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ABSTRACT

From the beginning, social theory has been motivated by the desire to advance human freedom and bring about social change (Seidman, 2008). From classical theorists such as Marx, who writes of class division and the exploitative nature of capitalism in order to bring about change, to more contemporary sociologists such as C. Wright Mills, who helps to redefine personal problems in terms of public issues, many of sociology’s foundational texts clearly demonstrate a propensity for advancing human freedom and inducing social change. Thus, it is interesting to examine what sociologists are doing because their work has historically had, and will continue to have, the potential to make real and significant change in the world. And, it is imperative to have knowledge of the current state of affairs in the discipline in order to facilitate discussion around how to promote sociological work that seeks to bring about social change. It is in this context that this research project seeks to answer the following: what is the distribution of sociology professors in Canada using Burawoy’s (2009) disciplinary mosaic framework? In addressing this question, two sub-questions are asked: to what extent do Canadian sociologists agree or disagree with Burawoy’s normative vision of the discipline? And, to what degree do the socio-demographic shown to be relevant by Brym and Nakhaie (2009) continue to emerge in the Canadian context. Using data collected from an online questionnaire delivered to all full-time sociologists in universities and colleges in Canada, this project reveals that Canadian sociology is dominated by Professional sociology with Public, Policy and Critical sociology featuring much less prominently. This is despite the fact that in aggregate Canadian sociologists tend to agree that all types of sociology ought to be conducted. Finally, several socio-demographic variables—such as gender, income and type of post secondary institution—continue to be relevant in the Canadian context.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Why is it interesting to look at what sociologist’s are doing?

From the beginning social theory has been motivated by the desire to advance human freedom and bring about social change (Seidman, 2008). Examples can be found in classical theorists, such as Marx, who writes of class division and the exploitative nature of capitalism in order to bring about change, and in more contemporary sociologists, such as C. Wright Mills, who helps to redefine personal problems in terms of public issues. Many of sociology’s foundational texts clearly demonstrate a propensity for advancing human freedom and inducing social change. Sociology has also spawned a number of relevant public figures and organizations such as Fernando Henrique Cardoso, a professional sociologist who served as Brazil’s president and Chief Executive (Whitehead, 2009) and more recently Sociologists Without Borders, an organization committed to the principles that all people have equal rights to political freedoms and legal protections, to socioeconomic security and to self-determination (Blau, 2008). This only begins to scratch the surface of sociology’s deep roots in social change and activism yet it clearly demonstrates how, to borrow from Seidman, “the faith that science could contribute to the making of a better world is at the heart of modern social theory” (2008, p. xi). Thus it is interesting to examine what sociologists are doing because their work has historically had, and will continue to have, the potential to make real and significant change in the world. And, it is useful to have knowledge of the current state of affairs in the discipline in order to facilitate discussion around how to promote sociological work that seeks to address social problems and contribute to social change.
Burawoy and Public Sociology

This project emerged after a year of reviewing the literature around applied sociology and is motivated by the apparent tension in the discipline between theory and practice. Undoubtedly, it was the connection to contemporary social issues and the potential to make positive change in the world that initially made sociology so appealing. Yet, the connection between social theory, research, activism and social change is not always clear. Burawoy’s (2005) four-sociologies framework, the division of sociological labour, provides a way of understanding how different types of sociological work can simultaneously contribute both inwards to the discipline and outwards to the social world. Ultimately Burawoy provides a framework to understand how sociology as a discipline can be both theoretically oriented and action oriented at the same time. After reviewing the numerous responses to Burawoy, Brym and Nakhaie’s (2009) empirical study—designed to measure the four-sociologies model—served as the inspiration for this project. Their call for a project designed specifically to measure Burawoy’s framework coupled with a revised typology, the disciplinary mosaic, for which there has been no empirical study, thus acted as the catalyst for my work.

Objectives and Outline

This introductory chapter explores the primary objectives of this research and briefly outlines each of the subsequent chapters. The main purpose of this project is to determine the current distribution of sociologists in the Canadian context using Burawoy’s (2009) disciplinary mosaic framework. In addressing this question, two sub-questions are asked: (1) to what extent do Canadian sociologists agree or disagree with Burawoy’s normative vision of the discipline? And (2) what sociodemographic variables are relevant to this discussion? Based on data collected using an online questionnaire delivered to all full-
time sociologists in Canada working in Canadian Universities and colleges, this project provides a snapshot of the current state of the discipline. A secondary objective is to conduct comparative analyses between this project and the 2009 study by Brym and Nakhaie who provide the first empirical evidence to support Burawoy’s (2004) four sociologies framework. Finally, this project will explore the implications of the results in order to make suggestions about the future of the discipline.

The second chapter introduces both of Burawoy’s theoretical frameworks, the division of sociological labour and the disciplinary mosaic, followed by a survey of the relevant literature. The chapter begins by introducing the reader to Burawoy’s original four sociologies framework: the division of sociological labour\(^1\). The contours of this model are explored as each Professional, Policy, Critical and Public sociology are defined. This is followed by a discussion of Burawoy’s normative vision: a discipline characterized by four equally important types of sociology that are both synergetic and interdependent. Next, the relevant literature is surveyed and key issues surrounding Burawoy’s division of sociological labour and Public sociology are identified. Broadly defined, these issues include the tension between sociology and interdisciplinarity, practical concerns regarding Public sociology, questions about the scientific credibility of the discipline and Public sociology and fundamental problems with Burawoy’s division of sociological labour framework. Of particular relevance, the call for empirical evidence by McLaughlin and Turcotte (2007) and the first study to empirically measure the division of sociological labour framework by Brym and Nakhaie (2009) are discussed. The chapter concludes by outlining Burawoy’s (2009) response to Brym and Nakhaie and

---

\(^1\)Burawoy’s (2005) original framework will be referred to as either The Division of Sociological Labour or the four sociologies framework
introducing the revised framework for the Canadian context, the disciplinary mosaic. It is this framework, the disciplinary mosaic, which informs the questionnaire tool used for this research.

The third chapter outlines the data and methodology of this project. It begins by discussing the data needed to answer the primary research questions. Flowing from this, the operationalization of Burawoy’s disciplinary mosaic is outlined through a discussion of the questionnaire tool developed specifically for this study. In addition, the process of interpreting the questionnaire results, which are informed by the disciplinary mosaic framework, in terms of Burawoy’s original framework, the division of sociological labour, is also discussed. Next, the study population and sampling are defined. Finally, the delivery of the online questionnaire using the SurveyMonkey website is explained.

The fourth chapter explores the results of the questionnaire in terms of Burawoy’s disciplinary mosaic framework followed by a discussion of the implication of the results. The results in this chapter indicate that Substantive Professional sociology dominates the Canadian context. This being said, the professorate as a whole varies considerably in the type of work being conducted. In addition to Substantive Professional sociology, Traditional Public and Advocacy Policy sociology also feature prominently. Normatively, respondents indicate that each of the types of work in the disciplinary mosaic framework ought to be conducted with the notable exception of Sponsored Policy sociology. The chapter concludes with a discussion of some of the implications of the findings.

The fifth chapter explores a comparative analysis between this project and the its forerunner conducted by Brym and Nakhaie (2009). It begins by explaining how the
questionnaire data was transformed in order to facilitate comparative analysis and presents the results of the questionnaire in terms of the original four sociologies model. Next the limitations of the comparative analysis are discussed, namely, the convergence of factors which make direct percentage comparisons between the two studies inappropriate. The chapter then goes on to discuss, in general terms, where the results of the two projects converge and diverge. Most notable of these differences are the overrepresentation of Professional sociology and underrepresentation of Critical and Policy in the current study. Several other factors shown to be relevant in the literature—such as income, gender, type of post secondary institution, are also compared and analyzed in this chapter. Significant results include the findings that Professional sociologists tend to be paid more, tend to occupy positions in higher status institutions and tend to be male whereas the reverse is true for Public sociologists. The implications of these results are then discussed.

The final chapter explores the implications of this project as they pertain to the future of sociology in Canada drawing upon the relevant literature. Advocating an increase in the proportion of Public sociology in the Canadian context, the concluding chapter makes several concrete suggestions based on the relevant literature, such as, the call for more equally distributed rewards and a revised graduate education program. In addition, some of the obstacles to increasing the prominence of Public sociology—such as the negative connotation of the word public—as well as areas for future study are discussed. We now turn our attention to the literature describing and explaining the contemporary work of sociologists, with a focus on the Canadian context.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

What types of sociology are Canadian sociologists currently conducting? More specifically, what is the current distribution of sociology professors in Canada using Burawoy’s (2009) disciplinary mosaic framework? Are they equally represented in the Canadian context, as in Burawoy’s normative vision of the discipline, or are some types of sociology given precedence? Finally, what sociodemographic variables, if any, are relevant to this discussion? These are the underlying questions that this project seeks to answer. In order to address these questions, it is first necessary to delve in to the literature surrounding Burawoy’s four-sociologies framework. To begin, Burawoy’s conceptual framework will be examined followed by a discussion of his normative vision for the discipline. Next, the critical responses to Burawoy’s framework and normative vision will be discussed. This will be followed by an examination of the literature around the call for empirical evidence to support the conceptual framework as well as the first empirical study to do so. Finally, Burawoy’s (2009) revised conceptual framework, the disciplinary mosaic, will be discussed in order to set the stage for the remainder of this project.

Throughout the history of sociology there has been much debate over the nature of the discipline and the role it should play in the world. From foundational debates over the role of morality in social theory to debates about the merit of specific theories and methodologies, few areas within the discipline have escaped the reflexive musing of sociologists. It is within this historical context that former American Sociological Association (ASA) president, Michael Burawoy, reignites debate surrounding the nature
of the discipline. During Burawoy’s 2004 presidential address—subsequently published as *For Public Sociology*—he outlines both a framework for conceptualizing the discipline as well as a normative vision of sociology. It is this framework and normative vision that serve as the cornerstone of this project.

**The Four-Sociologies Model**

In *For Public Sociology*, Burawoy (2005) provides a theoretical framework for conceptualizing the discipline of sociology. More specifically, this theoretical framework provides a way to conceptualize the discipline as a fourfold division of labour. Using two criteria, the type of knowledge produced and the target audience, Burawoy differentiates four types of sociology. Burawoy posits that each criterion contains two discrete types. In terms of the type of knowledge produced, there is a dichotomy between instrumental and reflexive knowledge. To elaborate, instrumental knowledge is concerned with “puzzle solving” or “problem solving” (Burawoy, 2007, p.34). The emphasis is on resolving the best means to an end. Instrumental knowledge is juxtaposed with reflexive knowledge, “concerned with a dialogue about ends” (Burawoy, 2007, p.34). Whether in the context of the social sciences or the public more generally, reflexive knowledge facilitates discussion about what the end goals ought to be. To reiterate, reflexive knowledge facilitates the discussion about how structures and relations ought to be as compared to how they are.

The second criterion used to differentiate between the four types of sociology is the intended audience. Here there is a dichotomy between the academic audience and the extra-academic audience. The academic audience, in the context of this discussion, tends to be other sociologists but the only requirement is that the audience be within academia. The extra-academic audience is much more broadly conceived and may include, at the
most general level, any individual or group outside of academia. More specifically, Burawoy has various public groups, governments and paying clients in mind when speaking of an extra-academic audience.

By tabulating both the type of knowledge and the target audience, Burawoy creates a two-by-two matrix. This matrix, the division of sociological labour, is comprised of the four types of sociology: Professional, Policy, Critical and Public.

Table 2-1. The Division of Sociological Labour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrumental Knowledge</th>
<th>Academic Audience</th>
<th>Extra-Academic Audience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Academic Audience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Extra-Academic Audience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflexive Knowledge</td>
<td>Critical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professional sociology produces instrumental knowledge and directs its work at an academic audience. Policy sociology is also characterized by instrumental knowledge but directs its work towards an extra-academic audience. Critical and Public sociology are both engaged in the production of reflexive knowledge with Critical sociology addressing an academic audience and Public sociology addressing an extra-academic audience.

To elaborate on the model, Burawoy also identifies some of the specific tasks which define each of the four-sociologies. Professional sociology “supplies true and tested methods, accumulated bodies of knowledge, orienting questions, and conceptual frameworks” (Burawoy, 2007, p. 32) with its primary focus being on multiple and intersecting programs of research. Policy sociology engages in policy-oriented work “in the service of a goal defined by a client” (Burawoy, 2007, p. 31). Critical sociology, on the other hand, examines “the foundations—both explicit and implicit, both normative and descriptive—of the research programs of professional sociology” (Burawoy, 2007, p.
Finally, Public sociology is characterized by Habbermasian communicative action; it involves a “dialogic relation between sociologist and public in which the agenda of each is brought to the table” (Burawoy, 2007, p. 31).

After broadly outlining the contours of the four-sociologies model Burawoy makes an important qualifier, namely, that each of the four sociologies represent a Weberian ideal type. In doing so, Burawoy reconciles possible differences between his model and the actual nature of sociology as a discipline in different contexts. To recapitulate, each type of sociology in Burawoy’s model represents only the purest form of that type of sociology; it is unlikely to appear in this pure form outside of theoretical discussion. Moreover, it is possible to consider both the individual and the institution when determining the appropriate classification. As long as most of the criteria are met, most of the time, a best-fit type for a particular sociologist—or particular institution—can be determined. Alternatively, it is also possible for a sociologist to engage in more than one type of sociology and be considered a practitioner of many. This can change over time and it is important to note that over the span of a sociologist’s career it is possible for his or her trajectory to carry them through any combination of the four sociologies. Analogously, it is possible for an institution to foster a particular type—or multiple types—of sociology and for this to also shift over time.

Although this four-sociologies division of sociological labour represents the core of the disciplinary framework, it is worth noting that Burawoy (2007) acknowledges a further level of internal complexity by claiming that each of the four sociologies can be subdivided yet again using the same typology. Thus, for example, Professional sociology can have a Professional, Policy, Critical and Public side. By further subdividing each of
the four sociologies, Burawoy is able to account for much more variation within each
type of sociology.

**Normative Vision**

...my normative vision of the discipline of sociology is of reciprocal
interdependence among our four types—an organic solidarity in which
each type of sociology derives energy, meaning, and imagination from its
connection to the others. (Burawoy, 2007, p.41)

Aside from the substantive theoretical framework, there is also a second key
component of Burawoy’s work: a normative vision for the discipline. Here Burawoy
uses the four-sociologies framework to advance a dynamic, synergistic vision of the
discipline. In this vision each of the four types of sociology—Professional, Policy,
Critical and Public—are equally important and serve to reinforce the others. The linchpin
of this vision is a Professional sociology which provides the social theory, methodology
and, most importantly, legitimacy and expertise for the other types of sociology. Critical
sociology derives legitimacy through its engagement with the established knowledge base
of Professional sociology. In return, Critical sociology interrogates the value premises of
Professional sociologists and provides a guiding ‘conscience’ for Professional sociology
(Burawoy, 2007). The synergy between Professional and Critical sociology can easily be
seen in this normative vision. Quite simply, without Professional sociology, Critical
sociology would have nothing to be critical of. Conversely, without Critical sociology,
Professional sociology can lose sight of its biases and assumptions.

Public and Professional sociology also enjoy a symbiotic relationship. Public
sociology derives some of its orienting questions, theory and methodology from
Professional sociology and in return revitalizes Professional sociology through the
injection of public issues. Similarly, Policy sociology can also ‘reenergize’ particular
research areas within Professional sociology through its own research (Burawoy, 2007). Finally, there is also a relationship between Public and Policy sociology, just as Critical sociology serves as the conscience of Professional sociology, “public sociology is the is the conscience of policy sociology” (Burawoy, 2007, p. 33). Public sociology keeps Policy sociology accountable to those groups that its work impacts upon.

It is worth reiterating that what is noteworthy about Burawoy’s normative vision is the synergistic relationship between different but equal types of sociology. This is a normative vision of sociology free of major antagonism; interdependence and positive reinforcement between the four types is emphasized. In addition, Burawoy strongly advocates for Public sociology to be included, as an equal partner, in what is considered legitimate and meaningful sociology.

**Sociology as a Field of Power**

Having presented his normative vision of the discipline, Burawoy provides a brief comparison of his vision and the current state of sociology in the US. Currently in that country the four types of sociology can be seen as “asymmetrical and antagonistic” rather than being characterized by the “reciprocal interdependence” of the normative model (Burawoy, 2007, p. 44). This antagonism shapes the discipline into a Bourdieusian ‘field of power’ in which some types of sociology enjoy supremacy over others. This field of power represents “a more or less stable hierarchy” (Burawoy, 2007, p. 45) where Professional and Policy sociology are dominant. Consequently, the instrumental knowledge producers—Professional and Policy sociology—tend to overshadow the

---

2 In this context ‘field of power’ refers to Bourdieu’s idea that “in the academic field there are individuals – positioned in relation to the objective social relations set out by universities, disciplines and faculties – who compete for authority, power and prestige by using available resources” (Seidman, 2008, p. 143).
reflexive knowledge production of Critical and Public sociology. This acknowledgement is important at it sets the stage for subsequent comparative analysis on how sociology in Canada compares to Burawoy’s normative vision.

**Response to Burawoy**

From the previous discussion it is clear that *For Public Sociology* contains two components: a normative vision, the synergistic discipline; and a substantive component, the four-sociologies model. Much of the literature written in response to Burawoy is generally receptive to the proposed division of sociological labour as well as the normative claims, particularly those claims regarding public sociology (Morrow, 2009). In *Recapturing the Sociological Imagination*, Furedi (2009) is a strong advocate of Burawoy’s Organic Public sociology arguing that:

one of the most important justifications for public sociology is the contribution it can potentially make to the emergence of a more intellectually oriented public sphere. (Furedi, 2009, p. 172).

Public sociology can aid in the recovery of the public’s sociological imagination and in doing so “promote a sociologically informed view of the world” (Furedi, 2009, p. 179). This allows for elucidation, in the spirit of C. Wright Mills, of the distinction between private troubles and public issues. Similarly, other authors are also optimistic about the prospect of Public sociology (Piven, 2007).

