the Preparing Future Faculty Initiative, the International Society for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (ISSOTL), ASA's Teaching Resources Program, and no less important, the growing membership in ASA's newly retitled Section on Teaching and Learning. Further, at the risk of leaving out the scores of individuals who have come together to make this sea change happen, none will be surprised to hear the names of Lee Shulman, Craig Nelson, Pat Hutchings, or sociology's own Carla Howery among those who paved the way.

The purpose of this paper is not to write this much needed intellectual history, nor to argue the merits of the critiques or the solutions to higher education's contemporary dilemmas. Rather, my goal is to point to a convergence, partly expected and partly unexpected, among three critical statements about the work of the professoriate that reflect this changing landscape. As a sociologist, I target the discipline as my first and foremost concern in tailoring these larger, global issues down to our local concerns. However, because these new conceptualizations did not occur in a socio-historical vacuum, I begin with Ernest Boyer's *Scholarship Reconsidered* (1990), generally viewed as a watershed in changing the conversation about higher education. The Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate (Golde 2007) serves as the second exemplar; and while this program specifically left sociology out of its umbrella for funding, it nonetheless offers a clear guide for the goals of any discipline.[1] Its link to the first statement, Boyer's typology of the work of the professoriate, may be inevitable given the interconnections of people and ideas at the Carnegie Foundation and, specifically, the enormous influence of Boyer and his ideas even after his death (see, for example, the work of Glassick et al. 1997; Huber and Hutchings 2005). Nevertheless, the latter does not serve simply as a cognitive map for operationalizing the former; in fact, they do not map on part by part. Surprisingly, it is the third of these, Burawoy's (2005b) call for a "public sociology" that offers the most remarkable consistency with the Boyer scheme. While Burawoy is an outstanding teacher, hailed by his university and the American Sociological Association, there is no clear evidence that Boyer was a direct influence.[2] Rather, I argue that this convergence speaks to a cul-

[1]The disciplines included in the Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate were neuroscience, history, and mathematics. Despite a personal visit to the Carnegie Foundation to discuss the inclusion of Sociology in this program, program staff indicated that those disciplines having the most difficulty in placement and pursuing innovations were targeted.

[2]Burawoy does not cite Boyer in any of his articles on public sociology; and, having served as his Vice President, I do not recall this being

tural resonance among individuals located on different parts of the higher education landscape regarding the nature of what we do and how we can best achieve a set of goals.

Even with this accounting, it would be unwise to assume that all is well in sociology or in higher education. Lest we become complacent, I lay out a set of contemporary challenges to maintain our achievements and our ability to build on these changes and move forward. Drawing from sociological research on major socio-political changes, I end by suggesting that a dual focus on institutionalizing gains and on engaging the new generation of sociologists may offer the best strategy against retrenchment.

NEW MAPS FOR THE PROFESSORIATE: HIGHER EDUCATION, TEACHING AND RESEARCH, AND SOCIOLOGY

Map 1: Boyer's Scholarship Reconsidered

In many ways, Boyer's (1990) book started it all. It was a new perspective at the right time and in the right place. Boyer drew not only from the broader public criticisms of faculty and what they did outside the classroom, but with the disconnect and dismay that many in the professoriate expressed in the 1989 National Survey of Faculty, and to him personally, as he visited colleges and universities as President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Boyer noted that his concern lay not only with society's view of higher education but with the professoriate, themselves, whom he perceived to be increasingly dissatisfied with conflicting priorities on campus (1990:16). Not surprisingly, he was fundamentally troubled by the place that research had come to occupy in terms of faculty time and in the hierarchy of rewards. He addressed issues of faculty rewards, intrinsic meaning of the work of the professoriate, and institutional structures that facilitated or frustrated either.

In his four-fold typology, displayed in Table 1, Boyer saw a basic division of audiences—academic and civic. While Boyer was not explicit about a second dimension, Table 1 suggests that there are diverse goals within and across disciplines of higher education. As a result, the scholarship of discovery, most traditionally associated with research, targets what disciplines do to create basic knowledge within the academy. The scholarship of application, also centered within the discipline, seeks to extend the utility of that basic research or create a bridge between the worlds inside and outside of the academy. This distinction parallels commonplace discussions within sociological subfields; for example, Robert Strauss's (1957) distinction between the "sociology of medicine" and the "sociology in medicine" which use sociological concepts and methods to different ends.