Of those authors less receptive to Burawoy, Morrow (2009) identifies four prominent, often overlapping, themes the literature. They are as follows:

(1) the tension between interdisciplinary and sociological myopia; (2) reservation about the specific tasks and future of public sociology in different national contexts; (3) questions about scientific credibility; and (4) fundamental theoretical problems of the original model. (Morrow, 2009, p. 49)
These four themes will be used loosely as the basis for organizing the critical responses section of this literature review later in the current chapter. In relation to these four themes, what is important to note here, is that the majority of authors take issue with some aspect of Burawoy’s normative vision of the discipline. Thus themes one (1) through three (3) will explore various issues with the normative vision. Finally, the fourth theme—fundamental theoretical problems of the original model—will explore responses critical of the theoretical underpinning of the four-sociologies framework.

**Issues with the Normative Vision: The Tension Between Sociology and Interdisciplinarity**

As Morrow (2009) notes, many authors have focused on the tension between sociology and interdisciplinary collaborations. This tension exists because interdisciplinary collaborations have been marginalized both historically and in the contemporary context by a marked lack of support (E. N. Glenn, 2007). Interdisciplinary collaborations are important in the context of Public sociology, however, because:

> once you acknowledge that there is, or should be, a unifying underlying question, then you have to admit that sociology cannot handle it alone.… (Ehrenreich, 2007, p. 236)

Thus this tension has stunted, and will continue to inhibit, the development of a truly relevant and Public sociology. Moreover, the aversion to the interdisciplinary has also resulted in the missed opportunity to effectively incorporate Public sociology into the core of sociology (E. N. Glenn, 2007).

It is precisely those disciplines which sociology stands to learn the most from about Organic Public sociology that are marginalized or completely excluded from the core of the discipline (E. N. Glenn, 2007). Ehrenreich (2007) agrees—stating that there is a
perfectly sensible connection between sociology, history, psychology, and biology—and argues that,

when sociologists say ‘we don’t go there,’ which seems to be the current stance, they rob themselves of potentially paradigm-rocking insights into the human condition. (pp. 238-239)

The key discernant here is that the Public sociology may not be a viable option within the rigid disciplinary boundaries that currently exist. This is because the knowledge required for successful and relevant Public sociology may come from a plethora of sources, both disciplinary and extra-disciplinary. But in an era of social science funding cutbacks and increasing competition from the humanities, carving out specific and exclusive academic turf is sometimes seen as the primary goal of sociology. As a result, the tendency is towards increasing solidification of the disciplinary walls. Consequently, if E. N. Glenn (2007) and Ehrenreich (2007) are correct: Public sociology will need to transcend increasingly fortified disciplinary boundaries in order to be successful, while at the same time ensuring its future as a discipline, no small task to be sure.

Shifting now to the second theme in the critical literature: much has been written in regard to reservations about the tasks and future of Public sociology in various national contexts. More specifically, several authors express reservations about the practicality of conducting Public sociology in the current context.

**Issues with the Normative Vision: The Tasks and Future of Public Sociology – Practical Concerns Regarding the Practice of Public Sociology**

As indicated by Morrow (2009) one of the main themes in the literature is concern over the tasks and future of Public sociology. This literature tends to focus on the disciplinary changes and reorganization required in order for Public sociology to be fully
realized. In particular, it is argued, there are much needed changes to both the reward structure of the discipline and to the structure of graduate education programs.

Smith-Lovin (2007) eloquently articulates concern about the institutionalization of Public sociology: specifically, reservations about the possibility of Public sociology being rewarded within the discipline because it is:

…difficult to imagine developing a serious, meaningful institutional system that would train people for, encourage, and reward political activism when we do not agree on the value positions that are endorsed by that activism. (Smith-Lovin, 2007, p. 130)

The central issue here is that there is no unifying set of moral values within sociology (Nielsen, 2004; Smith-Lovin, 2007). Therefore, as a result, it is inevitable that disagreements around the value claims implicit in activism would make the institutionalization of Public sociology difficult if not impossible. How could sociologists dole out disciplinary rewards for Public sociology to which they are fundamentally opposed? Thus Smith-Lovin (2007) agrees with Burawoy that sociological insights and understandings should be shared with the public but disagrees about how the institutionalized program of knowledge exchange would look.

Conversely, others take the position that it may be possible for Public sociology to be institutionalized but that a significant restructuring of the disciplinary reward structure will be required (Gans 2009; Piven 2007). This restructuring must focus on ensuring that Public sociologists have equal eligibility for promotions, tenure appointments and other disciplinary rights and privileges based on their respective types of work. Without significant restructuring there is little chance that Public sociology will flourish as it is not a viable career option. Thus the current disciplinary reward structure makes equality within the discipline, especially for Public sociology, a fever dream.
Moreover, there is also a need for changes in terms of funding. Gans (2009) believes effective Public sociology, even excluding what Burawoy defines as Organic Public sociology—the most closely linked to activism—will require major changes in the funding structure of the discipline to ensure its viability. This is because only limited works of Public sociology can be produced without sufficient funding. At currently available levels the lack of money available for Public sociology limits the work that can be done. If funding levels increase or other sources of funding become available practitioners of Public sociology will then be able to pursue these activities as their primary focus. Inversely, without adequate funding Public sociology can never attain equal status within the discipline.

In addition, for Public sociology to prosper there is also a need for sociological organizations and publications to demonstrate sustained enthusiasm and commitment towards Public sociology (Gans, 2009). Without professional acknowledgement of the merit of Public sociology through engagement and publication there is, again, little hope of Public sociology reaching equal status within the discipline. This may prove to be a significant obstacle for Public sociology given its location with the disciplinary field of power.

Furthermore, according to Gans (2009), Mayrl (2009), and Stacey (2007) there is also a need to revise graduate education programs if Public sociology is to become an equal partner within the discipline. In particular, there is the need for an institutional system capable of reproducing and training Public sociologists. One possible solution is a revised graduate program where students can choose between a theory-based track and a topic-driven track with a research curriculum tailored to Public sociology (Gans, 2009).
This is crucial for two reasons: firstly, students will be able to receive formally recognized Public sociology training; and secondly, it sets the stage for establishing academic standards related to quality and best practice in Public sociology.

Several other authors also elaborate on the need for establishing academic standards and best practice for public sociologists. These standards are important, as they can serve as the basis for a sustained and systematic quality control system for Public sociology analogous to the peer-review process of Professional sociology. A common theme emerging in the Public sociology best practice literature is the need to avoid using inaccessible jargon-laden language (Glenn, 2009; Wilson, 2007). The real challenge for sociology is the production of works accessible—both in terms of content and language—to both academic and extra-academic audiences. By ensuring sociology is accessible and relevant to academic and extra-academic audiences, it is much more likely that the sociological work will attract media attention and represent ‘good Public sociology’. In addition, this also helps to keep Public sociology accountable to the public (Mayrl, 2009). Finally, this best practice literature is important as it implores Public sociologists to be mindful of how Public sociology reflects on the discipline as a whole (N. D. Glenn, 2009).

From an alternate standpoint, many authors are concerned about the practicality of conducting Public sociology because of Burawoy’s four-sociologies model and normative vision. In particular, Collins (2007) and Hays (2007) are concerned with the impact that naming Public sociology may have. This is because “once a set of practices is named and thereby placed in its classificatory cell within an institution, those practices can become even more difficult to do” (Collins, 2007). Collins poses the question: how
will the current discussion around Public sociology assist sociologists who currently practice Public sociology? It may be erroneous to assume that classifying a particular set of practices as Public sociology will improve the status of those who currently engage in these practices. It is equally plausible that it:

… may instead install a permanent and recognizable underclass that now carries the stigmatized name of public sociology. Stated differently, will doing public sociology emerge as a new form of tracking within the discipline? (Collins, 2007, p. 103)

Moreover,

being classified under the banner of public sociology may foster a kind of sociological ghettoization, primarily because those who gravitate towards public sociology may already hold subordinate status within the discipline itself. (Collins, 2007, p.104)

Hays (2007) is also concerned that Burawoy’s normative vision will not come to fruition. This is because, it is argued, the content of Burawoy’s 2004 presidential address is based on his political motive within the American Sociological Association. Accordingly, the ultimate goal of Burawoy’s address was to “build consensus and avoid ruffling too many feathers” rather than provide a complete picture of Public sociology and the discipline (Hays, 2007, p. 80). Consequently, this may have had the unintended consequence of accepting without question the disciplinary status quo—complete with its existing hierarchy structure—while simply throwing Public sociology into the mix. This is problematic for two reasons: firstly, it reproduces existing disciplinary inequalities; secondly, it compartmentalizes Public sociology thus reproducing its ‘second-class status’ (Hays, 2007). It is precisely by ignoring the existing struggles for status within the discipline that Public sociology will have to face, that Public sociology risks remaining second-class.
Aside from the struggle for status within the discipline, Public sociology may also be marginalized, at least in part, due to semantics. More specifically, the use of the word ‘public’ in defining Public sociology (Collins, 2007). As a result of the rampant expansion of neo-liberalism many public institutions have deteriorated to the extent that the word public often does not possess any positive connotation (Collins, 2007). Worse yet, public often becomes a derogatory term synonymous with poverty, inferior quality as well as deficiency in control and privacy. To elaborate:

Currently the term public invokes neither populist nor democratic sensibilities. Rather it means popular (as in popular versus high culture) and, more ominously, inferior. Let the diverse public in and your discipline suffers. Let public sociology in and your scholarship deteriorates. Is sociology ready for this? (Collins, 2007, p. 108)

To crystallize this position, Collins (2007) states that, “If public sociology is unprepared to jump into the controversies that surround the term public, then this may not be the best name” (p. 108).

In addition to the practical concerns about conducting Public sociology discussed above, several authors are apprehensive about Public sociology. This apprehension stems for the perception that Public sociology will undermine the scientific credibility of the discipline. This position will be explored in the following section.

**Issues with the Normative Vision: Questions About Scientific Credibility**

It can be seen in the literature that many authors express concern over the perceived detrimental effects of Public sociology on the accumulation of sociological knowledge and the scientific credibility of the discipline. For some sociologists the call for Public sociology by Burawoy is premature, arguing instead that:

establishing a strong program in professional sociology, based upon the inherent reflexivity of science, presents the most promising avenue for the
strengthening of the discipline and the facilitation of our public engagement. (Boyns & Fletcher, 2005, p. 24)

Sociology, it is argued, is not ready to take the Public form as envisioned by Burawoy because there is still insufficient consensus in the discipline about what constitutes foundational sociological knowledge. More ominously, Public sociology may ‘get in the way’ of good Professional sociology (Turner 2005) while at the same time undermining the legitimacy of sociology and undercutting reliable disciplinary knowledge (Tittle, 2004). This is because the advocacy of Public sociology runs the risks of simply turning sociology into another interest group thus forfeiting its prestige as an academic discipline.

Accordingly, what sociology needs is a renewed commitment to scientific inquiry to create and solidify the disciplinary knowledge base. This can only be accomplished through a rigorous program of Professional sociology. According to Tittle (2004):

sociology needs to re-commit itself to the epistemology of science; it needs to seek out clients for sociological knowledge; and it needs to demonstrate that our knowledge is useful. Only then will we begin to make inroads on broader publics. (p. 29)

It is through scientific study that legitimacy in the eyes of the public and within academia can be attained. Only once further legitimized, with solid foundational scientific knowledge, it is then possible for the discipline to engage the public in discussion. Ultimately, it appears that the authors who are concerned with the scientific credibility of the discipline are motivated by the fear that without sufficient foundational knowledge sociology runs the risk of having little credible information to bring into discussion with the public.

Many of these arguments, specifically the need for a more scientific sociology based on the primacy of scientific knowledge are countered by claims in the sociology of science and knowledge literature. In particular, the critical perspective adopted in this
literature makes “a very strong social constructionist argument for all forms of knowledge claims, most certainly and especially scientific ones” (Haraway, 1988, p. 576). As a result, scientific knowledge loses its preeminence over social and sociological knowledge and becomes equally contestable. Although for the purpose of this discussion the social construction of scientific knowledge will not be explored any further, it is worth noting that there is a strong counter argument against the need for a more scientific sociology.

**Fundamental problems of the original framework**

In addition to those authors who take issue with Burawoy’s normative vision of the discipline, there are also several authors who have fundamental problems with the theoretical model proposed by Burawoy. Patterson (2007) is opposed to Burawoy’s theoretical contribution—the four sociologies model—for several reasons. Firstly, it is argued that the four-sociologies model:

> illustrates some of the worst habits of contemporary sociological thinking, the most important being its excessive overschematization and over theorizing of subjects, the construction of falsely crisp sets and categories, and the failure to take seriously the role of agency in social outcomes. (Patterson, 2007, p. 176)

Furthermore, the distinction between Public sociology and Policy sociology is unjustified because: “Any action by a sociologist beyond the academy…that entails and engages a public is public sociology” (Patterson, 2007, p. 180). Patterson also provides an alternative framework for conceptualizing the discipline: in place of the four-sociologies there are instead “three broad sets of public sociologies: the professionally engaged; the discursively engaged; and the actively or critically engaged” (2007, p. 181).

For Morrow (2009), the problems in Burawoy’s model run deep. In particular, the juxtaposition of instrumental and reflexive knowledge in Burawoy’s model is
problematic. This polarization, argues Morrow, is historically and geographically specific and therefore not generalizable to other contexts. As a result, the four-sociologies model may be an accurate reflection of US sociology at this current juncture in history, but it is not an accurate reflection of the discipline in other time periods or, more generally, of sociology in the global context. Morrow also provides the foundation for developing an alternative to Burawoy’s four-sociologies model while at the same time pointing to some of its other shortcomings. What is required is a generalizable framework that:

1. is not based on a polarization of instrumental and reflexive knowledge;
2. expands the quadrant now labeled ‘critical sociology’ to encompass ‘social theory’ generally in order to extend its meaning to include the multiple forms of reflexivity necessary for social theory;
3. takes into account that professional sociology as empirical knowledge takes a multiplicity of explanatory and methodological forms that cannot be reduced to the concept of ‘instrumental knowledge’;
4. recognizes that policy sociology needs to be differentiated by recognizing its ‘technocratic’ and ‘liberal enlightenment’ forms, a distinction that suggests greater continuity between some forms of policy and public sociology. Finally (5), such modification will provide a basis for clarification of the logical status and rationale of a fourfold model of the division of sociological labour. (Morrow, 2009, p. 48)

Other sociologists are far less optimistic about the prospect of sociology being able to contribute to public discourse at all. Stinchcombe (2007) argues that as a discipline, sociology does not have enough relevant truth to either improve the outcome of policy or the public’s understanding of their own situation. As a result, any attempts at contributing to public discourse are ultimately not likely to be useful to public. Thus Public sociology is an illusion.

Similarly, Smith-Lovin (2007) is skeptical about the idea of being able to predict what knowledge will be useful in the future. Without knowing what knowledge will be useful in the future, Public sociology risks pursuing irrelevant topics. Worse yet, Public
sociology risks having little or no useful knowledge to contribute to the public. Thus for any program of Public sociology relevance is of utmost importance—it makes sense as the standard by which the quality should be judged. But without being able to discern what knowledge will be useful to the public in the future, is it possible to have a relevant program of Public sociology? In retrospect it is possible to see what knowledge would have been useful in a particular situation, as hindsight is rarely less than 20/20, but proactively determining what knowledge will be useful in the future may require a whole new machine.

More optimistically, Wallerstein (2007), in a discussion of the functions of all scientists and scholars, makes the argument that all sociology is inherently public. What differentiates the types of sociologists then is whether or not they adopt the label of public sociology. The implications are that Burawoy’s schematization is in fact superfluous because:

> all sociologists – living, dead, or yet to be born – are, and cannot be other than, public sociologists. The only distinction is between those who are willing to avow the mantle and those who are not. (Wallerstein, 2007, p. 174)

To recapitulate, Burawoy’s conceptual framework and normative vision have generated much discussion and debate. Many authors advocate Public sociology and focus on how Public sociology can contribute to a better world. Other responses focus on the shortcomings of Burawoy’s normative vision. Here the literature is plentiful and diverse including discussions around the need for truly interdisciplinary collaborations, the practicality of conducting Public sociology and questions about the scientific credibility of the discipline. In addition, there are also critiques of Burawoy’s conceptual framework. Ranging from disagreement about the polarization of instrumental and
reflexive knowledge, to claims of overschemeization and the view that Public sociology cannot exist as Burawoy claims; the critical responses to the theoretical model are also numerous.

**Burawoy’s Four-Sociologies Model and the Call for Empirical Evidence**

Arguing ‘for’ and ‘against’ Burawoy and his vision for public sociology is not deepening our understanding of what public sociology is, and what it can do, in ways that are empirically interesting and useful. (McLaughlin and Turcotte, 2007, p. 825)

As can be seen in the previous sections, there is a rich and heterogeneous assortment of responses to Burawoy. Of particular relevance to this project, however, is the literature related to the empirical testability of Burawoy’s typology. This will be discussed in the current section.

Rather than joining in the normative debates surrounding Burawoy’s vision, McLaughlin and Turcotte (2007) are concerned with the empirical testability of Burawoy’s model. More generally, this focus represents a concern that Burawoy’s model:

works better as a political program and diplomatic compromise within the profession than as an outline for an empirically grounded understanding of sociology and other organized forms of knowledge production. (McLaughlin, Kowalchuk, & Turcotte, 2005, p. 134)

This is because: (1) the central concepts and categories of the typology are ambiguous, therefore, difficult to operationalize; (2) the institutional context of sociology—particularly the interface between academia and the public—is insufficiently clear; and (3) the relative size of each type of sociology in various contexts is also unclear (McLaughlin and Turcotte, 2007). It is for these reasons that McLaughlin and Turcotte (2007) shift focus from the normative to the empirical in their formulation of a framework for conceptualizing the discipline.
Answering the call for an empirical study, Brym and Nakhaie (2009) examine Burawoy’s four-sociologies framework in the Canadian context. Using data collected for a study of Canadian academics in 2000, Brym and Nakhaie examine the distribution of Burawoy’s four categories in several academic fields including sociology. They conclude that the professorate in Canada can, in fact, be represented by Burawoy’s division of sociological labour framework.

In order to measure the distribution of each type of sociology, Brym and Nakhaie (2009) operationalize the typology using the number and type of publications as well as a measure of reflexivity. By looking at the number and type of publications it is possible to distinguish between those academics who target an academic audience and those who target extra-academic audience. To elaborate, Brym and Nakhaie (2009) articulate that, on the one hand, academics who write more peer-reviewed journal articles tend to address an academic audience, thus being either Professional or Critical sociologists. On the other hand, academics who write more books and reports tend to focus more on an extra-academic audience, thus being either Policy or Public sociologist. This claim is further qualified in three ways: (1) the current relationship between the type of sociology and type of publication is not enduring, rather it is a product of the current nature of sociology; (2) the distinction between peer-reviewed journal articles and, books and reports, is ‘a matter of degree, not kind’. In other words, all sociologists are likely to publish each type of publication but the ratio of peer-reviewed journal articles to books and reports will vary; and (3) there are many other possible ways of differentiating between the types of sociology (Brym and Nakhaie, 2009).
Next, the reflexivity dimension of Burawoy’s framework is measured using participant responses to a question asking respondents whether they believe “‘universities have a major obligation to help society solve its problems’” (Brym and Nakhaie, 2009, p. 661).

Brym and Nakhaie argue this operationalization is warranted because:

respondents would not strongly agree that universities are so obliged if they take an ivory-tower view of the university – regarding it as an institution removed from mundane social concerns, and focusing on purely intellectual issues – and distinguish respondents who strongly agree that universities have a major obligation to help society solve its problems from others. (2009, p. 661)

By creating a table of these two variables—publications and reflexivity—Brym and Nakhaie are able to operationalize Burawoy’s typology using the two original criteria, the type of knowledge produced and the target audience. Based on a sample of 113 sociologists in Canada, the breakdown according the four-sociologies model is as follows: 19% Professional, 27% Policy, 19% Critical and 35% Public.
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In addition to providing the first empirical evidence related to the typology, Brym and Nakhaie (2009) also verify additional claims made by Burawoy. Professional sociologists tended to conduct more research and secure more research funding compared to Public sociologists. Public sociologists, however, tend to teach more than their Professional sociologist counterparts. Furthermore, Brym and Nakhaie also examine
patterns in terms of the four-sociologies model and socio-demographic characteristics.

They conclude that:

Canadian academic types do not differ by visible minority status, ethnicity, or religiosity. However, public and policy academics are more likely to be female, young, unmarried, employed in institutions of low academic standing, and earn relatively low income than are professional academics. This means that professional academics tend to enjoy higher status on a range of sociodemographic and economic variables than public and policy academics do. Additionally – and surprisingly – we note that public, policy and critical academics are less likely to be employed in Quebec universities than are professional academics. (Brym and Nakhaie, 2009, p. 666).

In summary, Brym and Nakhaie (2009) provide extensive data regarding the contours of the Canadian sociology landscape including the distribution of sociologists within each of Burawoy’s four types, as well as related socioeconomic variables. Thus Brym and Nakhaie successful provide the first empirically grounded analyses of Canadian sociology in the context of Burawoy’s four-sociologies model.

**Burawoy’s Response and the Revised Theoretical Framework**

Acknowledging Brym and Nakhaie’s work, Burawoy (2009) elaborates and refines his theoretical framework specifically for the Canadian context. This is necessary, Burawoy argues, because Canadian sociology differs from US sociology due to its unique historical context. The resulting framework provides a more nuanced conceptualization of the different types of sociological work. Using the original four-sociologies framework as a base, the model is refined by increasing the number of categories by further subdividing each of the four original types of sociology—Professional, Policy, Critical and Public. The result is a model of the discipline with eight types of sociology:
In the process of delineating the boundaries of each type of sociology, Burawoy (2009) provides a clearer picture of the work each type of sociology conducts. Of the two Professional sociologies, the Formal variety deals with “modes of collective self-regulation, defending academic freedom and autonomy [and]… peer review” (Burawoy, 2009, p. 879). It is the ‘bureaucratic apparatus’ that supports the “multiple and intersecting research programs” (Burawoy, 2009, p. 879) of Substantive Professional sociology. Of the Policy sociologies, Sponsored Policy sociology is work commissioned by a client; the terms of research and the nature of the problem are driven by the client’s agenda (Burawoy, 2009). Advocacy Policy sociology, on the other hand, involves independently engaging specific policy issues where the sociologist “decides what issues are important for any policy agenda” (Burawoy, 2009). While both Critical sociologies criticize the foundations of sociology, Interdisciplinary Critical engages in a critique that is “influenced by other disciplines” (Burawoy, 2009, p. 881). In contrast, Disciplinary Critical sociology is influenced by social theory within the discipline. Finally,
differentiation between the two Public sociologies can be made based on the level of interaction between the sociologist and those whom the relevant social issues affect. On the one hand, Organic Public sociology engages social issues to alleviate social problems in close contact with those whom it affects. It is characterized by “direct face-to-face connection to publics” (Burawoy, 2009, p. 876) and includes participatory action and community engaged research. On the other hand, Traditional Public sociology maintains a degree of distance when critically examining social issues.

By subdividing each of the four types of sociology as described above, Burawoy is able to provide a clearer account of both his framework as well as his vision of the discipline. It is this revised version of the typology that served as the basis for the questionnaire that was used for this research project. This model was used, as opposed to the original four-sociologies model, because it was developed specifically for the Canadian context. In addition, it is also possible to collapse the revised framework into the original framework by combining the two categories that make up each quadrant. As a result it was still be possible to conduct comparative analysis between Brym and Nakhaie’s work and the finding of this project.

As previously mentioned in this chapter, it was Michael Burawoy’s 2004 presidential address at the American Sociological Association where he presented a new conceptual framework for understand the discipline of sociology, the division of sociological labour. This framework, characterized by four interdependent sociologies: Professional, Policy, Critical and Public, became the focal point of much subsequent discussion around the nature of sociology and the call for a more public sociology. To recapitulate, Burawoy’s address provoked a multitude of responses, both receptive and critical, to his theoretical
framework and normative vision of the discipline. In this literature many authors focus their attention on the practicality of conducting Public sociology (Collins, 2007; Gans, 2009; Glenn, 2009; N. D. Glenn, 2009; Hays, 2007; Mayrl, 2009; Nielsen, 2004; Piven, 2007; Smith-Lovin, 2007; Stacey, 2007; Wilson, 2007). Alternatively, other sociologists focus on problems with the theoretical model (Morrow, 2009; Patterson, 2007; Smith-Lovin, 2007; Stinchcombe, 2007; Wallerstein, 2007) and concerns about the scientific credibility of the discipline (Boyns & Fletcher, 2005; Tittle, 2004; Turner, 2005). Finally, the call for concrete evidence to support the framework is particularly relevant to this project. It is McLauqlin and Turcotte’s (2007) call for empirical evidence and the first empirical study by Brym and Nakhaie (2009) that serve at the catalyst for this project which answers the call for a survey designed specifically to measure, elaborate, and test the validity of Burawoy’s typology.

At this point we will shift the focus of our attention away from the existing literature towards the data needed to evaluate the central research questions of this research. The data, operationalization and underlying methodological considerations will be discussed in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 3
DATA AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction - Primary Objectives

Prior to beginning the discussion of data and methodology, it is first useful to frame this chapter in terms of the central research question of this project. Generally speaking, this project seeks to determine the broad contours of sociology in the Canadian context. More specifically, this research project has three objectives: firstly, the primary objective is to determine the current distribution of Canadian sociologists using Burawoy’s (2009) disciplinary mosaic framework. A secondary objective of this research project is to measure the extent that Canadian sociologists agree with Burawoy’s normative vision of the discipline. Finally, a tertiary objective of this project is to explore and evaluate socio-demographic and other variables shown to be relevant in the literature. In the context of these three objectives, the current chapter will proceed in the following manner: firstly, the key variables of this research will be identified and the operationalization of each will be explained. Next, the study population will be identified and sampling considerations discussed. Finally, the questionnaire design and delivery using the SurveyMonkey website will be outlined.

Key Variables and Operationalization

It is clear that in order to accomplish the main research objectives, measures of each of the following is required: (1) the types of sociological work the professorate in Canada is currently engaged in; (2) general normative beliefs regarding the type of sociological work that ought to be conducted; and (3) the socio-demographic characteristics of the professorate shown to be relevant including income, age, sex, region, type of institution, research funding, and teaching load.
An online questionnaire was chosen as the method of data collection utilizing a survey tool developed specifically for this project. This questionnaire (Appendix B) contains 30 quantitative items to measure the three primary areas of interest as well as qualitative questions about the type of work Canadian sociologists are currently conducting. By including both quantitative and qualitative measures it is possible to triangulate the results where both the quantitative and qualitative questions converge and draw attention to where they diverge. As a result, it is possible to determine if the quantitative measures—operationalized from Burawoy’s disciplinary mosaic framework—accurately represent the types of work that Canadian sociologists are conducting and feel they ought to be conducting or whether additional types of work emerge in the qualitative data.

Before discussing the questionnaire tool in depth, it is worth noting the rationale for using the disciplinary mosaic framework as opposed to Burawoy’s (2005) four sociologies model. Firstly, the disciplinary mosaic framework was chosen for because it was developed specifically to describe the Canadian context. Secondly, subdividing each of the original categories creates the disciplinary mosaic framework. It is therefore possible to collapse the subdivided categories back into the four original categories—Professional, Policy, Critical and Public—during data analysis. Thus it will be possible to use the disciplinary mosaic framework and also conduct comparative analysis between the results of this project and of the result of Brym and Nakhaie’s 2009 article Professional, Critical, Policy and Public Academics in Canada.

The Questionnaire Tool – Measuring the Disciplinary Mosaic Framework

As previously indicated, the main purpose of the research project is to determine the balance of each type of sociology in the Canadian context using Burawoy’s disciplinary mosaic framework. In order to accomplish this goal, however, it was first necessary to
operationalize Burawoy’s framework, the disciplinary mosaic, in terms of the different work conducted by each type of sociology.
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Figure 3-1. The Disciplinary Mosaic

Burawoy (2009) indicates that there are eight (8) types of sociology each with its own specific tasks. Of the two Professional sociologies, the Formal variety engages in professional services such as “modes of collective self-regulation, defending academic freedom and autonomy [and]… peer review” (Burawoy, 2009, p. 879) while Substantive Professional sociology engages in programs of social research. Of the Policy sociologies, Sponsored Policy sociology is work commissioned or directed by the goals of a client while Advocacy Policy sociology involves independently engaging specific policy issues. Of the two Critical sociologies, Interdisciplinary Critical engages in a critique of sociology drawing upon other disciplines while Disciplinary Critical sociology does not derive any of its critique from other disciplines. Finally, the two Public sociologies differ not on their task, the alleviation of social issues, but based on the level of interaction with
those publics whom the social issues affect. Organic Public sociology engages issues in close, face-to-face with publics while Traditional Public sociology maintains its distance.

Using the aforementioned distinctions made by Burawoy (2009), it is possible to operationalize the disciplinary mosaic framework according to the type of work conducted. It is clear that social research is at the heart of Substantive Professional sociology. Because social research has two main components, theory and methodology, engaging in theoretical or methodological work will also be considered as Substantive Professional sociology. To reiterative, theoretical and methodological contributions are included in this measure of Substantive Professional sociology because they are intimately linked to social research; without social theory and methodology there could be no social research. Thus respondents will be asked three questions relating to Substantive Professional sociology: How often do you engage in developing or improving upon social theory? How often do you engage in developing or improving upon the methods/methodology of sociology? And, how often do you engage in social research?

Because the disciplinary mosaic framework differentiates Substantial Professional from Formal profession sociology based on professional service and regulation, a separate measure will be included on the questionnaire to gauge which type of Professional sociology is the respondent’s primary focus. This measure is a time-budget asking respondents to indicate the following: In terms of the work you do as a sociologist, please indicate an approximate percentage of time you spend on each of the following activities in a typical week: (1) teaching (2) research and scholarship (3) professional service (4) other activities. Those respondents who indicate that they spend
more time engaged in professional service than research and scholarship will be classified as Formal Professional sociologists while those respondents who indicate spending more time on research and scholarship will be classified as Substantive Professional sociologists. This measure also allows for the possibility that the professional service component of Professional sociology is distributed across the other types of sociology rather than being exclusively in the realm of Professional sociology. It is hypothesized that the professional service component of sociological work is relatively equally distributed across all types of sociology. The rationale behind this hypothesis is that all participants of this study will be located within the context of the university. As such, it is unlikely that employment and promotion in their respective departments would be possible without performing the professional service role. Put another way, it is anticipated that this professional service role will be considered mandatory for all full-time sociologists working in the University context.

In terms of the difference between Sponsored and Advocacy Policy sociology, Burawoy (2009) is clear that the main distinction between the two is who defines the goals of the policy work. If the client defines the goals then the work is considered Sponsored Policy sociology; if the sociologist defines the goals then the work is considered Advocacy Policy sociology. Thus the questionnaire asks participants to rate how often they critically engage specific policies/policy issues and how often they formulate policy for a client.

Of the two types of Critical sociology, the central difference is the source of the criticism. While both Critical sociologies criticize the foundations of sociology, Interdisciplinary Critical engages in a critique that is “influenced by other disciplines”
(Burawoy, 2009, p. 881). Thus respondents were asked how often they engage in: (1) critically examining the foundations of social theory; (2) critically examining and critiquing the work of other sociologists; and (3) critically examining the disciplinary foundations of sociology drawing upon the critiques provided by other disciplines.

Finally, one of the main differences between Traditional Public sociology and Organic Public sociology is the level of interaction between the sociologist and the public: where there is no interaction or dialogue between the sociologist and the public, the work is considered traditional Public Sociology. Where there is face-to-face dialogue between the sociologist and the public, the work is considered Organic Public sociology. Thus respondents were asked how often they spent time critically examining issues to alleviate social problems and how often they actively engage issues to alleviate social problems in close contact with those whom the issue is relevant.

Using the responses from these questions it will be possible to determine the primary type(s) of sociology for each respondent in terms of the disciplinary mosaic framework. In addition, a second measure of the type of sociology conducted will be included on the questionnaire. Using the same operationalization as the previous question, this second measure asks respondents to rate the top three (3) activities in terms of the importance to their work as a sociologist from the following list:

Table 3-1. Sociological Work by Type of Sociology

1. Formal Professional Sociology
   - Developing or improving upon social theory
   - Developing or improving upon the methods/methodology of sociology
   - Engaging in social research

2. Sponsored Policy Sociology
   - Formulating policy for a client

3. Advocacy Policy Sociology
   - Critically engaging specific policies/policy issues
4. Disciplinary Critical Sociology
   • Critically examining the foundations of social theory
   • Critically examining and critiquing the work of other sociologists

5. Interdisciplinary Critical Sociology
   • Critically examining the disciplinary foundations of sociology drawing upon the critiques provided by other disciplines

6. Organic Public Sociology
   • Actively engaging issues to alleviate social problems in close contact with those whom the issue is relevant

7. Traditional Public Sociology
   • Critically examining issues to alleviate social problems

Although this second measure will not force respondents to choose only one type of sociological work for each ranked position, it will, nonetheless, force respondents to think about what type of activities are most important to the work they conduct. Where the primary type of sociology cannot be determined by the responses to the likert items, this second measure will be used instead.

At this point it is worth elaborating on the decision not to force respondents to rank order the top three activities in terms of importance to their work. This decision was made based on the fact that each type of sociology represents only a Weberian ideal type (Burawoy, 2007). Consequently, it is possible for a sociologist to engage in more than one type of sociology and be considered a practitioner of many. Being mindful of this fact, it is useful to allow for a mixed category to emerge during the data collection process. Those respondents who indicate that multiple types of work are of primary importance will be classified in this mixed category. By comparing Burawoy’s normative vision of the discipline using the data collected from the previous measures it will be possible to evaluate the extent to which Canadian sociology converges with this normative vision. In sum, the questionnaire will provide the data necessary to accomplish the first primary objective of this research project.
In addition, the questionnaire has items to provide data necessary to accomplish the remaining two objectives: to determine the extent that Canadian sociologists agree with Burawoy’s normative vision and to examine claims made in the existing literature.

The Questionnaire Tool – Evaluating Normative Claims

In order to gauge the extent to which sociologists agree with Burawoy’s normative vision each of the items from Table 3-1 (Sociological Work by Type of Sociology) are used again. This time respondents will be asked to indicate on a likert scale, from strongly agree to strongly disagree, what types of work sociologists ought to be conducting. By examining the answers to these questions in aggregate, it will be possible to determine the normative stance of the professorate as a whole and thus whether it conforms to Burawoy’s normative vision. In addition to the normative likert items, questionnaire respondents will also asked the following open-ended question about their normative beliefs: In your professional opinion, what type of work should sociologists be conducting at this juncture in history?

The operationalization used for the measures of both the primary type of sociological work conducted and normative beliefs about the discipline have the added benefit of circumventing the potentially problematic labels of Professional and Public sociology. To elaborate, the label ‘Professional sociology’ is problematic because by naming one type of sociology ‘professional’ it implies that other types of sociology are in fact not professional. Although Professional sociology may represent the type of work that is currently associated with the majority of disciplinary rewards, the name does not help to create a profession in which the four types of sociological work in Burawoy’s model are each professionally recognized. Similarly, ‘Public sociology’ may also be a problematic
moniker due to the negative association with the word ‘public’ (Collins, 2007). Although
the questionnaire sidesteps these issues by excluding the words professional and public in
the operationalization, it may be useful to reconsider the nomenclature of Burawoy’s
typology in future work. In sum, the questionnaire provides the data necessary to
investigate the normative beliefs of Canadian sociologists while avoiding the issues
associated with professional and public.

**The Questionnaire Tool – Sociodemographic Data**

Finally, the questionnaire will include items to collect the data necessary to meet the
third and final objective of this research project: an examination of the relevant
sociodemographic variables. For the purpose of this discussion it is useful to reexamine
the original four-sociologies framework. As can be seen in the table below, the four
types of sociology are differentiated using the target audience, academic or extra-
academic, and the type of knowledge produced, instrumental or reflexive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Academic Audience</th>
<th>Extra-Academic Audience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Knowledge</td>
<td><em>Professional</em></td>
<td><em>Policy</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflexive Knowledge</td>
<td><em>Critical</em></td>
<td><em>Public</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-2. The Division of Sociological Labour

In terms of the target audience, Brym and Nakhaie (2009) found that by comparing the
number and type of publication for each type of sociology it is possible to differentiate
between those sociologists who direct their work towards an academic audience,
Professional and Critical, and those who direct their work towards an extra-academic
audience, Policy and Public sociology. In particular, Professional and Critical
sociologists tended to have more publications in peer-reviewed journals while policy and public sociologists tended to publish more books and reports. Thus the questionnaire asks respondents to indicate the number and types of publications produced over the past five years. The questionnaire also includes two additional measure of the target audience: which of the following best represents the target audience for your papers, reports and publications? And, which of the following best represents the target audience for your public presentations? The results of these questions will make it possible compare the self-reported target audience with the type of sociology conducting. It also allows for comparative analysis between Brym and Nakhaie’s (2009) findings and this research study.