However, the second dimension on the left hand side suggests that professors across universities and colleges share common concerns despite their disciplines. On the academic side, the scholarship of integration requires that the faculty understand both the lines of connections and of differences between their discipline's worldview and others. In current contexts stressing multidisciplinary work, this issue of integration becomes even more paramount. Finally, the scholarship of teaching brings research knowledge—whether basic, applied or integrated—to relevant audiences, including, but not limited to, students. Across the disciplines, the professoriate has the obligation to share knowledge, and that knowledge should come from the scholarships of discovery, integration, and application.

In sum, *Scholarship Reconsidered* lays

---

part of his stock of most relevant cultural knowledge. That said, there could have been indirect influences since Burawoy was very concerned about all corners of the discipline, charmingly demonstrated all of the characteristics of a life-long learner, and wisely sought the counsel of Carla Howery and a very broad-based constituency through a year of extensive travel to regional meetings, numerous departments, and other venues.

Table 1. Boyer's Typology of the Priorities of the Professoriate

	Academic	Civic
Focused Within Disciplines	Scholarship of Discovery	Scholarship of Application
Common Across Disciplines	Scholarship of Integration	Scholarship of Teaching

From Boyer, Ernest L. 1990. *Scholarship Reconsidered.* Published by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

out the multiple tasks that, according to Boyer, reflect the concerns of different historical periods in higher education's past, and organizes them into a new perspective. At least parts of each task traditionally defined as research, teaching, and service are now redefined as either a form of scholarship or reliant upon it. As such, it suggests that the reward system that has come to value only research, as it had come to be narrowly defined, needs to be realigned with what faculty are both obligated and inspired to do.

While not without its critics who argue that Boyer underplays the importance of socio-economic context (Davis and Chandler 1998) or is, at best, suggestive of what the scholarship of teaching is (Trigwell et al. 2000), a number of institutions have used these guidelines to reconceptualize and even to rewrite their promotion and tenure guidelines.

Map 2: The Carnegie Foundation's Initiative on the Doctorate

In 2002, the Carnegie Foundation launched an initiative on graduate education. Focusing on a number of disciplines that either had a history of troubles in student learning or placements (e.g., history, math) or on relatively recent arrivals (e.g., neuroscience), the Initiative sought to reconceptualize the PhD degree as a set of roles, a set of skills, and a set of moral/ethical obligations embodied in basic principles. George Walker and Chris Golde, who led the project, centered their efforts on the notion of "stewardship" to capture the idea of a "shared purpose" (Golde 2007; see also Golde and Stricker 2002), and to complement traditional notions of expertise through the PhD experience, with a goal of providing a "moral compass."

As shown in Table 2, they specifically conceptualized stewardship as having three critical elements: generating new knowledge, conserving the important ideas that are a legacy of the past, and transforming knowledge into explaining and connecting the field to others. Golde (2007) contends that a "PhD-holder should be capable of *generating* new knowledge and defending knowledge claims against challenges and criticism" (p. 10). She goes on to say that they must be able to formulate interesting and important questions, design rigorous methods to address them, carry out these plans, and share the results with professional and non-professional audiences. The aim of conservation ensures that important past ideas are kept alive and that the discipline does not "reinvent the wheel." Members of a discipline should both "know their history" and acknowledge the contributions of those who came before them. Additionally, they must monitor the current body of knowledge with a critical eye. Those ideas which have "outlived their usefulness" are discarded. With both new findings and a store of useful knowledge from the past, a discipline's members must share that knowledge with others. As Golde (2007:11) notes, this transformation "encompasses teaching in the broadest sense of the word," and includes understanding, examining, and sharing a discipline's unique and intersecting space on the intellectual landscape. Effectively communicating about one's own discipline requires an understanding of other disciplines and the ability to communicate across traditional disciplinary boundaries.

Table 2. Walker and Golde's Domains of Stewardship of the Discipline

Domain	Target
Generation Criticism	New knowledge and defending knowledge claims against challenges and criticism.
Conservation Work	The most important ideas and findings that are a legacy of past and current work.
Transformation	Knowledge that has been generated and conserved by teaching well to a variety of audiences; fit with other disciplinary perspectives.

In sum, the Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate reconceptualizes the meaning of the PhD under a broad vision—training should embed an active stance, a sense of ownership, and clear awareness of responsibilities, in addition to providing expertise in theory, method and substance. Basically, it eschews any notion of an isolated researcher or teacher narrowly focusing on some little corner of the academic world. As Golde (2007) states, "Self-identifying as a steward implies adopting a sense of purpose that is larger than oneself. One is a steward of the discipline, not simply the manager of one's own career" (p. 13).