There are several other variables in the literature that this questionnaire seeks to measure, namely, the link between graduate education and public sociology (Gans 2009; Mayrl, 2009; Stacey, 2007), the status of public sociology in the institutional context (Collins, 2007; Hays 2007) and sociodemographic characteristics (Brym and Nakhaie, 2009). Related to both graduate education programs and the status of public sociology in the institutional context, the questionnaire will ask respondents to indicate if their department has a graduate program at either the MA or PhD level. From this question it will be possible to examine the relationship between graduate education and the type of sociology conducted.

In addition there are several other socio-demographic characteristics shown to be relevant in the literature. In a discussion of their findings, Brym and Nakhaie (2009) state that:

Canadian academic types do not differ by visible minority status, ethnicity, or religiosity. However, public and policy academics are more
likely to be female, young, unmarried, employed in institutions of low academic standing, and earn relatively low income than are professional academics. This means that professional academics tend to enjoy higher status on a range of sociodemographic and economic variables than public and policy academics do. Additionally – and surprisingly – we note that public, policy and critical academics are less likely to be employed in Quebec universities than are professional academics. (Brym and Nakhaie, 2009, p. 666)

Accordingly, several measures will be included on the questionnaire in an attempt to measure whether there have been any changes in the past decade—the Brym and Nakhaie (2009) utilized data from a study conducted in 2000. These measures included income, age, sex, and region. In addition, as Brym and Nakhaie (2009) note, Burawoy makes claims regarding teaching and research funding. More specifically, that Public sociologists tend to teach more classes compared to the other sociologists. While Professional sociologists focus primarily on social research and tend to secure more research funding than the other types of sociology. To evaluate these claims, and again see if there have been an changes in the ten years since Brym and Nakhaie’s data was collected, the following questions will be included on the survey: in the past five (5) years, on average, how many classes have you taught each year? (including regular and spring/summer session); and, in the past five (5) years, approximately how much research funding have you received?

Although there are additional measures on the questionnaire, the measures relevant to this research project are discussed above. Appendix B and C contain the English and French version of the questionnaire, respectively. Here a comprehensive list of the measures on the questionnaire can be found.
Population and Sample

The population for this study is all full-time faculty members in sociology departments in universities and colleges across Canada. This population was chosen because it includes those individuals most intimately involved with the discipline and most actively engaged in sociological work. Thus, while the results of this project may be generalizable to sociologists working within the university and college contexts in Canada, they are not generalizable to other contexts where sociologists may work. It is worth noting that this study would likely have significantly different results if the sample was expanded to include sociologist working in other contexts such as health, education or agriculture to name a few. Furthermore, the results would also likely differ by including professors with part-time appointments, sessional lecturers and graduate students in the sample. As a result, there is the potential for much future work on how the types of work sociologists do varies by context and appointment.

In order to maximize the number of responses as well as ensure sample representativeness, it was decided to include the entire population in the sample. As a result, many of the methodological issues around sampling have been sidestepped. The first phase of sampling began with retrieving a list of Canadian Universities and Colleges from the Association of Universities and Colleges in Canada (AUCC) website (www.aucc.ca). This list provided the name, contact information and website for all AUCC institutions. The website of each institution was then searched for the presence of a sociology program and department. Those institutions without sociology programs or departments were excluded from the sample. Of the institutions with a sociology program or department, a list of all full-time faculty members in sociology was compiled from the sociology department website. For all sociology departments where full-time
and part-time faculty members were differentiated, only the full-time faculty members were added to the contact list. In sociology departments where full-time and part-time faculty members were not differentiated, all faculty members were added to the contact list. The part-time faculty members were then separated from the full-time faculty during the data analysis process.

Where joint departmental websites existed—for example, sociology and anthropology—only the email addresses of full-time sociologists were gathered. For joint departments where the specialization of individual professors could not be ascertained, all full-time department members were included. During data analysis other specializations were filtered out to ensure that only full-time sociologists were included in the final results.

Using the aforementioned criteria for selection, the number of participants contacted for this research study was 947. As alluded to, this number is higher than the actual number of full-time sociology professors in Canada due to two factors: (1) it was not possible to differentiate between full-time and part-time faculty members in all instances; and (2) for those individuals in joint departments it was not always possible to differentiate between specializations. The actual number of full-time sociologists is likely closer to N=800 (Curtis & Weir, 2005, p. 503). Consequently, the questionnaire was sent to a minimum of 150 part-time faculty and faculty from other specialization. This was necessary to ensure that all full-time sociologists were contacted during this study. Subsequent steps were taken to ensure that only full-time sociology professors were included in the results. In terms of sample representativeness, there were less than twenty full-time faculty members without publicly available email addresses. It is highly
unlikely that the exclusion of this subpopulation significantly impacted upon the results of this study.

The same steps were also taken to sample French-speaking respondents. A translated version of the questionnaire (Appendix C) was delivered to those sociologists who primarily or exclusively speak French. This was determined by examining the website and personal profile of each faculty member. Where the website indicated the University was French-speaking, the translated questionnaire was sent. In institutions where both French and English were prominent, the personal profile of each faculty member was used to determine which questionnaire to send. Where the personal profile contained only French, the individual was sent the French questionnaire. If the profile was written in English, on the other hand, the individual was sent the questionnaire in English.

**Questionnaire Design, Delivery and Data**

Due to limited financial resources and time constraints, the online questionnaire was the most pragmatic method of data collection for the desired population. This being said, there is no reason to believe the online questionnaire, compared to other possible data collection methods, in any way compromises the results of this project. Moreover, the online questionnaire has several advantages making it ideal for this project: the cost is low, there is a faster response rate compared to questionnaires administered by mail, there are fewer unanswered questions and also a better response to open-ended questions (Bryman & Teevan, 2005). Although the response rate for self-administered surveys is typically low, particularly for online surveys, it was not anticipated that the response rate would be sufficiently low to hinder statistical analysis.

The online version of the survey was created using the Survey Monkey website. Because participants had not opted-in to participating in this project prior to receiving
contact from the researcher, each individual on the contact list received an introductory email explaining the project and inviting their participation. The introductory email included a link to the online questionnaire hosted by the Survey Monkey website. For those who chose to respond, the questionnaire was designed to take approximately 30 minutes to complete. Before closing the data collection portion of this project, two additional email reminders were sent asking professors to participate. Precaution was taken to ensure that those who indicated through correspondence that they did not wish to participate in the study were not contacted again. Those who completed the questionnaire were also excluded from subsequent mail outs where possible.

Once data collection was complete, all responses were downloaded from the Survey Monkey website as a Microsoft Excel file and imported into SPSS 18.0. Next, the data was cleaned and a codebook created for all variables setting the stage for quantitative data analysis. The questionnaire also included a number of open-ended questions suitable for qualitative data analysis. The responses to the opened-ended questions were copied into a Microsoft Word document and each respondent assigned a respondent number to ensure confidentiality. Next, the text was imported into NVivo 8.0 where emerging themes in the responses were coded thus making it possible to conduct further analysis of the qualitative data. The results of the quantitative and qualitative data analysis will be discussed in the next chapter.

---

3 All respondents will be identified by their ‘respondent number’ hereafter
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS –THE DISCIPLINARY MOSAIC

As discussed in Chapter 2, Michael Burawoy’s 2004 presidential address at the American Sociological Association (ASA) presented a new conceptual framework for understanding the discipline of sociology, the division of sociological labour.

Table 4-1. The Division of Sociological Labour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Academic Audience</th>
<th>Extra-Academic Audience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Knowledge</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflexive Knowledge</td>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This framework, characterized by four interdependent sociologies: Professional, Policy, Critical and Public, became the focal point of much of the subsequent discussion surrounding the nature of sociology and the call for a more public sociology. The literature written in response to Burawoy is diverse and several prominent themes emerge including the practicality of conducting Public sociology, problems with the theoretical model, concerns about the scientific credibility of the discipline and the call for empirical evidence. Ultimately, it is McLaughlin and Turcotte’s (2007) call for concrete evidence and the first empirical study by Brym and Nakhaie (2009) that serve as the catalyst for this project which answers the call for a survey designed specifically to measure, elaborate, and test the validity of Burawoy’s typology. Based upon both the original four sociologies framework and Burawoy’s (2009) revised disciplinary mosaic framework, developed specifically for the Canadian context, this project utilizes data collected using an online questionnaire delivered to all full-time faculty in sociology department across Canada. The questionnaire tool was designed specifically to measure the type of work
conducted by Canadian sociologists, the type of work they perceive to be important as well as a number of other characteristics shown to be relevant in the literature.

Before proceeding with a discussion of the results of the questionnaire, it is first useful to situate this chapter in terms of the central research question of this project which it seeks to answer, namely, what is the distribution of sociology professors in Canada using the disciplinary mosaic framework? In order to answer this question, respondents were asked to rate numerous items in terms of importance to their work. The aggregate result of this rating is the relative balance of each type of sociology in the Canadian context and the answer to this project’s central research question. A secondary purpose of this project is to evaluate the extent to which Canadian sociologists agree or disagree with Burawoy’s normative vision of the discipline. Using the same operationalization as the measure of primary sociological work conducted, a number of normative measures were also developed and included on the questionnaire.

To elaborate, there are four overarching types of sociology in the disciplinary mosaic framework: Professional, Policy, Critical and Public. Each of these four types is subdivided resulting in the eight types of sociology that make up the substantive framework this project evaluates.
Respondents are classified as one particular type based on the questionnaire item which they label as most important to their work as a sociologist\textsuperscript{4}. Although the rationale behind each of questionnaire items has been discussed in the data and methodology chapter, it is useful to briefly outline the measures once again. The first category is Substantive Professional sociology. Burawoy (2005) is clear that social research is the cornerstone of Substantive Professional sociology. Moreover, Substantive Professional sociology also provides the tried and tested theory and methodology for the other types of sociology. Accordingly those respondents who indicate that social research, social theory and/or methodology are of primary importance to the work they conduct are classified as Substantive Professional sociologists.

Each respondent classified under the heading of Substantive Professional sociology will then be revisited to determine the relative percentage of time devoted to research and

\textsuperscript{4}This measure was used for data analysis instead of the likert items as its interpretation was much more intuitive.
scholarship versus professional service activities, those activities which are of central to Formal Professional sociology. Those respondents who indicate spending more time on professional service than research and scholarship are classified as Formal Professional sociologists. Where research and scholarship are more prominent, the classification of Substantive Professional sociologist remained.

The second overarching category is Policy sociology of which there are two types: Advocacy Policy sociology and Sponsored Professional sociology. Respondents who indicate that they critically engage specific policies or policy relevant issues are classified as Advocacy Policy sociologists. Whereas respondents indicating that their policy relevant work is dictated by the goals of a client they are instead classified under the banner of Sponsored Policy sociology.

The third type of sociology is Critical sociology, which is also subdivided into two categories: Disciplinary Critical sociology and Interdisciplinary Critical sociology. Those respondents who indicate that their primary focus is critically examining the foundations of sociology or examining and critiquing the work of other sociologists are classified as Disciplinary Critical sociologist. Where respondents indicate that of their primary focus is on the critical examination of the disciplinary foundations based upon the critique of sociology provided by other disciplines they are classified as Interdisciplinary Critical sociologists.

Finally the fourth category is Public sociology. Where respondents indicate that the most important task to their work as a sociologist involves critically examining issues to alleviate social problems, they are classified under the Traditional Public sociology category. Alternatively, respondents who indicate that working to alleviate social
problems in close contact with those whom the issue is of primary importance they are
instead classified as an Organic Public sociologist.

**The Disciplinary Mosaic – Canadian Results**

Based on the operationalization briefly outlined above, the following chart was created
based upon the frequencies table generated by SPSS 18.0.

![The Disciplinary Mosaic](chart)

**Figure 4-2. Canadian Results Using the Disciplinary Mosaic Framework**

By far the most prominent group in the Canadian sociological landscape is
Professional Substantive sociology (n=65, 43.3%), followed by Traditional Public
sociology (n=27, 18.0%), Advocacy Policy sociology (n=14, 9.3%) and the mixed
category (n=14, 9.3%). Less prominent in the results were Disciplinary Critical (n=10,
6.7%), Organic Public (n=10, 6.7%) and Interdisciplinary Critical (n=6, 4.0%). Finally,
Formal Professional (n=3, 2.0%) and Sponsored Policy (n=1, 0.7%) sociology were
observed with the least frequency. The percentage totals are base on the 150 complete
responses to this questionnaire item.
The Disciplinary Mosaic – Evaluating Normative Claims

Data Analysis

The secondary purpose of this chapter is to determine the normative stance of the Canadian professorate and then to compare it to Burawoy’s normative vision of the discipline. To encapsulate Burawoy’s (2005) vision, he sees the four overarching types of sociology as being mutually reinforcing and interdependent. Burawoy argues that the discipline as a whole should ideally contain relatively equal component of each Professional, Policy, Critical and Public. In order to compare Canadian sociologists and Burawoy on these normative claims, respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with a series of normative claims about the type of work sociologists ought to be conducting. These normative measures were based on the same operationalization as the measures used to classify respondents using the disciplinary mosaic framework but modified the items to make each a normative statement. Interpretation of these items was based on the assumption that if a respondent agreed that a particular type of sociology was important then they would also believe that sociologists ought to focus more time and energy to that type of work. If the respondent did not agree, on the other hand, the opposite would be true. Considering these responses in aggregate, it is the possible to gauge if any type of sociological work is perceived as more or less important than any other. Relatively equal levels of agreement that sociologists ought to focus more on each type of sociology would indicate a level of face validity for Burawoy’s vision. Alternatively, high levels of disagreement would seem to indicate that the typology and normative vision have missed the mark.

Where multiple measures of the same type of sociology existed in the quantitative data and the results across each of the measures were relatively consistent, they were
combined into a single measure. Due to the consistency between responses to the
measures of Substantive Professional sociology—72.7% of respondents agree or strongly
agree that sociologist ought to focus more on theory, 73.8% agree or strongly agree that
sociologists ought to focus more attention on methodology and 85.2% agreed or strongly
agreed that sociologists ought to focus more on social research—these measures were
combined into a single measure of Professional sociology. Similarly the results of the
two measures of Critical sociology were also combined into a single measure—66.7% of
respondents indicated that sociologists ought to focus more on critiquing the foundations
of social theory and 69.6% indicated that they agreed or strongly agreed that the critique
of other sociologists ought to be afforded more attention.

In addition to the quantitative questions, questionnaire respondents were also asked
the following open-ended question about their normative beliefs: In your professional
opinion, what type of work should sociologists be conducting at this juncture in history?
The results of the NVivo coding for this question will be used to supplement the
quantitative results and make it possible to verify the underlying assumption for
interpreting the quantitative data. In total there were 113 responses to the open-ended
question.

Quantitative and Qualitative Results

Subsequent analysis of the quantitative data revealed that a high percentage (89.9%) of
respondents agree or strongly agree that sociologists should focus more on the various
aspects of Substantive Professional sociology. There were also 57 references to
Substantive Professional sociology in the qualitative data. Many sociologists indicated
that the following types of work should be conducted:
Solid, theoretically informed empirical research, whether quantitative or qualitative. (Respondent #15, Disciplinary Critical, Male, PhD and MA program)

Critically informed research on key social, political, cultural and economic issues. (Respondent #13, Substantive Professional, Female, PhD and MA program)

Good, solid empirical research and explanatory theory. (Respondent #31, Substantive Professional, Male, PhD and MA program)

In addition, many respondents make reference to specific research areas such as poverty, class, gender, ethnicity, age, economic issues, environmental issues, health issues and globalization.

Based on the quantitative results Advocacy Policy is also viewed favorably, 76.6% of respondents agree or strongly agree that sociologists ought to focus more time to it. In contrast, Sponsored Policy sociology was not viewed favorably and was the only item to elicit generally negative responses. Only 14.4% of respondents agree or strongly agree that sociologists should devoted more attention to Sponsored Policy work. Although a large number of respondents (42.5%) indicated neutrality, more indicated that they disagreed (27.4 disagree, 15.8 strongly disagree) that Sponsored Policy work ought to be given more attention in the discipline. In the open-ended responses there are 11 coding references to Policy sociology. Although the references to “policy oriented” sociology tended to be quite general, two respondents specifically referenced Advocacy Policy sociology and one respondent referenced Sponsored Policy sociology. Of the more specific responses, respondents indicated that the following types of policy work ought to be conducted:

5 All open-ended responses are reported in the following manner: (Respondent #, Disciplinary Mosaic classification, gender, departmental graduate program)

6 There are several possible reasons for the level of disagreement with this questionnaire item including its operationalization. These will be discussed later in the current chapter.
Policy oriented research, with an emphasis on issues directed to alleviate the situation of the most vulnerable people. (Respondent #102, Substantive Professional, Male, MA program)

Internationally comparable policy research. (Respondent #156, Substantive Professional, Female, PhD and MA program)

Respondents also generally agreed that Disciplinary Critical sociology (76% agree or strongly agree) and Interdisciplinary Critical sociology (66% agree of strongly agree) ought to be afforded more attention. There were also references to both Disciplinary Critical (n=9) and Interdisciplinary Critical (n=8) in the open-ended responses. The references to Disciplinary Critical sociology focused on the critical examination of both the theory and methods of the discipline. For example:

[Sociologists] should be critically examining where sociology is, as a discipline…who maintains power and perpetuates conventional, traditional, patriarchal ideology and discourse. (Respondent #48, Substantive Professional, No Response, PhD and MA program)

[Sociologists should be] describing actually existing social action in detail so as to illuminate its irremediably setting-ed character, then critically re-examining actually existing social theories and methods in light of this observation, in order to save social thought (and the social practices it informs) from a host of conceptual and methodological errors which have dogged it since the beginning. (Respondent #25, Substantive Professional, Male, MA program)

Of the references to Interdisciplinary Critical sociology, respondents focused on incorporating interdisciplinary methods and conducting various forms of interdisciplinary work. For example:

Sociologists should be engaged in interdisciplinary research and teaching focused on issues and problems characteristic of complex, contemporary societies…. (Respondent #106, Advocacy Policy, Male, PhD and MA program)

[Sociologists should be] critically thinking about "critical thinking" (more attention to interdisciplinary methods and pedagogies). (Respondent #76, Professional Substantive, Male, PhD and MA program)
Finally, respondents tended to agree that sociologists should focus more on Traditional Public sociology (83.7% agree or strongly agree) and to a slightly lesser extent Organic Public sociology (75.7% agree or strongly agree). Of the references to Public sociology in the qualitative data, 17 references are to Traditional Public sociology, characterized by public education and/or a level of social distance between the sociologist and the public. The 14 remaining references to Public sociology are to the Organic variety, characterized by face-to-face communication with publics and/or social activism. In addition, there are also five general references to public sociology which cannot be classified as either Traditional or Organic. Of the references to Traditional Public sociology, respondents tended to focus on public relevance and accessibility, and indicated that sociologists should focus on:

- Work that goes beyond the "ivory tower" that people can see how what we say impacts everyday life. (Respondent #93, Disciplinary Critical, Female, no graduate program)

- … help[ing] people understand the intended and unintended consequences of their individual and collective decisions for other people, locally, globally, now in the future as well as for the environment. (Respondent #163, Traditional Public, Male, PhD and MA program)

- Works that address social problems and make the world a better place to live. (Respondent #126, Mixed, Female, PhD and MA program)

- Big Picture accounts of critical social issues. Cut back on fancy theory and methodology. We have enough of theory and methodology to get a good handle on the really important issues. What we really need are overall macro accounts social transformations written in a language that a broad non-sociological audience can understand and appreciate. (Respondent #85, Interdisciplinary Critical, Male, PhD and MA program)

- Work that focuses on the real day-to-day lives of people and that results in or forwards its improvement. And here I mean material and structural lives, not the "inner lives" of identity and self-awareness. (Respondent #39, Substantive Professional, Female, PhD and MA program)
Of the references to Organic Public sociology, respondents tended to emphasize the need for an ongoing conversation with publics, “collaborative projects”, “social activism”, “participatory action research” and “research with marginalized communities”. For example, sociologists ought to be conducting:

Collaborative work with activists and communities, with theoretical and strategic emphases. (Respondent #115, Substantive Professional, Male, PhD and MA program)

As can be seen in the quantitative and qualitative data, professors in Canada tend agree that all types of sociological work are worthy of increased attention with the notable exception of Sponsored Policy sociology. The responses to the claim sociologists should focus more on formulating policy for a paying client overwhelming indicate that Canadian sociologists find this type of work the most disagreeable. Generally speaking, the quantitative and qualitative responses indicate that sociologists believe that the discipline ought to contain a mixture of several different types of sociological work. In addition, this position made explicit in several of the open-ended responses as well. The following quotes represent some of the responses explicitly advocating for multiple types of sociology:

The problem is that 'sociologists' aren't a homogenous group. As a discipline, we should be doing lots of different types of work, guided by interests and the pressing needs of our communities and nations. (Respondent #84, Traditional Public, Female, no graduate program)

[sociologists should be conducting] many types [of work], certainly all of Burawoy's categories: professional, critical, public and policy. But professional and policy types should be careful not to be seduced by corporate money and agendas - and related neo-liberal government agendas. Inevitably some sociologists will be neo-liberals. That's fine. As a whole, however, the discipline must retain a critical edge. (Respondent #88, Disciplinary Critical, Male, PhD and MA program)

I don't think that there is one thing that Sociologists should be doing. I would like to see more sociologists called on to speak to policy. I think
the economists get too much sway with the government and I think the Sociological Imagination could be employed to great effect. But I also think building theory and methods are important to give those speaking to policy something to speak with. But I do agree with Burawoy that Sociologists need to be speaking to the people, to the policy makers, to other sociologists and to the world. We have important things to say that can help society be more just. (Respondent #118, Traditional Public, Female, MA program)

We need a wide variety of types of work - not one "box". People do different work at different points in their lives, too. We need to be good researchers, develop strong methodologies and analytical tools, and contribute to theory and critical perspectives on today's world. But we also need to investigate the possible, to work with activists who are trying to ameliorate and transform. We need to get the attention of politicians and public servants, and provide valid data and compelling analyses for those who would influence such folk and do some of that ourselves! (Respondent #143, Substantive Professional, Female, no graduate program)

We need a mix of different Sociologists doing different things - some doing theoretical work, some methodological developments, some analyses, some synthesis, some policy relevant work, and some so called "knowledge mobilization". (Respondent #151, Substantive Professional, Female, no graduate program)

There is no single form. Everything from abstract theorizing to pragmatic empirical and policy-oriented research can play a role if it sufficiently critical and serves to broaden horizons of the possible. (Respondent #82, Mixed, Male, PhD and MA program)

We should resist the blandishments of commerce, the preferences of students, the prejudices of colleagues, calls to the barricades, and the hubris of intellectual stardom, but otherwise let a thousand flowers bloom. (Respondent #95, Disciplinary Critical, Male, no graduate program)

Further analysis was also run on the quantitative data in order to determine the extent to which sociodemographic characteristics influence beliefs about the types of work sociologists ought to be focusing more attention. For this analysis the following variables were used: the primary type of sociology conducted, gender, age and institution type.
Firstly, the Kruskal-Wallis H\(^7\) Test was conducted to evaluate differences between the five types of sociology (Professional, Policy, Critical, Public and mixed) on a series of normative likert items. The results reveal that there are statistically significant differences in the normative claims of respondents depending on what type of sociology the respondent conducts. There are significant differences in terms of normative beliefs about Substantive Professional sociology \(\chi^2=13.651, \text{df}=4, N=146, p=.008\), Traditional Public sociology \(\chi^2=17.167, \text{df}=4, N=145, p=.002\), Organic Public sociology \(\chi^2=27.028, \text{df}=4, N=146, p=.000\), and Advocacy Policy sociology \(\chi^2=11.729, \text{df}=4, N=143, p=.19\). Based upon the mean rank scored, Professional sociologists tended to believe more than any other group that sociologists should focus more on Professional sociology. Public and Policy sociologists, on the other hand, tended to believe that sociologists ought to focus more attention on both Traditional Public and Organic Public sociology. Finally, Public sociologists, more than any other group, also tended to agree that Advocacy Policy work ought to be given more attention.

By gender, there was also a significant difference regarding normative claims about both Traditional Public sociology \(\chi^2=5.863, \text{df}=1, N=143, p=.015\) and Organic Public sociology \(\chi^2=6.890, \text{df}=1, N=144, p=.009\). Based upon the mean rank scores, women were more likely than men to agree that sociologists ought to focus more on both Traditional and Organic public sociology. No significant differences were found by region, likely due to the small sample of Quebecois sociologists, nor were there significant differences by the type of institution.

\(^7\) See Appendix A for the rationale behind using the Kruskal-Wallis H test


Discussion of Results – The Disciplinary Mosaic

It is clear based upon these results that Substantive Professional sociology dominates the Canadian sociological landscape, 43% of respondents fall into this category. As many sociologists are engaged in Professional Substantive sociology as the next four categories combined—Traditional Public, Advocacy Policy, mixed and Disciplinary Critical sociology. Perhaps this is not surprising considering the population for this study is full-time faculty in the University context but these results vary significantly from Brym and Nakhaie (2009). The preeminence of Substantive Professional sociology may be the result of the reward structure of the discipline: because disciplinary rewards are for the most part tied to Professional sociology, it makes sense that the bulk of Canadian sociologists would primarily pursue this type of work.

The next largest group is Traditional Public sociology (18%) followed by Advocacy Policy sociology (9%), mixed sociology (9%), Disciplinary Critical sociology (7%) and Organic Public sociology (7%). These categories represent the vast majority of respondents. A small percentage of respondents are Interdisciplinary Critical (4%) and the percentage of Formal Professional (2%) and Sponsored Policy sociology (1%) is vanishingly small. While the former result was anticipated—it was hypothesized that there would be a relatively equal distribution of Formal Processional service work across all types of sociology—the latter was unexpected.

As the results indicate, Substantive Professional sociology is most prevalent in the Canadian sociological landscape. It is not surprising that Substantive Professional sociology—work which engages theory, methodology and social research—is so pronounced as these types of work are typically perceived as being core elements of academic life at the university. Moreover, the academic reward structure is closely
linked to the types of work characteristic of Substantive Professional sociology. It seems reasonable to claim that part of the reason Substantive Professional sociology is so prominent is because in many respects it is necessary to do this type of work in order to be eligible for disciplinary rewards. Respondents also tended to agree that sociologists should focus more on the aspects of Substantive Professional sociology.

The second largest group in Canada is Traditional Public sociology. Although the positive normative responses to both Traditional and Organic Public sociology are comparable\(^8\), Organic Public sociology is conducted much less frequently than Traditional Public sociology. In fact the percentage of Traditional Public sociology is nearly three times larger than Organic Public sociology\(^9\). The discrepancy between Traditional and Organic Sociology is likely due to a number of factors. In particular, the lack of an institutional reward structure for those sociologists who conduct both Traditional and Organic Public sociology is likely limiting the number of sociologists engaged in this type of work. Additionally, there may be even fewer opportunities for Organic Public sociologists, compared to Traditional Public, to pursue work that is eligible for disciplinary rewards. Thus it is may not be a lack of desire that stops sociologists from engaging in this work rather it is the lack of viable career incentives which makes it impractical to pursue as a primary focus. Therefore it appears that if either Traditional or Organic Public sociology is a priority, as many sociologists indicate in their responses, then a significant restructuring of the disciplinary reward

---

\(^8\) 83.7% of sociologists agree or strongly agree that sociologists should focus more on Traditional Public sociology and 75.7% of sociologists agree or strongly agree that sociologists should focus more on Organic Public sociology

\(^9\) 18% of the respondents were classified as Traditional Public while only 7% were Organic Public
structure—or at the very least an acknowledgement of the legitimacy of Public Sociology will be required in order to make it a viable career option. In turn, the number of sociologists able to focus primarily on this type of work will increase.

The third largest group is Advocacy Policy sociology while its counterpart, Sponsored Policy sociology, is the smallest. The normative results are also clear, they indicate that while Advocacy Policy is generally seen in a positive light, Sponsored Policy sociology elicits a strong negative response. These discrepancies can be accounted for, however, and are likely due to the perceived loss of academic freedom inherent in Sponsored Policy sociology. On the one hand, Advocacy Policy sociology may be seen as a more formalized route to promote positive social change. It is a way for sociological knowledge to be translated into practice with minimal external influence. Accordingly, Advocacy Policy sociology could even be interpreted as a form of Traditional Public with the caveat that policy-makers are the public it engages. On the other hand, this can be juxtaposed against Sponsored Policy research where a client defines the goals. Presumably this is seen negatively because: 1) it is perceived to be undermining academic freedom and autonomy; and 2) the possibility exists to pervert and distort the toolbox of sociology for some other end. If this is the case then sociologists are justifiably weary and hesitant about Sponsored Policy sociology. This being said, a sociologically informed decision may still be the best decision even if the agenda is driven by a client. Further research into the interface between sociologists and policy clients may be warranted, particularly into ways that Sponsored Policy work can be conducted without sacrificing academic freedom and autonomy. It is also worth noting that the low number of self-reported Sponsored Policy sociologists may partially be also
a matter of semantics. Perhaps this item needs to be adjusted to reflect the nature of sponsored policy sociology without the connotation that simply working towards a goal defined by a paying client.

The fourth largest group, the mixed category, is an artifact of the theoretical framework. Because the framework is composed of ideal types and it is possible to conduct more than one type of sociology simultaneously, the operationalization of the typology needed to allow for respondents to indicate that multiple types of work were of primary importance to their work. The result? 9% of respondents indicated that multiple types of sociology were of primary importance to their work. This group varies widely in terms of the type of work conducted and are generally quite heterogeneous. Although this mixed category will not be explored further for this project, there may be an opportunity for future study on those sociologists who are engaged in multiple and intersecting types of sociological work.

Finally, Disciplinary Critical sociology is the fifth largest category. Although Disciplinary Critical sociology is more prominent than its interdisciplinary counterpart, the two Critical sociologies are relatively similar in size, 7% and 4% respectively. Although it unclear why Sponsored Policy sociology is generally underrepresented compared to the other types of sociology, it does makes sense the Disciplinary Critical sociology is more prominent than Interdisciplinary Critical sociology. This is for the simple reason that the former draws from within the discipline whereas the latter relies on interdisciplinary collaboration. To elaborate, in an era of social science funding cutbacks the ability to carve out an academic niche is often paramount. The tighter the social science budget, the more likely sociologist are to draw from within the discipline in an
attempt to solidify disciplinary boundaries. Thus the ascendancy of Disciplinary over Interdisciplinary Critical sociology may be the product of recent social science cutbacks rather than a genuine disinterest in interdisciplinary collaborations. Alternatively, the tension between interdisciplinarity and sociology is seen as one of the major barriers to a truly public sociology (Ehrenreich, 2007; E. N. Glenn, 2007). It is not a stretch to contend that because of the tensions between interdisciplinarity and sociology that the interdisciplinary variety of Critical sociology would be less prominent. Moreover, disciplinary boundaries may be less important to those working to address social problems as social life is not divided according to academic disciplines.

As indicated above, the number of Formal Professional sociologists—those who devote more time to professional service than research and scholarship—is small (n=3, 2.0%). This was interpreted as initial confirmatory evidence to support the hypothesis that the Formal Professional component of sociology is conducted equally across all types of sociology. More rigorous steps were also taken: firstly, the eight types of sociology were collapsed into the four overarching types—Professional, Policy, Critical and Public. Secondly, using SPSS 18.0 the Mann-Whitney U test was conducted. Because the Mann-Whitney U test measures the difference on a measure between two groups, the test was run on each possible combination of the five types of sociology. The result: there are no statistically significant differences in the percentage of time devoted to professional service between any of the groups. This test provides substantive

10 The Mann-Whitney U test was used to analyze the percent of time devoted to professional service because the Shapiro-Wilk test of normality revealed that the variable deviated significantly from a normal distribution (p<.000). It was therefore inappropriate to use the independent t-test for this variable. See Appendix A for more information on this test and the rationale behind using it.
evidence to support the hypothesis that all sociologists in the context of post-secondary institutions conduct Formal Professional sociology equally. The implications of this are that the division between Formal and Substantive Professional sociology in the disciplinary mosaic framework may not be warranted. Instead, it may be more appropriate to consider the Formal Professional sociology as a component of all types of sociology in the university context.

There also appears to be an oversight in the framework developed by Burawoy. In For Public Sociology (Burawoy, 2005) and Disciplinary Mosaic: The Case of Public Sociology (Burawoy, 2009) there is little discussion of teaching. At times Burawoy (2005) claims that teaching is a form of Public sociology because it engages in conversation with a visible public, namely, students. Alternatively, it is also argued that teaching is a component of Professional sociology where sociologists train students in the necessary theory, research and methods of sociology (Burawoy, 2009). Thus there appears to be a contradiction in Burawoy’s claim as both positions are equally plausible. Teaching can engage students, as a public, in dialogue and also build a knowledge base of the core professional sociology tools. What is proposed for the disciplinary mosaic framework, as well as the four-sociologies, model is allowance for the types of work conducted by all sociologists. It seems likely that teaching, as well as the professional service work of Formal Professional sociology, are conducted more-or-less equally by all sociologists.

Because the conceptual framework is composed of ideal types, the variation in the amount of teaching and research done by individual sociologists can be accounted for. Similarly, any change in the relative balance of teaching and research over time can also
be accounted for. Perhaps a measure designed to gauge the relative importance of teaching, research and professional service—or a time budget as used by this project—is sufficient to classify the sociologist as either teaching-based or research-based. The percentage of time devoted to teaching will be more formally addressed in the next chapter which outlines the relevant sociodemographic variables and provides comparative analysis of this research project and the results of Brym and Nakhaie (2009).
CHAPTER 5
RESULTS – COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS WITH BRYM AND NAKHAIE

In addition to mapping the discipline using the disciplinary mosaic framework, this project also seeks to evaluate the relevant sociodemographic variables and whether the Canadian sociological landscape has changed since the first empirical study of the four sociologies framework by Brym and Nakhaie (2009). Although the questionnaire used for this study was designed to measure the disciplinary mosaic framework, a simple recoding of the data results in the original four-sociologies model. For each quadrant in the disciplinary mosaic there are two types of sociology which can, for the purpose of this chapter, be collapsed back into the four original categories. Here is the result:

Table 5-1. Results Using the Division of Sociological Labour Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quadrant</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of this project are considerably different than Brym and Nakhaie (2009); below are the results of each study. Although a direct percentage comparison between the two studies is inappropriate, the same theoretical framework informs both studies and it is useful to consider the results of the current study in the context of Brym and Nakhaie (2009).
As can be seen, the most striking difference between the two studies is the overrepresentation of professional sociology in the current study. In addition fewer sociologists are engaged in both Policy and Critical sociology. Finally, Public sociology had the least variation across the two studies. As previously noted, a direct percentage comparison of the current study to Brym and Nakhaie (2009) is inappropriate. This is due to the convergence of three factors which likely all contribute to differences between the two studies. Firstly, the results of the current study are based on a wider range of factors and questions. Secondly, the inclusion of a mixed category in the current study, but not in Brym and Nakhaie (2009), can also account for some of the variation. Finally, some of the variation can be attributed to actual differences as a result of changes during the ten years that separate the data collected for the two studies.

In addition to examining the results of this study in the context of Brym and Nakhaie (2009), several test were conducted using SPSS 18.0 to determine the relationship, if any, between various sociodemographic variables and the type of sociological work conducted. The variables shown to be relevant in the literature include gender, type of institution, income, region and age (Brym and Nakhaie, 2009). The level of research
funding as well as the time devoted to research and teaching are also relevant variables (Brym and Nakhaie, 2009) and were explored. The Chi-square test was run to determine if a statistically significant relationship existed between the variables shown to be relevant in the literature and the type of work conducted. Where statistically significant relationships emerged, the Cramer’s V \(^{11}\) test was run to determine the strength of the relationship\(^{12}\). This resulted in the following sociodemographic variables being significant: gender, type of institution and income. No statistically significant variations were observed by age or region.