Map 3: Burawoy's Public Sociology

As Burawoy points out, sociologists have periodically asked themselves whether the discipline of sociology matters to anyone outside itself (Burawoy 2004; 2005a; 2005b; 2005c). While not specifically concerned with the larger debates on the relevance of higher education, Burawoy contextualizes his concerns for the discipline in light of attacks from the National Association of Scholars, declining budgets, intensified competition, and, especially, market solutions—"joint ventures with private corporations, advertising campaigns to attract students, fawning over private donors, commodifying education through distance learning, employing cheap temporary professional labor, not to mention the armies of low-paid service workers" (Burawoy 2005b:7).

Burawoy's fundamental interest lies in "public sociology," as the title of his ASA presidential address in 2004 clearly indicates. However, since any attempt to talk about how sociology relates to "the public" had become fraught with confusion at the time, Burawoy discussed his ideas about public sociology within a larger perspective that laid out the nature and interrelationship of sociological work (see Table 3). His typology looks at how the discipline's types of work and specific audiences interact to create four diverse "sociologies," each of which contributes to sociology's body of knowledge. Essentially, Burawoy maintains that a discipline is a field of power that can, and does, have a division of labor. To understand "public sociology," he argues, one must understand the matrix of co-existing professional, policy, public, and critical sociologies however their prevalence may vary both historically and cross-nationally (see Quah 2005 on this last point).

As Table 3 lays out, it is the intersection of audience (academic/extra-academic) and type of sociology (instrumental/reflexive) that produces the sociological division of labor. Professional sociology encompasses the "tested methods, accumulated bodies of knowledge, orienting questions, and conceptual frameworks" of the discipline (Burawoy 2004:10). For Burawoy, professional sociology is the foundation, the *sine qua non,* of at least two of the other types (public and policy sociology), providing both expertise and legitimacy. These research programs, most often but not always located in university and college settings, provide much of the substance and perspective that sociology has to offer.

Table 3. Burawoy's Typology of Sociological Work

	Academic	Extra-Academic
Instrumental	Professional	Policy
Reflexive	Critical	Public

From Burawoy, Michael. 2005. "2004 Presidential Address: For Public Sociology." *American Sociological Review* (70)February:4-28.

However, professional sociology is not without its reflexive cousin—critical sociology—which stands back and asks about those theoretical and methodological foundations as well as the research agendas that follow from them. Looking to the well-known critics of the discipline's isolationist past such as C. Wright Mills, Herbert Gans, and Alvin Gouldner and to the more recent streams of feminist, queer and critical race theory which also point to disciplinary narrowness, Burawoy seeks to incorporate both mainstream and alternative viewpoints within the community of sociology.

Further, for Burawoy, policy sociology differs from professional sociology only in its audience. Policy sociology, often most confused with what sociologists have thought of as "public" sociology, is distinct in that clients present sociology with a problem, and practitioners of the discipline are expected to use their expertise in the service of the client-defined goal. That is, policy sociology brings the tools of sociology to solve practical problems brought to us by others. It also focuses on the evaluation of solutions that have already been put in place by governments, agencies or community groups.

However important these other types of sociology are, Burawoy's primary goal is to clarify and elaborate on what is public sociology. In fact, Burawoy's first and critically important point is that there are many "public sociologies," a feature with which many find agreement (e.g., Sassen 2005). He criticizes those who see public sociologists "only" as writers of Op-Ed pieces in *The New York Times* and other popular venues, who take on the big questions of the day, and who have been roundly "openly contemptuous" of professional sociology. This view has often confused professional sociology with a type of method, primarily quantitative, and with the philosophy of sociology as a narrow pretender to the natural sciences. In return, he criticizes those in the mainstream of professional sociology who have been skeptical, equally contemptuous, and worried that this public work is "sociology light." Rather, Burawoy sees these bifurcations as unwise and arbitrary, noting that these public skirmishes obfuscate the fact that there often is, and should be, synergy and mutual admiration among different types of sociological work. Yet, he notes, as Boyer does, that only certain types of work tend to garner available rewards in higher education.

It is here, in his discussion of public sociology and its connection to civil society, that Burawoy's typology resonates importantly with the issues of teaching and learning that are at the heart of the two other perspectives presented earlier. Under his schema, students are our first, most captive, and ever present public. As he notes, "As teachers we are all potentially public sociologists" (Burawoy 2005b:9).