As was found by Brym and Nakhaie (2009), there is a statistically significant relationship between gender and type of sociology conducted (Pearson’s \(\chi^2 = 13.846, \text{ df}=4, \text{ N}=145, p=.008, \text{ two-tailed}\) There is a strong relationship between these variables (Cramer’s \(V = .309, p = .008\). Men tend to self-identify themselves as Professional sociologists more often than women while the opposite is true for Public sociology.

As expected there are also statistically significant differences in the type of sociological work conducted by the type of institution. Respondents were asked to indicate if their institution had a graduate program at either the MA or PhD level. Using the responses to this item a hierarchy of institutional status was created. Departments with both an MA and a PhD program are at the top of the hierarchy while departments with no graduate program are at the bottom. This reveals statistically significant differences between the institutional status and type of sociology conducted (Pearson’s

---

\(^{11}\) See Appendix A for the rationale behind using the Chi-square and Cramer’s V statistical tests

\(^{12}\) See Appendix A for information on interpreting the strength of the relationship between variables
\( \chi^2 = 21.653, \text{df}=8, \text{N}=149, \text{p}=.006 \) and a moderately strong relationship between these variables (Cramer’s \( V=.270, \text{p}=.006 \)). These results similarly echo Bryam and Nakhaie’s (2009) findings, those institutions without a graduate program tended to house more Public sociologist whereas institutions with an MA and/or PhD programs tend to house more Professional sociologists.

There is also a significant relationship between income and the type of sociology conducted\(^{13} \). This relationship is statistically significant (Pearson’s \( \chi^2 = 27.390, \text{df}=16, \text{N}=138, \text{p}=.037 \)) and of moderate strength (Cramer’s \( V=.223, \text{p}=.037 \)). In congruence with Brym and Nakhaie’s findings, Professional sociologists tended to make more money while Public sociologist make the least.

Where this study diverges is on the findings related to region and age. Although both of these variables were found to be relevant by Brym and Nakhaie, they were not statistically significant in this study. The reason for divergent finding by region may be due to the fact that the Quebecois sample size is small (\( n=13, 7.6\% \) of the total sample). Although professional sociology appears to be overrepresented in Quebec when examining bivariate crosstabs, this difference did not achieve statistical significance. This was an unexpected finding.

The lack of statistically significant differences by age was also not anticipated. Instead it was anticipated that Public sociologists would tend to be in the younger age cohorts where as Professional sociologist would be overrepresented in the older age cohorts (Brym and Nakhaie, 2009). The lack of statistical significance to support this is

\(^{13} \) The was also a statistically significant difference between professional sociologists and sociologists classified in the mixed category in terms of income (\( z=-1.987, \text{p}=0.47 \))
perhaps due to the fact that public sociology, at least the core of it, is not a new idea. From its inception sociology’s moral impetus has resulted in work that by Burawoy’s definition would be considered Traditional Public sociology, if not Organic Sociology. Because the underlying ideas of public sociology are not new, then it is perhaps not surprising that all age cohorts tend to equally conduct each different type of sociology. It may be that Burawoy’s (2005) call for public sociology resonated so well because it taps into deeply entrenched beliefs that span across age cohorts.

Aside from the sociodemographic variables discussed above, Brym and Nakhaie (2009) also found differences in research and teaching. These differences are consistent with Burawoy’s claims. For instance, Burawoy often remarks that social research is the heart of Professional sociology (2005; 2009). It is thus reasonable to assume that the level of research funding is highest for Professional sociologists, which is what Brym and Nakhaie found. Similarly, it is also reasonable to assert that the percentage of time devoted to research and scholarship will be highest for Professional sociologists, which is what this project measured. Finally, Burawoy makes two claims regarding teaching: 1) that the most readily accessible public for public sociologists is students; 2) that part of the professional sociologists job is teaching in order to train the next generation of sociologists. This project seeks to resolve the ambiguity of these statements by tested whether the one group devotes more time to teaching.

Using the Mann-Whitney U\textsuperscript{14} test, each set of groups were compared to determine if there were significant differences in the percent of time devoted to professional service, research and scholarship, research funding in the past five years, and the average number of

\textsuperscript{14} The Mann-Whitney test was used to analyze the percent of time devoted to professional service (p<.000), the percent of time devoted to research and scholarship (p=.002), research funding in the past five years (p<.000) and the average number of
the percent of time devoted to scholarship, earned gross income and research funding received in the past five years. The bulk of significant results came from the comparison between Professional and Public sociology. As previously indicated, any differences in the percent of time devoted to profession service were not significant.

For the percent of time devoted to research and scholarship, the results of the test were in the expected direction and significant \((z=-2.329, p=.020)\). Professional sociologists have an average rank of 61.00\(^{15}\), while Public sociologists have an average rank 46.60. Thus it is clear that Professional sociologists do devote more time to research and scholarship than Public sociologists.

Moreover, the measure of research funding was also used as a variable for data analysis. Respondents were asked to indicate the research funding they had secured in the past 5 years, when comparing Professional sociologists to Public sociologists the results were in the expected direction and significant \((z=-2.031, p=.042)\). Professional sociologists have an average rank of 57.34, while Public sociologists have an average rank of 45.06 thus providing further confirmatory evidence of Brym and Nakhaie’s results.

Finally, for the average number of classes taught\(^{16}\), the test results were in the expected direction and significant \((z=-3.226, p=.001)\). The average rank for Professional classes taught in the past five years \((p<.000)\) because the Shapiro-Wilk test of normality revealed that the variable deviated significantly from a normal distribution. It was therefore inappropriate to use the independent t-test for this variable. See Appendix A for more information on this test and the rationale behind using it.

\(^{15}\) Because the Mann-Whitney U uses the ranked order of the data for analysis, as opposed to the actual value, the results of this test are presented as an average rank value for the test variable. More information on this statistical test can be found in Appendix A

\(^{16}\) The average number of classes taught over the past five years was chosen over the percent of time devoted to teaching because the percent of time devoted to teaching can
sociologists is 47.06, while the average rank for Public sociologists is 66.66. There was also a significant difference between the number of classes taught for Professional and Critical sociologists ($z=-2.239, p=.025$). The average rank for Professional sociologists is 39.18, while the average rank for Critical sociologists is 53.81. Similarly, there are also a statistically significant differences in the percentage of time devoted to teaching for Professional and Public sociologists ($z=-2.788, p=.005$). Comparison of the average rank for Professional (48.48) and Public (66.20) indicates that public sociologists tend to devote a higher percentage of time to teaching.

**Discussion of Comparative Analysis**

Clearly the results of this study vary considerable from Brym and Nakahie, this can be attributed to several factors. This variation may partially be attributed to a shift in disciplinary priorities. In addition there are also several other external factors which may have shifted the balance of the sociological landscape in Canada over the decade between when the data was collected for Brym and Nakhaie’s study and when the data for this project was collected.

These external factors include changes in the funding infrastructure and shifts in the priorities of funding agencies. It is entirely plausible that changes in the way Canadian funding agencies such as the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) allocate funds can lead to particular types of sociology being conducted more frequently. Furthermore, the current emphasis on public-private partnerships may also be shifting the focus of the discipline. Many groups, including sociologists, governments and private vary significantly by experience without indicating increased contact with students. For example, more preparation time could be needed to teach a new class as opposed to one which has been previously taught by the instructor. Alternatively, a junior faculty member may need to devote more time to preparation whereas senior faculty can draw upon their teaching experience.
enterprises, have vested interests in certain types of sociological work being conducted. Thus changes in funding patterns and sources of funding may be responsible, at least to a certain extent, for some of the variation. Although this study will not further explore this option, there is the need for future study on how funding impacts upon the type of sociology that is conducted.

It may also be possible to account for some of the variation in the type of sociology practiced by considering the nature of the measures used for each study. In particular, the questionnaire used for this project was designed specifically to measure the type of sociology conducted. The increased level of instrument precision, therefore, can account for at least some of the variation between the two studies.

To conclude, this project provides a snapshot of the Canadian sociological landscape at one point in time. What can be done with this information very much depends on disciplinary priorities in the Canadian context. If having a broad base of Professional sociology is the goal then it appears little needs to be done to facilitate this. If Policy, Critical or Public sociology are regarded as more important then this project can provide support for the claim that disciplinary changes are needed to facilitate the ascendancy of these types of work.

This project may also provide a useful starting point for bringing about changes to the discipline. As the results indicate, there is a significant difference in income between Professional and Public sociologists. This can be interpreted to be evidence to support the lack of disciplinary rewards for Public sociology. Thus if Public sociology is the priority in the Canadian context, some form of restructuring may be required.
In addition, this project supports the claim that a revised graduate education program is vital if Public sociology is to flourish. The results of this study indicate that institutions with both MA and PhD programs tend to house more Professional sociologists while institutions without a graduate program house more Public sociologists. Accordingly, one way to promote Public sociology is to foster a graduate program specializing in Public sociology. By doing so it would be possible to increase the number of sociologists trained in and passionate about Public sociology. By virtue of being in an institution which gives precedence to Professional sociology, fewer graduates will be trained specifically in Public sociology.

Much can be done with insight into the nature of the discipline in the Canadian context, but little will happen without consensus about the direction the discipline ought to take. Thus, the next step is to engage in a reflexive discussion about what the discipline ought to look like. In turn this may facilitate action based upon the results of this project. The next chapter will briefly summarize the results of this research project followed by discussion of the future of the discipline in the Canadian context.
CHAPTER 6
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Summary

This research project answers McLaughlin and Turcotte’s (2007) call for empirical evidence to support Burawoy’s (2005) theoretical framework, the four-sociologies division of sociological labour. In addition it also uses Burawoy’s (2009) disciplinary mosaic to paint a more nuanced picture of the discipline in the Canadian context. In short, this project utilizes data collected from an online questionnaire delivered to all full-time sociologists in Canada working at Canadian universities and colleges. The overall response rate was approximately 30% with 176 responses collected in total. Using Burawoy’s (2009) disciplinary mosaic framework, the results of this project that indicate professional substantive sociology (n=65, 43.3%) is the largest group in Canadian sociological landscape. The second largest group is Traditional Public sociology (n=27, 18.0%) followed by Advocacy Policy sociology and the mixed sociology category (n=14, 9.3% for each). Less prominent featured are Disciplinary Critical (n=10, 6.7%), Organic Public (n=10, 6.7%) and Interdisciplinary Critical (n=6, 4.0%). Finally, the number of sociologists conducting Formal Professional (n=3, 2.0%) and Sponsored Policy (n=1, 0.7%) sociology is vanishingly small indicating that minor revisions to Burawoy’s framework may be required.
Figure 6-1. Results Using the Disciplinary Mosaic Framework

Normatively, respondents also tended to agree that sociologists should focus attention on each type of sociological work in the disciplinary mosaic with the notable exception of Sponsored Policy sociology. This type of work was the only one to elicit a negative response from participants in the quantitative data; 27.4% disagree and 15.8% strongly disagree that sociologists ought to devote more attention to Sponsored Policy sociology. Sponsored Policy sociology notwithstanding, sociologists tend to agree that the types of work that make up Burawoy’s disciplinary mosaic are the types of work that sociologists ought to be conducting. This was also found in the qualitative data as well. Several respondents explicitly stated that sociologists ought to be conducting a range of work. Accordingly, it appears that Burawoy’s framework enjoys, at the very least, face validity with sociologists in the Canadian context.

After collapsing the disciplinary mosaic into the original four-sociologies model it was possible to conduct comparative analysis between this project and Bryam and Nakhaie (2009), who made the first attempt to provide empirical evidence to test Burawoy’s four-sociologies model. This comparison reveals significant differences between the two studies. Based on the current study, evidence suggests an overrepresentation of
Professional sociology in the Canadian context. In contrast to the findings of Brym and Nakhaie (2009), there are also a reduced number of sociologists conducting both Policy and Critical sociology. While the reasons for these discrepancies are not entirely clear, at least some of the variation can be accounted for in the revised measures designed for this research project. Revised measures likely do not account for all the variation between the two studies, however, and further study of factors impacting the type of sociology conducted such as the funding patterns of granting agencies such as SSHRC is warranted.

Additionally, several other statistically significant relationships were also observed in the data collected for this project. Gender, the type of post-secondary institution and income were all significant variables in the data analysis and echo the findings of Brym and Nakhaie (2009). Men tend to be overrepresented in the Professional sociology category while women are overrepresented in the Public sociology category. Public sociologists tend to be housed in institution without a graduate program whereas Professional sociology is more prominent in institutions with an MA or PhD program. Finally, Professional and Public sociologists differ significantly in terms of income. More specifically, Professional sociologists tend to make more money than Public sociologists. Unlike Bryman and Nakhaie (2009), this study did not find significant region regional differences in the distribution of different types of sociology nor are there differences by age.

Conclusion

The results of this project are particularly useful because they facilitate discussion about the nature, purpose and future of sociology in the Canadian context. In addition, the current research also reveals the need for future study in a number of areas. For instance, inquiry into the relationship between specific funding patterns and the type of
sociology that is conducted would be beneficial. Alternately, further research into the integration of different types of sociology is also warranted. In particular a study of how ‘mixed’ sociologists combine elements of Professional, Policy, Critical and Public sociology in their work may be worthwhile. Furthermore, it may also be useful to investigate the specific ways that interdependence manifests itself within division of sociological labour. Burawoy characterizes the discipline as a series of interdependent sociologies and further research could help to make explicit these connections.

To answer the primary research question of this project, Professional sociology currently dominates the sociological landscape in Canada. Professional sociologists are the gatekeepers of the discipline and academic rewards appear to center around the work of Professional sociology. To address the sub-question about relevant sociodemographic variables, a number of various factors—such as gender, income and type of institution—are related to the distribution of sociologists across the four broad types. Professional sociologists tend to be male, tend to be paid more and tend to be housed in institutions of higher status with graduate programs. These differences are especially pronounced when comparing Professional and Public sociology. Thus the Canadian sociological landscape is, more accurately, a hierarchy where particular types of work conducted by particular groups of people tend to be dominant.

To answer the remaining sub-question about normative beliefs, the normative responses—both quantitative and qualitative—indicate that overall\(^{17}\) Canadian professors tend to agree that the discipline should contain a multitude of different types of sociological work. In the qualitative data several respondents indicate that “there is no

---

\(^{17}\) With the notable exception of sponsored policy sociology.
single form” of work that sociologists ought to be conducting. Instead, respondents state that “many types” of work needed including “all of Burawoy’s categories: Professional, Critical, Public and Policy”.

This makes sense because without a doubt this is one of the greatest strengths of sociology: the breadth of work that it encompasses. Accordingly, the purpose of this conclusion is not to argue for the elimination of any type of sociology but to instead argue for a different balance of the four types of sociology. Although the results do not speak to underlying questions about the role of sociology in the world, it is crucial to address these questions when advocating an increase in a particular type of sociology, namely, Public sociology. Here it is useful to pose a question that goes unanswered in this project’s responses: what is the fundamental purpose of sociology?

If the purpose of sociology is to acquire knowledge through rigorous programs of social research, then it appears that the balance of sociology in Canada already promotes this. If the purpose is instead to help alleviate social problems, as this chapter will argue, then the balance of sociology is far from optimal. While claims about the purpose of sociology are ultimately contentious, there is still merit to making such claims so long as they can be justified. Notwithstanding some inevitable disagreement, the purpose of sociology, to borrow from Seidman,

is not to accumulate knowledge, establish a science of society, or build a system of sociology, but to be part of the ongoing conversation and conflict over the present and future shape of the social world. (2008, p. ix)

And being part of the ongoing public discussion over the present and future of the social world is precisely what Public sociology seeks to do. Ultimately the goal of Public sociology, in either its Traditional or Organic form, is to address problems in the social world by contributing to the dialogue surrounding these problems. In particular, Organic
Public sociology facilitates this dialogue by intimately linking sociology to relevant social issues through unmediated dialogue with those whom the issues affect. Thus Public sociology provides a way for sociology to contribute to the conversation over the present and future of the social world and issues of the day. But why is this important for sociology? For two primary reasons: firstly, it translates sociological knowledge into efforts toward positive social change; and secondly, it ensures continued relevance of the discipline through its connection to contemporary issues of broad public significance.

Logically, the next question to ask is how can Public sociology assume a more significant role within the discipline? The answer to this question is clear. The results of this project support the claim that significant restructuring of the disciplinary reward structure is necessary for Public sociology to flourish. This is consistent with the existing literature (Gans 2009; Piven 2007). Public sociologists tended to make less than their professional sociologist counterparts in the Canadian context, a finding corroborated by Brym and Nakhaie (2009). In addition, sociologists housed in less prestigious institutions, those without a graduate program, tend to focus more on Public sociology while sociologists housed in institutions with an MA and/or a PhD program tend to focus more on Professional sociology. Moreover, the funding for social research is unevenly distributed between Professional and Public sociologists. All of these differences indicate there are discrepancies between the disciplinary rewards for Public sociology compared to Professional sociology. It appears that adjustment of the rewards, particularly in terms of the tenure and promotion process, is necessary to promote an increase in both the numbers and status of Public sociologists.
Advocating a greater role for Public sociologists is not without its own set of problems, however, because without anything approaching moral consensus in the discipline it is difficult to conceive of a system that would reward sociological work to which some sociologists are fundamentally opposed (Nielsen, 2004; Smith-Lovin, 2007). While finding a solution to this problem is no small task, those authors who have advocated for standards by which the quality of Public sociology can be judged offer some insight into this quandary (E. N. Glenn, 2009; N. D. Glenn, 2009; Mayrl, 2009; Wilson, 2007). By emphasizing accountability, relevance and accessibility it may be possible to dole out disciplinary rewards based on objective criteria even when there is disagreement about the specific position being advocated. Although establishing a set of standards by which to judge Public sociology will not be easy, doing so will make headway in mediating the potential disagreement around what constitutes legitimate Public sociology. Here much future work can be done around establishing best practices for Public sociology.