The reception to Burawoy's argument has been "mixed" in the U.S., "muted" in Great Britain, and often "guarded" in general (Hall 2005; Scott 2005). This perspective, like those described earlier, has not been without its critics. He has received the familiar criticism that his approach would jeopardize sociology as a "professional practice" (Holmwood 2007) and that his argument is merely a thinly veiled leftist call to "man the barricades" (Nielsen 2004). Others suggest that he has not gone

far enough, is too optimistic, or compartmentalizes sociological thinking in an arbitrary and artificial way that destroys synergy (Baiocchi 2005; Calhoun 2005; Hall 2005).

In sum, Burawoy's public sociology views the work of the discipline as multifaceted, where audience and the nature of the lens we use to view society represent the two crucial dimensions that define the contributions sociology can make. Seeing each as important and necessary to maintaining a connection to both production of knowledge and to civic society, he elaborates on the need for public sociology to remove isolationist tendencies that are often reinforced in existing reward systems. Importantly, he see teaching and learning as central aspects of public sociology and students as one of the most important targets groups for public sociology.

CONVERGENCE

Table 4 attempts to show the synergy and overlap among these three conceptual maps of academic work. While there is some "stretch" in fit, these three perspectives share six fundamental premises. *First*, each of these perspectives addresses the bifurcations that came to symbolize the problems in post-World War II higher education. Boyer (1990) suggests, for example, that "the time has come to move beyond the tired old 'teaching versus research'" (p. 16). *Second*, and more importantly, each provides a reconceptualization that targets one key part of a sea change. For Boyer, it lies in broadening the term "scholarship." For Golde and Walker (2006), rethinking the goals of a PhD education produces a set of fundamental principles that should guide the work of the disciplines. For Burawoy, it gives rise to a division of labor within a discipline. *Third*, each perspective recognizes that the parts are not discreet phenomena but represent overlapping pieces of a larger whole that support one another. As Burawoy (2005b:4) suggests, progress depends on a shared ethos where "[in] the best of all worlds the flourishing of each type of sociology is a condition for the flourishing of all." As such, an overemphasis on any one threatens the whole. *Fourth*, the underlying goal is to understand, change, and legitimize a broader scope of academic work. The developer of each perspective both recognizes and embraces the moral and political components of scholarly work and of their proposals. *Fifth*, while embracing this breadth, each contends that it is the generation of new knowledge that stands as the centerpiece. Even with the transformation of knowledge required under the Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate, public sociology's engagement with many groups in civic society, or the scholarship of teaching's focus on learning, basic research provides the foundation. *Sixth*, each of these perspectives is dynamic in nature, recognizing that different career stages, historical periods, or institutional structures will change the mix of these for individual scholars.

Looking at Table 4, the upper left quadrant represents this cornerstone of academic work. The academic discipline provides the "professional" division of labor, focusing

Table 4. Converging Quadrants of the Sociological Professoriate

	Academic **Academic**	***Extra-Academic*** **Civic**
Instrumental	*Professional* Scholarship of Discovery GENERATE/CONSERVE	*Policy* Scholarship of Application TRANSFORM
Reflexive	*Critical* Scholarship of Integration LANDSCAPE FIT	*Public* Scholarship of Teaching TRANSFORM

on the scholarship of discovery with the goals of generating new knowledge and conserving the ideas of the past. The upper right quadrant is where policy research is located. The basic tools of a discipline are transformed, for outside clients, into the scholarship of application. The lower right hand quadrant holds public sociology where basic research is also transformed for a wide variety of audiences, including students. In the lower left hand quadrant, we have the least smooth melding of the three perspectives. It represents the place where the discipline looks to its contributions, questioning dominant methods, finding its place on the large landscape of knowledge, and transforming its knowledge for other disciplines.

Together, the consideration of the different perspectives fleshes out the nature and processes of higher education. Each enriches the other; however, as Trigwell and colleagues (2000) point out, the scholarship of teaching and learning has not yet been fully incorporated. However, given this new development, including SoTL would more fully elaborate the nature of scholarship. Since Boyer, those in SoTL differentiate "scholarly teaching" (which uses a research base to transform basic disciplinary knowledge for public audience) from the scholarship of teaching and learning (which generates new research to improve the transformation of disciplinary knowledge for public audiences).