Aside from a reevaluating the rewards system of the discipline, this project also provide evidence to support the claim that graduate education programs will need to be revised in order to promote Public sociology (Gans, 2009; Mayrl, 2009; Stacey 2007). As the results of this project indicate, institutions without any graduate program are more likely to house sociologists conducting Public sociology where as institutions with a graduate program at either the MA or PhD level tend to house more Professional sociologists. This is problematic for two main reasons: 1) it minimizes the opportunity for graduate students to study under currently practicing Public sociologists; and 2) those institutions where students receive their graduate training will tend to have a Professional
sociology orientation. The creation of graduate programs with an emphasis on Public sociology where students can work with notable Public sociologists would help to shift the balance of sociological work in Canada and promote an increased number of Public sociologists.

Additionally, increasing the prestige of Public sociology through graduate programs tailored to Public sociology as well as a more equal distribution of the discipline’s rewards will also help to address the concerns that Public sociology will become, or remain, a second-class sociology (Collins, 2007; Hays, 2007). If it is true that “those who gravitate towards Public sociology may already hold subordinate status within the discipline”, as Collins claims, and that “being classified under the banner of public sociology may foster a kind of sociological ghettoization” (Collins, 2007, pg. 104) then certainly a more equal distribution of rewards and a revised graduate program with an emphasis on Public sociology will make substantial headway in ensuring that Public sociologist are not marginalized.

This does not, however, address the matter of semantics. It has been argued that the word ‘public’ has a negative connotation and can taint the project of Public sociology (Collins, 2007). This negative connotation is a product of neo-liberal and individualistic trends which are unlikely to change in the short term. As a result, it may be difficult to overcome this dilemma as there does not appear to be any easy solution to fix the meaning attached to ‘public’. Aside from renaming Public sociology—applied sociology may be a better term in order to avoid semantic discrimination—it appears that there is little which can be done to change whatever negative connotation ‘public’ currently is
ascribed. Perhaps a successful program of Public sociology is exactly what is needed to rejuvenate the word ‘public’.

In regard to claims about the public sociology undermining the scientific credibility of sociology (Boyns & Fletcher, 2005; Turner, 2005; Tittle, 2004) it is possible to make the following counter argument: it is not Public sociology that undermines the scientific credibility of the discipline; rather, it is the pursuit of scientific credibility which has disconnected sociology from relevant social issues. Seidman (2008) articulates this position well in stating that “sociological theory has all too often, especially in the past few decades, become isolated from public life and has chased the idol of science to a point of its own obscurity” (Seidman, 2008, p. ix). This counters the position that Public sociology undermines the credibility of Professional sociology without necessarily undermining Professional sociology. There can be fruitful collaboration between Professional and Public sociology, as Burawoy (2005) claims, and the two types of work can mutually reinforce each other. Thus, rather than attempting to replicate the natural sciences model of knowledge production, sociology should continue to develop its own standards of quality. Here Public sociology has much to offer. As previously mentioned, accountability, relevance and accessibility are alternative standards by which sociology and social theory can be judged. Making relevance one of the standards by which sociological work is judged helps to ensure that the discipline remains credible. As a result, Public sociology may be able to enhance the credibility of Professional sociology rather than undermine it.

Burawoy (2005; 2009) is clear that Professional sociology is essential, not only for Public sociology but for all types of sociology. Each type of sociology draws upon the
theory, methods and research of Professional sociology while at the same time providing feedback to it. It is precisely because the four types of sociological work are interdependent that each is necessary for the discipline to function optimally. Here it is useful to recall For Public Sociology, where Burawoy (2005) claims that each of the four types of sociology—Professional, Policy, Critical and Public—can be subdivided yet again using the same four categories. The result: each type of sociology contains a Professional, Policy, Critical and Public element. In this regard, Wallerstein (2007) and Burawoy appear to be in agreement, all sociology is inherently Public sociology.

Perhaps, in addition to an increased proportion of Public sociologists, it is the public side of each type of sociology that needs to be emphasized. It is the public side of Professional sociology that can ensure social theory and methods are relevant to current Public issues. The public side of Policy sociology can keep policy accountable to those whom it impacts upon while the public side of Critical sociology helps to ensure that the guiding critique of the discipline is directed in part by public relevance. And finally, the more public side of Public sociology, Organic Public sociology, seeks to alleviate social problems in close contact with those whom it affects. Accordingly, it appears to be possible to advocate both a shift in the balance of sociological work and a plurality of public sociologies without sacrificing any of the discipline’s complexity.

Broadly speaking, this project provides empirical evidence to support both the four-sociologies framework and the disciplinary mosaic framework. Although the results indicate that there may be some shortcomings in Burawoy’s typology, the small number of Formal Professional and Sponsored Advocacy sociologists, the framework nonetheless provides a clear snapshot of the Canadian sociological landscape within the discipline of
sociology. The results indicate that Professional sociology is by far the largest group in Canada and is much larger than anticipated. What is even more useful about the results generated using Burawoy’s framework, however, is that they act as a catalyst for discussion around the nature and future of sociology. After adopting the position that “sociology needs to recover its role as public educator in order to contribute to a more measured and thoughtful public discussion” (Seidman, 2008, p. xii), it is possible to make concrete suggestions to how these can be accomplished. Based on the relevant literature and the results of this project, these suggestions include a revised graduate education program tailored specifically to Public sociology and a revised institutional reward system that places equal value on the work conducted by both Professional and Public sociology. Through these changes it may be possible to increase the proportion of sociologists conducting Public sociology as their primary type of work. If the goal of sociology is to regain its focus on issues of broad public significance by addressing key social and political debates of our time, as Seidman (2008) claims, then more Public sociology is highly desirable. To reiterate, according to Seidman (2008), “theorists need to recover the moral impulse at the heart of social theory, and to see themselves, once again, as public educators engaging issues of the day” (p. xii) and it is through Public sociology that this can occur. Developing a greater role for Public sociology will also move all types of sociology closer to fulfilling their respective promise.
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APPENDIX A
INFORMATION ON STATISTICAL TESTS USED

The Kruskal-Wallis Test

The Kruskal-Wallis test is the non-parametric equivalent of the one-way independent ANOVA for measuring differences between several independent groups (Field, 2009). It can be used on data that do not meet assumption required for parametric tests. According to SPSS:

Although one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) is the method of choice when testing for differences between multiple groups, it assumes that the mean is a valid estimate of center and that the distribution of the test variable is reasonably normal and similar in all groups. However, when your test variable is ordinal, the mean is not a valid estimate because the distances between the values are arbitrary. Even if the mean is valid, the distribution of the test variable may be so non-normal that it makes you suspicious of any test that assumes normality.

When the assumptions behind the standard ANOVA are invalid or suspect, you should consider using the nonparametric procedures designed to test for the significance of the difference between multiple groups. They are called nonparametric because they make no assumptions about the parameters (such as the mean and variance) of a distribution, nor do they assume that any particular distribution is being used. In this chapter, we discuss two nonparametric tests for multiple independent samples, the Kruskal-Wallis and median tests.

The Kruskal-Wallis test is a one-way analysis of variance by ranks. It tests the null hypothesis that multiple independent samples come from the same population. Unlike standard ANOVA, it does not assume normality, and it can be used to test ordinal variables.

Like the F test in standard ANOVA, Kruskal-Wallis does not tell us how the groups differed, only that they are different in some way. The Mann-Whitney test could be used for pairwise comparisons.

The Kruskal-Wallis test is a popular nonparametric alternative to the standard one-way analysis of variance. It is appropriate when your test variable is ordinal or its distribution does not meet the assumptions of standard ANOVA. The only assumptions made by the test are that the test variable is at least ordinal and that its distribution is similar in all groups. (SPSS for Mac, 2009)

The Kruskal-Wallis test was used to evaluate normative claims because the data collected regarding normative claims is in ordinal form, a five-point likert scale.
The Mann-Whitney Test

The Mann-Whitney test is the non-parametric equivalent of the independent t-test for comparing two independent groups differ significantly on a variable. It can be used on data that do not meet assumption required for parametric tests. The limitation of this test is that it is more conservative and therefore has less statistical power that its parametric equivalent, the independent t-test (Field, 2009).

When you want to test for differences between two groups, the independent-samples t test comes naturally to mind. However, despite its simplicity, power, and robustness, the independent-samples t test is invalid when certain critical assumptions are not met. These assumptions center around the parameters of the test variable (in this case, the mean and variance) and the distribution of the variable itself.

Most important, the t test assumes that the sample mean is a valid measure of center. While the mean is valid when the distance between all scale values is equal, it’s a problem when your test variable is ordinal because in ordinal scales the distances between the values are arbitrary. Furthermore, because the variance is calculated using squared distances from the mean, it too is invalid if those distances are arbitrary. Finally, even if the mean is a valid measure of center, the distribution of the test variable may be so non-normal that it makes you suspicious of any test that assumes normality.

If any of these circumstances is true for your analysis, you should consider using the nonparametric procedures designed to test for the significance of the difference between two groups. They are called nonparametric because they make no assumptions about the parameters of a distribution, nor do they assume that any particular distribution is being used. Two popular nonparametric tests of location (or central tendency)--the Mann-Whitney and Wilcoxon tests--and a test of location and shape--the two-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test--are illustrated.

Mann-Whitney and Wilcoxon tests. You can use the Mann-Whitney and Wilcoxon statistics to test the null hypothesis that two independent samples come from the same population. Their advantage over the independent-samples t test is that Mann-Whitney and Wilcoxon do not assume normality and can be used to test ordinal variables.

Because the test variables are assumed to be ordinal, the Mann-Whitney and Wilcoxon tests are based on ranks of the original values and not on the values themselves. (SPSS for Mac, 2009)
The Mann-Whitney test was used to analyze the percent of time devoted to professional service (p<.000), the percent of time devoted to research and scholarship (p=.002), research funding in the past 5 years (p<.000) and the average number of classes taught in the past five years (p<.000) because the Shapiro-Wilk test of normality revealed that the variable deviated significantly from a normal distribution.

Two-Way Contingency Table Analysis

Chi-Square Test

The chi-square test may be applied to studies investigating the Independence between variables to evaluate whether a statistically significant relationship exists between two variables. The chi-square test is only a measure of association, however, and does not assess the strength of the relationship (Green & Salkind, 2005). It can be used with variables measured at any level—including the nominal level—and is nonparametric (Healey, 2009).

Cramer’s V Test

The Cramer’s V test is a measure of association that can be used for nominal variables in two-way contingency table analysis. It is preferred over Phi when one of the variables has more than two categories (Field, 2009).

Interpreting Measures of Association

If the test statistic result is between .0 and .1 the strength of relationship is weak. If the test statistic result is between .1 and .3 the relationship is moderate. If the test statistic result is more than .3 then the strength of the relationship is strong (Healey, 2009).
APPENDIX B
QUESTIONNAIRE – ENGLISH VERSION

Online Questionnaire Consent Letter

Please read this consent letter carefully, and feel free to contact the researchers by email or at
the numbers provided if you have any questions.

Purpose and Procedure: Using data collected from focus groups and an online questionnaire delivered to full-
time sociology faculty in Canada, this research project seeks to answer the following questions: does sociology
in the Canadian context adhere to the typology generated by Burawoy? Do Canadian sociologists agree with
Burawoy’s normative claims about public sociology? And finally, what factors - if any - facilitate or
constrain sociology as a discipline in achieving its ideal form?

Potential Benefits: The possible benefits of this research are both individual, in that you as a participant will be
given the opportunity to share your professional opinion about the nature of sociology in Canada, and
institutional, as there will be increased academic awareness and discussion of the issues addressed by this
research project.

Potential Risks: There is no anticipated risk for respondents of this questionnaire. Every precaution will be
taken to safeguard confidentiality and anonymity. In addition, your participation is completely voluntary and
you may choose to exit the questionnaire at anytime.

Storage of Data: All data collected during the research process, including responses from this questionnaire and
all other supporting correspondence and documentation, will be stored for a minimum of five years by research
supervisor Dr. Darrell McLaughlin in a secure location at the St. Thomas More College in Saskatoon, SK.
After that time all data will be destroyed.

Confidentiality: No identifying information will be connected with any of your responses. All demographic
information collected will be used in aggregate form only; it will be used to cross-tabulate questionnaire
responses by demographic characteristics shown to be relevant in the literature on this topic. The data from this
research project will be published and presented at conferences. Where direct quotations from the open-ended
questions are used, every precaution will be taken to ensure that the individual remains anonymous. For all
material resulting from this questionnaire pseudonyms will be used and all identifying information (such as your
name, the name of your institution, your position and your area of specialization) will be removed.

Right to Withdraw: Your participation is completely voluntary and you can choose to answer only those
questions that you are comfortable with. You may also choose to exit the questionnaire at any time without
penalty of any sort. If you withdraw from the research project, any data that you have contributed will be
destroyed at your request. There is no guarantee that you will personally benefit from your involvement. The
information that is shared will be held in strict confidence and discussed only with the research team.

Questions: If you have any questions concerning the research project, please feel free to contact the researchers
by email or at the numbers provided. This research project has been approved on ethical grounds by the
University of Saskatchewan Behavioural Research Ethics Board on April 13, 2010 Any questions regarding
your rights as a participant may be addressed to that committee through the Ethics Office (966-2084). Out of
town participants may call collect.

Follow-Up: All participants will be given a summary report of the study via email upon request. The completed
thesis will also be available for access in the main library and the Department of Sociology library at the
University of Saskatchewan.
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Consent to Participate

I have read and understood the description provided; I have had an opportunity to ask questions and my questions have been answered. *Completion of this online questionnaire constitutes consent to participate in this research project and permission for the researcher to use the data gathered in the manner described.*

Contact Information:

John Dickinson, MA Student Researcher  
Department of Sociology  
University of Saskatchewan  
9 Campus Drive  
Saskatoon, SK S7N 5A5  
Phone: (306) 966-6947  
Fax: (306) 966-6950  
john.dickinson@usask.ca

Dr. Darrell McLaughlin, Research Supervisor  
Associate Professor of Sociology President of Society for Socialist Studies St Thomas More College  
1437 College Drive  
Saskatoon SK, S7N 0W6  
Phone: (306) 966-8943  
Fax: (306) 966-8904  
dmclaughlin@stmcollege.ca
1. What is your current area of specialization?

2. What is the highest level degree you have obtained?

3. What is the faculty for the highest level degree(s) you have completed? Check all that apply.
   Sociology
   Anthropology
   Other (please specify)

4. Do you currently hold a full-time faculty position at your institution?
   Yes
   No
   Other (please specify)

5. Approximately how many faculty members are in your department

6. Approximately how many students attend the institution at which you work?

7. Does your department have a graduate program?
   Yes, MA & PHD programs
   Yes, MA program
   No
   Other (please specify)

8. In which province/territory is your institution located?

9. Does your department have formal academic ties to a university in another country?
   Yes
   No
   If yes, where?

10. Do you personally have an academic connection to a university or other academics in another country?
   Yes
   No
   If yes, where?

11. In the past five (5) years, on average, how many classes have you taught each year? (including regular and spring/summer session)

12. In the past five (5) years, approximately how much research funding have you received?
13. What are the main sources of the research funding you have received in the past five (5) years?

14. Please indicate how many of each of the following types of publications you have produced in the last five (5) years.

number of publications
books
book chapters
book reviews
research monographs
articles in refereed journals
articles in non-refereed journals
literature reviews and reports
op-ed articles
other
(please specify)

15. In terms of the work you do as a sociologist, please indicate an approximate percentage (%) of time you spend on each of the following activities in a typical week?

教学
research and scholarship
professional service (ex. peer review, defending academic freedom, etc.)
other activities

16. As sociologist, please indicate how often you engage in each of the following activities.

Developing or improving upon social theory
Developing or improving upon the methods/methodology of sociology
Engaging in social research
Critically engaging specific policies/policy issues
Formulating policy for a client
Critically examining the foundations of social theory
Critically examining and critiquing the work of other sociologists
Critically examining the disciplinary foundations of sociology drawing upon the critiques provided by other disciplines
Actively engaging issues to alleviate social problems in close contact with those whom the issue is relevant
Critically examining issues to alleviate social problems
17. Which of the following best represents the target audience for your papers, reports and publications?

Sociology students
A paying client
Other sociologists
Other academics
Individuals outside of academia
N/A
Other (please specify)

18. Which of the following best represents the target audience for your public presentations?

Sociology students
A paying client
Other sociologists
Other academics
Individuals outside of academia
N/A
Other (please specify)

19. Of the following, please rank the top three (3) activities in terms of importance to your work as a sociologist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Important</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developing or improving upon social theory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing or improving upon the methods/methodology of sociology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging in social research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critically engaging specific policies/policy issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulating policy for a client</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critically examining the foundations of social theory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critically examining and critiquing the work of other sociologists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critically examining the disciplinary foundations of sociology drawing upon the critiques provided by other disciplines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively engaging issues to alleviate social problems in close contact with those whom the issue is relevant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critically examining issues to alleviate social problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other activities (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. In the past five (5) years, how many times have you travelled internationally for work?
21. Please indicate the main reasons for your work related international travel in the past five (5) years; check all that apply.

Work with Non-Governmental Organizations/International Non-Governmental Organization
Work with Canadian government organization
Work with foreign government organizations
Academic research
Attending an international conference
Overseas teaching
Invited as a visiting scholar or adjunct professor
Co-authorship with foreign scholars
Other (please specify)

Strongly disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly agree

22. As a sociologist, indicate the extent to which you agree with the following normative claims about the type of work sociologists should be focusing on.

Sociologists should focus more on:

developing social theory
developing the methods/methodology of sociology
social research
critically engaging specific policies/policy issues
formulating policy for a paying client
critically examining the foundations of social theory
critically examining and critiquing the work of other sociologists
critically examining the disciplinary foundations of sociology drawing upon the critiques provided by other disciplines
actively engaging issues to alleviate social problems in close contact with those whom the issue is relevant
critically examining issues to alleviate social problems

23. How often do you:

participate in public demonstration for a social cause?

very often  regularly  some times  rarely  never

24. Please indicate your age.

25. Please indicate your gender.

Female
Male
Other

26. What is your religious affiliation, if any?
27. What is your country of birth? (please specify)

28. To which ethnic group(s) do you self-identify? (please specify)

29. What is your citizenship status?
   
   Canadian citizen
   Permanent resident (landed immigrant)
   Temporary resident with working visa
   Student visa with work permit
   Other (please specify)

30. What was your earned gross income in 2009?

31. In terms of your growth and development as a sociologist, what has been the most influential publication you have read?

32. In your opinion, what is the most influential publication written by a Canadian Sociologist?

33. As a sociologist, what is the most important publication to read at this juncture in history?

34. In your professional opinion, what type of work should sociologists be conducting at this juncture in history?

35. In your professional opinion, what types of questions should sociologists be asking at this juncture in history?

36. In your opinion, what factors are currently facilitating or impeding sociology in its ideal form?

37. In the next ten (10) years what do you anticipate will be the major challenges facing sociology?

38. Do you wish to receive a summary report of this project when it is complete?
   
   Yes
   No

Please enter the email address you would like to be contacted at.
APPENDIX C
QUESTIONNAIRE – FRENCH VERSION

Questionnaire en ligne et lettre de consentement

Veuillez lire attentivement la lettre de consentement. Si vous avez des questions supplémentaires, n'hésitez pas à vous mettre en contact avec les chercheurs par courriel, par téléphone ou par fax.

Buts et procédures: En utilisant les informations rassemblées par les groupes de discussion, et avec un questionnaire en ligne remis aux professeurs de sociologie qui travaillent à temps plein au Canada, ce projet de recherche a pour but de répondre aux questions suivantes: Est-ce que la sociologie dans le contexte canadien se conforme à la typologie suscitée par Burawoy? Est-ce que les sociologues canadiens sont d'accord avec les réclamations normatives de Burawoy en ce qui concerne la sociologie publique? Et finalement, quels facteurs – s'il y en a – facilitent ou limitent la sociologie comme discipline à réaliser sa forme idéale?

Avantages potentiels: Les avantages possibles de cette recherche sont à la fois individuels, dans la mesure où comme participant, vous aurez l'occasion de partager votre avis professionnel quant à la nature de la sociologie au Canada, et institutionnellement, car il y aura une plus grande sensibilisation universitaire et discussion vis-à-vis des problèmes abordés par ce projet de recherche.

Possibilités de risques: Il n'y a aucun risque prévu pour les personnes qui répondent à ce questionnaire. Toutes précautions seront prises pour sauvegarder la confidentialité et l'anonymat. De plus, votre participation est complétement à titre bénévole et vous pouvez terminer le questionnaire à n’importe quel moment.

Entreposage des données: Toutes données repérées durant ce processus, ci-inclus vos réponses de ce questionnaire et toute autre correspondance à l'appui et documentation, seront gardées pour un minimum de cinq ans par le professeur Darrell McLaughlin, directeur de recherche, dans un endroit sécuritaire au Collège St-Thomas More, situé à Saskatoon en Saskatchewan. Par la suite, toutes les données seront détruites.

Confidentialité: Tous renseignements que vous nous fournirez ne pourront être identifiés. Tous renseignements démographiques seront rassemblés de façon globale; ils seront utilisés pour classifier les réponses du questionnaire quant aux caractéristiques démographiques à ce sujet. Les données de ce projet de recherche seront publiées et présentées dans des colloques. Lorsqu'on vous citera mot pour mot, toute précaution sera prise pour s'assurer que chaque participant demeure anonyme. Pour tous les matériaux provenant de ce questionnaire, des pseudonymes seront fournis, et tous les renseignements identificatoires (par exemple, votre nom, le nom de votre institution, votre position et votre domaine de spécialisation) seront supprimés.

Droit de se retirer: Votre participation est entièrement à titre bénévole, et vous n'avez qu'à répondre aux questions où vous vous sentez à l'aise. Vous pouvez aussi quitter le questionnaire n’importe quand sans aucune pénalité. Si c’est le cas, toutes les données seront supprimées sur demande. Il n’y a aucune garantie que vous allez personnellement tirer avantage de votre participation. Les renseignements que vous nous donnez seront gardés confidentiellement et seulement partagés avec l’équipe de chercheurs.

Questions: Si vous avez des questions en ce qui concerne ce projet de recherche, n'hésitez pas à vous mettre en contact avec l’équipe de chercheurs par courriel, par téléphone ou par fax. Ce projet a été approuvé pour des raisons éthiques par the University of Saskatchewan Behavioural Research Ethics Board, le 13 avril 2010. Toutes questions quant à vos droits comme participant peuvent être posées à ce comité par l'entremise de the Ethics Office (966-2084). Les participants qui sont à l'extérieur de Saskatoon peuvent téléphoner à frais virés.

Suivi: Nous remettrons, sur demande, un document de synthèse de cette étude par courriel aux participants. La thèse, une fois terminée, sera aussi disponible à la bibliothèque principale ainsi qu’à la bibliothèque du sociologie.
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Consentement de participation

J'ai lu et j'ai compris l'explication fournie; j’ai aussi eu l'occasion de poser des questions, et on a répondu à mes questions. Le fait de remplir ce questionnaire en ligne affirme mon consentement de participation à ce projet de recherche et donne la permission au chercheur d'utiliser les données qui ont été fournies, telles que décrites.

Informations de contact:

John Dickinson, étudiant en maîtrise ayant le statut de chercheur
Department of Sociology
University of Saskatchewan
9 Campus Drive
Saskatoon, SK S7N 5A5
Téléphone: (306) 966-6947
Fax: (306) 966-6950
john.dickinson@usask.ca

Dr. Darrell McLaughlin, Directeur de recherche
Professeur agrégé en sociologie
Président de la Société des études socialistes
St Thomas More College
1437 College Drive
Saskatoon SK, S7N 0W6
Téléphone: (306) 966-8943
Fax: (306) 966-8904
dmclaughlin@stmcollege.ca
1. Quel est à présent votre domaine de spécialisation?

2. Quel est le diplôme le plus élevé que vous avez obtenu?

3. Dans quelle faculté avez-vous obtenu votre diplôme/vos diplômes le/les plus élevé/élevés? Veuillez cocher tout ce qui s’applique à votre cas.

Sociologie
Anthropologie
Autre (Veuillez préciser)

4. Avez-vous couramment un poste à temps plein dans votre institution?

Oui
Non
Autre (Veuillez préciser)

5. Environ combien de membres du corps professoral y a-t-il dans votre département?

6. Environ combien d’étudiants poursuivent leurs études dans l’institution où vous travaillez?

7. Est-ce que votre département a un programme d’études supérieures?

Oui, les programmes de maîtrise et de doctorat
Oui, le programme de maîtrise
Non
Autre (Veuillez préciser)

8. Dans quelle province/quel territoire est située votre institution?

9. Est-ce que votre département maintient des liens académiques officiels avec une université dans un autre pays?

Oui
Non
Si oui, où?

10. Avez-vous personnellement un lien académique avec une autre université ou avec d’autres universitaires dans un autre pays?

Oui
Non
Si oui, où?

11. Au cours des cinq (5) dernières années, en moyenne, combien de classes avez-vous enseigné chaque année? (ci-inclus les sessions d’hiver, de printemps et d’été)
12. Au cours des cinq (5) dernières années, quel est environ le montant d’argent que vous avez reçu pour la recherche?

13. Quelles sont les sources principales de financement que vous avez reçues pour la recherche au cours des cinq (5) dernières années?

14. Veuillez indiquer le nombre de publications que vous avez produites au cours des cinq (5) dernières années.

Nombre de publications

Livres
   Chapitres de livres
   Revues de livres
   Monographies de recherche
   Articles dans les revues à comité de lecture
   Rapports et revues littéraires
   Articles op-ed
   Autre
   (Veuillez préciser)

15. En fonction du travail que vous faites comme sociologue, veuillez indiquer un pourcentage approximatif (%) du temps que vous passez sur les activités suivantes dans une semaine typique.

Enseignement
   Recherche et bourse
   Service professionnel (par exemple, revue de pairs, défense des libertés académiques, entre autres)
   Autres activités

16. Comme sociologue, veuillez indiquer combien de fois vous vous engagez dans chacune des activités suivantes.

Développer ou améliorer la théorie sociale  
Développer ou améliorer les méthodes/la méthodologie en sociologie  
Se lancer dans la recherche sociale  
Entreprendre d’un œil critique des politiques spécifiques/questions de politique générale  
Formuler une politique pour un client  
Examiner d’un œil critique les bases de la théorie sociale  
Examiner d’un œil critique le travail des autres sociologues  
Examiner d’un œil critique les bases disciplinaires en sociologie en vous appuyant sur les critiques fournies par d’autres disciplines  
Entreprendre activement des questions afin de résoudre les problèmes sociaux ayant un rapport étroit avec ceux pour qui la question est pertinente.  
Examiner d’un œil critique les questions afin de résoudre les problèmes sociaux  

17. Qu’est-ce qui représente le mieux le groupe cible pour vos articles, vos rapports et vos publications?

Étudiants en sociologie
Un client payant
Autres sociologues
Autres universitaires
Personnes à l’extérieur du monde universitaire
Non applicable
Autre (Veuillez préciser)

18. Qu’est-ce qui représente le mieux le groupe cible pour vos présentations publiques?

Étudiants en sociologie
Un client payant
Autres sociologues
Autres universitaires
Personnes à l’extérieur du monde universitaire
Non applicable
Autre (Veuillez préciser)

19. Des exemples suivants, veuillez classer les trois (3) premières activités en fonction de votre travail comme sociologue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activités</th>
<th>Le plus important</th>
<th>2e</th>
<th>3e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Développer ou améliorer la théorie sociale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Développer ou améliorer les méthodes/la méthodologie en sociologie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Se lancer dans la recherche sociale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entreprendre d’un œil critique des politiques spécifiques/questions de politique générale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formuler une politique pour un client</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examiner d’un œil critique les bases de la théorie sociale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examiner d’un œil critique le travail des autres sociologues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examiner d’un œil critique les bases disciplinaires en sociologie en vous appuyant sur les critiques fournies par d’autres disciplines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entreprendre activement des questions afin de résoudre les problèmes sociaux ayant un rapport étroit avec ceux pour qui la question est pertinente.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examiner d’un œil critique les questions afin de résoudre les problèmes sociaux</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autres activités</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Veuillez préciser)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Au cours des cinq (5) dernières années, combien de voyages internationaux avez-vous faits pour votre travail?
21. Veuillez indiquer les raisons principales de vos voyages internationaux liés à votre travail au cours des cinq (5) dernières années; cochez tout ce qui s’applique.

Veuillez indiquer les raisons principales de vos voyages internationaux liés à votre travail au cours des cinq (5) dernières années; cochez tout ce qui s’applique.

Travail avec des organisations non gouvernementales/organisations non gouvernementales internationales
Travail avec une organisation du gouvernement canadien
Travail avec une organisation gouvernementale à l’étranger
Recherche académique
Assister à un congrès international
Enseignement à l’étranger
Invité comme spécialiste ou comme professeur adjoint
Auteur en collaboration avec des universitaires à l’étranger
Autre (Veuillez préciser)

22. Comme sociologue, veuillez indiquer la mesure dans laquelle vous êtes d’accord avec les valeurs normatives suivantes concernant le type de travail sur lequel les sociologues devraient se concentrer.

Les sociologues devraient se concentrer davantage sur le développement de la théorie sociale
Les sociologues devraient se concentrer davantage sur le développement des méthodes/de la méthodologie en sociologie
Les sociologues devraient se concentrer davantage sur la recherche sociale
Les sociologues devraient se pencher davantage sur les exigences de l’engagement des politiques spécifiques/questions de politique générale
Les sociologues devraient se concentrer davantage sur la formulation d’une meilleure politique pour le client payant
Les sociologues devraient se concentrer davantage sur un examen à fond des bases de la théorie sociale
Les sociologues devraient se concentrer davantage sur une critique à fond du travail des autres sociologues
Les sociologues devraient se concentrer davantage sur les bases disciplinaires de la sociologie faisant appel aux critiques provenant des autres disciplines
Les sociologues devraient discuter davantage des questions qui vont résoudre les problèmes sociaux ayant un rapport étroit avec ceux pour qui la question est pertinente.
Les sociologues devraient discuter davantage des questions qui vont résoudre les problèmes sociaux

23. Combien de fois est-ce que vous: Très souvent Régulièrement Parfois Presque jamais Jamais

assistez à une manifestation pour une cause sociale?

24. Quel âge avez-vous?

25. Veuillez identifier si vous êtes:

Femme
Homme
Autre
26. Quelle est votre affiliation religieuse, s’il y en a une?

27. Dans quel pays êtes-vous né? (Veuillez préciser)

28. Avec quels groupes ethniques est-ce que vous vous identifiez? (Veuillez préciser)

29. Quelle est votre citoyenneté?

Citoyen canadien
Résident permanent (Immigrant reçu)
Résident temporaire avec un visa d’emploi
Visa d’étudiant avec un permis de travail
Autre (Veuillez préciser)

30. Quel a été votre revenu brut en 2009?

31. En termes de croissance et de votre développement comme sociologue, quelle a été la publication qui aurait eu le plus d’influence sur vous?

32. À votre avis, quelle est la publication écrite par un sociologue canadien qui a exercé le plus d’influence sur la société?

33. Comme sociologue, quelle est la publication la plus importante à lire à ce moment-ci?

34. À votre avis professionnel, quel genre de travail est-ce que les sociologues devraient entreprendre à ce moment-ci?

35. À votre avis professionnel, quel genre de questions est-ce que les sociologues devraient poser à ce moment-ci?

36. À votre avis, quels sont les facteurs en ce moment qui facilitent ou nuisent à la sociologie sous sa forme idéale?

37. Au cours des dix (10) prochaines années, quels seront les plus grands défis face à la sociologie?

38. Aimeriez-vous recevoir le document de synthèse lorsqu’il sera terminé?

Oui
Non

Veuillez indiquer votre courriel afin d’entrer en contact avec vous.
### APPENDIX D
SPSS OUTPUT – STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS

**Kruskal-Wallis Test**

**Normative Claims by Type of Sociology**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The_Division_of_Sociological_Labor</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>83.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>66.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical on dimensi Critical</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>67.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>71.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Professional                      | 66    | 68.89     |
| Policy                            | 16    | 85.97     |
| Critical on dimensi Critical       | 15    | 46.80     |
| Public                            | 40    | 87.96     |
| Mixed                             | 8     | 55.31     |
| Total                             | 145   |           |

| Professional                      | 67    | 65.92     |
| Policy                            | 15    | 89.50     |
| Critical on dimensi Critical       | 16    | 45.22     |
| Public                            | 40    | 95.48     |
| Mixed                             | 8     | 53.69     |
| Total                             | 146   |           |

| Professional                      | 62    | 64.25     |
| Policy                            | 16    | 87.00     |
| Critical on dimensi Critical       | 16    | 60.16     |
| Public                            | 41    | 84.94     |
| Mixed                             | 8     | 59.44     |
| Total                             | 143   |           |

**Test Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Normative_Prof_Collapsed</th>
<th>Normative - Public Sociology - Traditional</th>
<th>Normative - Public Sociology - Organic</th>
<th>Normative - Policy Sociology - Advocacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square</td>
<td>13.651</td>
<td>17.167</td>
<td>27.028</td>
<td>11.729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig.</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*a. Kruskal Wallis Test  
b. Grouping Variable: The_Division_of_Sociological_Labor*
Kruskal-Wallis Test
Normative Claims by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Clean - Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Normative - Public Sociology - Traditional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dimension 1</td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>65.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Normative - Public Sociology - Organic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dimension 1</td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>64.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test Statistics \(^{a,b}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Normative - Public Sociology - Traditional</th>
<th>Normative - Public Sociology - Organic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square</td>
<td>5.863</td>
<td>6.890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig.</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Kruskal Wallis Test
b. Grouping Variable: Clean - Gender

Crosstabs
Type of Sociology by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crosstab</th>
<th>The Division of Sociological Labor</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Critical</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clean - Gender</td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>13.846</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>14.202</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>6.419</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 2 cells (20.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.53.

Symmetric Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approx. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal by Nominal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phi</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramer’s V</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Crosstabs

#### Type of Sociology by Type of Department (Institution)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does your department have a graduate program?</th>
<th>MA and PHD</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square Tests</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>21.653</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>21.377</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>7.823</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 6 cells (40.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.02.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symmetric Measures</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approx. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal by Nominal</td>
<td>Phi</td>
<td>0.381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramer's V</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Crosstabs

#### Type of Sociology by Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Earned gross income in 2009</th>
<th>40,000-59,999</th>
<th>60,000-79,999</th>
<th>80,000-99,999</th>
<th>100,000-119,999</th>
<th>120,000+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square Tests</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>27.390</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>27.222</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear-by-Linear Association</td>
<td>10.173</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 17 cells (68.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 0.17.
### Symmetric Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approx. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal by Nominal</td>
<td>Phi</td>
<td>.446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cramer's V</td>
<td>.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td></td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mann-Whitney Test

#### % of Time Devoted to Research and Scholarship
Comparing Professional and Public Sociologists

#### Ranks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of time devoted to scholarship</th>
<th>The_Division_of_Sociologic al_Labor</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Sum of Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional dimensi on1</td>
<td>Professional Public Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>61.00</td>
<td>4148.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td>46.60</td>
<td>1957.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Test Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% of time devoted to scholarship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mann-Whitney U</td>
<td>1054.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcoxon W</td>
<td>1957.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>-2.329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Grouping Variable: The_Division_of_Sociological_Labor

### Mann-Whitney Test

#### Research Funding Received in the Past Five Years
Comparing Professional and Public Sociologists

#### Ranks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research funding in the past 5 years</th>
<th>The_Division_of_Sociologic al_Labor</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Sum of Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional dimensi on1</td>
<td>Professional Public Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>57.34</td>
<td>3612.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>45.06</td>
<td>1847.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Test Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Research funding in the past 5 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mann-Whitney U</td>
<td>986.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcoxon W</td>
<td>1847.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>-2.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.042</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Grouping Variable: The_Division_of_Sociological_Labor
Mann-Whitney Test
Average Number of Classes Taught Each Year in the Past Five Years
Comparing Professional and Public Sociologists

Ranks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The_Division_of_Sociological_Labor</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Sum of Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of classes taught</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>47.06</td>
<td>3153.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>66.66</td>
<td>2733.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of classes taught</th>
<th>Mann-Whitney U</th>
<th>Wilcoxon W</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>875.000</td>
<td>3153.000</td>
<td>-3.226</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Grouping