CAUTIONS: MAINTENANCE AND PUSHING FORWARD

There are many positive signs that point to the adoption of these new models of scholarship. The ASA has incorporated public sociology sessions routinely in its annual meetings and introduced a new award to honor those who transform sociological research for public consumption. SoTL has new journals, a new international society, new professorships around the country, and newly dedicated research centers (e.g., University of British Columbia's Institute for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning; Indiana University's Mack Center for Inquiry on Teaching and Learning). Federal agencies and private foundations have issued calls for more social science, multidisciplinary collaborations, and efforts to translate social science knowledge into programs and policies. The National Science Foundations's Education Directorate now includes the social and behavioral sciences as part of its mission, expanding from the focus on the natural sciences and engineering. Many universities and colleges have reassessed their promotion and tenure standards and have renewed or created efforts for professional development and training the future professoriate. However, lest we become too complacent, it is critical to remember that institutional social change requires resources, a continued cultural climate of support, and leadership.

There has always been a small, determined cohort of individuals in disciplines like sociology who have focused on teaching (e.g., Goldsmid and Wilson's 1980, *Passing on Sociology*), who have been engaged in important policy research (e.g., Joyce Iutcovich, of the Keystone University Research Corp, Iutcovich and Iutcovich 1987) and who have made critical contributions to public debates (Massey and Denton 1993; Moynihan 1965). This begs the question: what will the next generation of the professoriate support, particularly at the PhD-granting institutions?

In particular, there are three critical areas of gains that should be on the forefront of our concerns. The first two target, respectively, the fates and shape of Preparing Future Faculty Programs and the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. Third, underlying both of these, and intertwined with them, are debates over standards for promotion and tenure.

Preparing Future Faculty Programs

PFF was developed in recognition of the mismatch between the priorities of training at research universities and the likely jobs that PhDs will fill across institutions of

higher education (Applegate 2002). Described as a "national movement to transform the way aspiring faculty members are prepared for their careers," PFF were designed to provide doctoral students (and sometimes master's and postdoctoral students) with "opportunities to observe and experience faculty responsibilities at a variety of academic institutions with varying missions, diverse student bodies, and different expectations for faculty" (http://www.preparing-faculty.org). Since 1993 the Council of Graduate Schools and the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) launched the initiative with support from three different funding agencies (the Pew Charitable Trusts, the National Science Foundation, and The Atlantic Philanthropies). While over 40 doctoral degree-granting institutions, both with and without finding from these agencies, developed PFF programs, there are serious questions that remain.

First, the grant periods have expired. While the Council of Graduate Schools indicates that it provides administrative support to both existing and newly developing programs, the critical issue is institutional and financial support. The discussion revolves around which PFF initiatives have continued to receive support from their institutions as funding initiatives have ended. There have also been questions raised about their disciplinary relevance and, relatedly, whether they are faculty-led or in the hands of professional development staff. Finally, even the Phase III—PFF that was discipline-based rarely included departments ranked in the top ten of their respective disciplines.

Together, these concerns raise what organizational sociologists who focus on work have called the "professional-bureaucratic dilemma" (Hall 1968; Miller 1967). The crux of this dilemma lies in the "conflicts that exist between professionals and their employing organizations" (Miller 1967:756). Importantly, these sociologists note that administrators in many venues are often not aware of the conflicts; however, it is unlikely that the same can be said for deans, provosts, or presidents. Under flat-budget conditions, the clash between local/university/teaching and national/disciplinary/research agendas will not go away. Most critically, the relevance of university-based PFF programs for sociology departments that have themselves engaged with teaching issues at the disciplinary level may be low. Further, as we replace current faculty with those who are likely to come from PhD-granting departments that have never subscribed to PFF goals, the dedication to issues of teacher training and professional socialization outside of the traditional mentor approach may be debated. In any case, all of these issues suggest that this social movement may be in jeopardy.

.

The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

Sociology has witnessed significant changes relative to educational research. A discipline with a subfield devoted to education has seen a blurry line developing between its teaching journal, *Teaching Sociology*, and its subfield journal, *Sociology of Education*. This results from both *Teaching Sociology*, under editors such as Jeffery Chin and Elizabeth Grauerholz moving the journal to SoTL *and* from the *Sociology of Education* widening its usual scope of concern from K-12 to higher education (e.g., NYU's 2006 ASA/FAD Conference, "A New Research Agenda for the Sociology of Higher Education," Mitchell Stevens, Elizabeth Armstrong and Richard Arum, organizers). Perhaps this is no surprise since the richness of sociological theory and method lends itself easily to questions involving organizations, interactions, power, and other processes/structures central to understanding teaching and learning. However, what places will SoTL research hold in funding sources, in discussion of outstanding teaching, and in promotion and tenure? There are still institutions that require that professors choose between promotion/tenure on the basis of teaching or research. How will SoTL be viewed in such a split? Will SoTL research institutes be

founded outside of central institutional research offices or teaching centers and be run by faculty like other research institutes? Can the recognition that SoTL represents an important type of scholarship pervade departments that have never subscribed to PFF-related goals or whose new faculty has not been introduced to broader training in their graduate programs? All of these issues require continued attention by sociologists.

There are signs of retrenchment. Some universities that advertised for SoTL professorships have rescinded the positions and, while anecdotal, a number of SoTL leaders have asked whether there is an interest in sustaining these efforts at the major PhD granting institutions. Some departments, primarily outside of sociology, have withdrawn their support from PFF initiatives, in part due to lack of support from younger faculty. Do the frustrations in graduate training that occurred before the changes that fueled much of our own participation in the social shift from no training to pedagogical programs, from teaching to learning, and from scholarly teaching to SoTL, find resonance among the new cohorts of scholars that have come, primarily, from departments that do not have PFF programs and often actively discourage students from participation in teaching and learning efforts, civic engagement, and applied careers?

SOLUTIONS FROM SOCIOLOGICAL RESEARCH?

The critical question, then, is what will it take to continue the forward movement toward a more integrated higher education? Perhaps equally important, how can we prevent the retrenchment of the gains made over the last two decades? In the spirit of the new perspectives, I build on two pieces of basic research that offer insights for change.

The first is Reskin's (2003) analysis of how stratification systems have been altered over time in the U.S. If we consider the difference in rewards between research and teaching, between traditional sociological research and sociological-SoTL research to be one of ascriptive inequality in higher education, then by association, her insights are relevant. Looking at the body of research, primarily on issues of discrimination in the workplace, Reskin maintains that the focus on changing attitudes is noble but misplaced. She argues that, too often, we tend to focus on motives that underlie the actions of individuals in power. That is, asking why inequality exists has had primacy over understanding how those disparities are produced. As she notes (2003), "There is, of course, nothing wrong with asking why; our lack of progress lies in our failure to ask how" (p. 2). Following from this, we should ask, "How do people end up being assigned to lower reward structures?"

Reskin suggests that, rather than change motives, the more critical task is to create formal structures that ensure that change will be stabilized. As she (2003)) points out, "Intellectually, the solution is simple: concentrate on allocation mechanisms." That is, the "methods for distributing social goods...are the engines of inequality" (p. 16). So, to move ahead, we need to concentrate on distribution systems. The question is how do we do that? In her view, formalization, transparency and accountability are the keys to decreasing inequalities. In sum, looking to Reskin's research tells us "what" to focus on.

The second insight from sociological research comes from Burstein and Freundberg's (1977) study of the dramatic shift of the U.S. Congress over the course of the Vietnam War. It addresses "who" to focus on. This research reinforces the notion that changing existing hearts and minds is a poor focus. Specifically, Burstein and Freundenberg (1978) found that hawks did not turn into doves as the war became more unpopular; rather, the culture of the U.S. Senate changed when hawks were voted out and doves voted in. Importantly, the change occurred toward the end of the war because hawks were retiring or died, and, more of

those running at the end of the war were doves.

What are the implications for higher education, particularly changes in the direction of a broader professoriate from Burstein and Freudenberg's research? We would be well served to focus on entering cohorts of the professoriate, starting during graduate school and before they enter their new positions. Further, we may be well served by embracing the issues that they face during the process of professional socialization. Incidentally, but not accidentally, these are the three issues that PFF holds at its core. They address the full scope of faculty roles and responsibilities (teaching, research, and service) and tailor expectations to different contexts; increase access to a range of mentors; and provide a better look at realities of professional life outside the Ph.D. university. They build a bridge from graduate training to professional life and, in the process, do a better job of connecting professors across institutional contexts.

From Sociological Research to Sociological Practice

With both the "what" and the "who" located, how can we transform these insights from basic research into policy recommendations? Cohort replacement and shoring up institutional structures that distribute rewards rather than conversion of the skeptical or the narrowly trained appear to be promising mechanisms to maintain the new scholarship and to press for further developments in the directions of integration and application. Our focus might best be targeted on the entering cohorts of faculty, training programs in SoTL leadership, and PFF Program development. A plan would be better developed by a diverse group of like-minded sociologists rather than one person, but a few possibilities are offered below.

The ASA Section on Teaching and Learning needs to continue its leadership with the pre-ASA annual meeting conference. This effort has been an important way to reach out to new teachers. In a similar manner, the Section might spearhead activities that bring together SoTL scholars from various corners of Sociology to create a leadership cohort, for example, reaching out to the organizers of the ASA/FAD conference for promising next steps. A PFF focus on Graduate Directors during the ASA meetings—targeting crucial issues, including PFF student placement success, for example—may offer incentives to innovate or retain their efforts in teacher training and professional development. In addition, didactic seminars, not just on teaching but on training teachers and professional development may be useful. Sessions on teaching have always been more popular among graduate students and new professors than among their more senior colleagues. Finally, the Section or the ASA might consider mounting a multi-campus project, submitted to NSF or other private foundations that will bring different institutions and researchers together. Because rewards attract the attention of departments and professors, having a funded project, rather than one more effort done as a pro-bono service activity, would have greater impact on the discipline as a whole.

CONCLUSION

Parker Palmer (2007) has recently reminded us that "every professional...is a moral agent with the power to challenge and help change the institution" (p. 8). If we are to address the bureaucratic-professional dilemma both within and across institutions of higher education, planning needs to be in place now to avoid retrenchment. We have three conceptual maps that suggest a timely convergence. The next steps lie with our own efforts, cultivating in ourselves what Palmer (2007:12) suggests we cultivate in our students—"communities of discernment and support."

REFERENCES

Applegate, James L. 2002. *Engaged Graduate Education: Seeing With New Eyes*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Armstrong, Elizabeth A. 2002. *Forging Gay Identities: Organizing Sexuality in San Francisco, 1950-1994*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Baiocchi, Gianpaolo. 2005. "Interrogating Connections: From Public Criticisms to Critical Publics in Burawoy's Public Sociology." *Critical Sociology* 31(3):339-52.

Becker, William E. and Moya L. Andrews, eds. 2004. *The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education: Contributions of Research Universities*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Belenky, Mary Field, Blyth McVicker Clinchy, Nancy Rule Goldberger, and Jill Mattuck Tarule. 1973. *Women's Ways of Knowing: The Development of Self, Voice, and Mind*. New York: Basic Books.

Bok, Derek. 2006. *Our Underachieving Colleges*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Boyer, Ernest L. 1990. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. New York: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Burawoy, Michael. 2004. "Public Sociology: Contradictions, Dilemmas and Possibilities." *Social Forces* 82(4):1603-18.

_____. 2005a. "Response: Public Sociology: Populist Fad or Path to Renewal?" *The British Journal of Sociology* 56(3):417-32.

_____. 2005b. "2004 Presidential Address: For Public Sociology." *American Sociological Review* 70(1):4-28.

_____. 2005c. "The Critical Turn to Public Sociology." *Critical Sociology* 31(3):313-26.

Burstein, Paul and William Freudenburg. 1978. "Changing Public Policy: The Impact of Public Opinion, Antiwar Demonstrations, and War Costs on Senate Voting on Vietnam War Motions." *American Journal of Sociology* 84(1):99-122.

Calhoun, Craig. 1999. "The Changing Character of College: Institutional Transformation in American Higher Education." Pp. 9-31 in *The Social Worlds of Higher Education: Handbook for Teaching in a New Century*, edited by B. A. Pescosolido and R. Aminzade. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Calhoun, Craig. 2005. "The Promise of Public Sociology." *The British Journal of Sociology* 56(3):355-63.

Campbell, John R. 2000. *Dry Rot in the Ivory Tower*. New York: University Press of America.

Davis, Walter E. and Timothy J.L. Chandler. 1998. "Beyond Boyer's 'Scholarship Reconsidered.'" *Journal of Higher Education* 69(1):23-64.

Glassick, Charles, Mary Taylor Huber and Gene I. Maeroff. 1997. *Scholarship Assessed: A Special Report on Faculty Evaluation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Golde, Chris. 2007. "Preparing Stewards of the Discipline." *The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching: Carnegie Perspectives*. Retrieved October 29, 2007 (http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/perspectives/sub.asp?key=245&subkey=1911).

Golde, Chris and Ed Stricker. 2002. "Evaluating Doctoral Education." Presented at the Association of Neuroscience Departments and Programs 2002 ANDP Spring Meeting, May 4-5, Bethesda, MD.

Golde, Chris and George Walker. 2006. *Envisioning the Future of Doctoral Education: Preparing Stewards of the Discipline - Carnegie Essays on the Doctorate*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Goldsmid, Charles A. and Everett K. Wilson. 1980. *Passing on Sociology: The Teaching of a Discipline*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Hall, Richard H. 1968. "Professionalization and Bureaucratization." *American Sociological Review* 33(1):92-104.

Hall, John A. 2005. "A Guarded Welcome." *The British Journal of Sociology* 56(3):379-81.

Hatch, Thomas. 2005. *Into the Classroom: Developing the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Holmwood, John. 2007. "Sociology as Public Discourse and Professional Practice: A Critique of Michael Burawoy." *Sociological Theory* 25(1):46-66.

Huber, Mary and Pat Hutchings. 2005. *The Advancement of Learning: Building the Teaching Commons*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Hutchings, Pat. 2000. *Opening Lines: Approaches to the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*. Menlo Park, CA: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

_____. 2002. *Ethics of Inquiry, Issues in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*. Menlo Park, CA: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Iutcovich, Joyce Miller and Mark Iutcovich, eds.

1987. *The Sociologist as Consultant*. New York: Praeger.

Massey, Douglas S. and Nancy A. Denton. 1993. *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Miller, George A. 1967. "Professionals in Bureaucracy: Alienation among Industrial Scientists and Engineers." *American Sociological Review* 32(5):755-68.

Moynihan, Daniel P. 1965. *The Negro Family: The Case for National Action*. United States Department of Labor: Office of Policy Planning and Research.

Nielsen, Francois. 2004. "The Vacant 'We': Remarks on Public Sociology." *Social Forces 82(4)*:1619-27.

Palmer, Parker J. 1998. *The Courage to Teach*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

_____. 2007. "A New Professional: The Aims of Education Revisited." *Change* 39(6):6-13.

Pescosolido, Bernice A. and Jack K. Martin. 2004. "Cultural Authority and the Sovereignty of American Medicine: The Role of Networks, Class and Community." *The Journal of Health Politics, Policy, and Law* 29(4-5):735-56.

Pescosolido, Bernice A. and Ronald Aminzade, eds. 1999. *The Social Worlds of Higher Education: Handbook for Teaching in a New Century*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Quah, Stella R. 2005. "Four Sociologies, Multiple Roles." *The British Journal of Sociology* 56(3):395-400.

Reskin, Barbara. 2003. "Including Mechanisms in Our Models of Ascriptive Inequality: 2002 Presidential Address." *American Sociological Review* 68(1):1-21.

Sassen, Saskia. 2005. "Digging in the Penumbra of Master Categories." *The British Journal of Sociology* 56(3):401-3.

Scott, John. 2005. "Who Will Speak, and Who Will Listen? Comments on Burawoy and Public Sociology." *The British Journal of Sociology* 56(3):405-9.

Shulman, Lee. 1999. "Taking Learning Seriously." *Change* 31(4):10-7.

_____. 2004. *The Wisdom to Practice: Essays on Teaching, Learning, and Learning to Teach*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

_____. 2004. *Teaching as Community Property: Essays on Higher Education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Smith, Page. 1991. *Killing the Spirit*. New York: Penguin.

Strauss, Robert. 1957. "The Nature and Status of Medical Sociology." *American Sociological Review* 22(1):200-4.

Sullivan, Teresa. 1999. "Higher Education and Its Social Contracts." Pp. 32-41 in *The Social Worlds of Higher Education: Handbook for Teaching in a New Century*, edited by B. A. Pescosolido and R. Aminzade. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Sykes, Charles J. 1988. *ProfScam*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Tilly, Charles. 1984. *Big Structure, Large Processes, Huge Comparisons*. New York: Russell Sage.

Trigwell, Keith, E. Martin, J. Benjamin, and P. Taylor. 2000. "Scholarship of Teaching: a model." *Higher Education Research and Development* 19(2):155-68

Bernice A. Pescosolido is Distinguished Professor of Sociology and Director of the Indiana Consortium for Mental Health Services Research at Indiana University. Her research targets social network influences in the health care arena, particularly as these ties serve as important links between communities and treatment systems. Pescosolido is also co-Director of the Preparing Future Faculty Program and Associate Director of the Mack Center's Institute for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning.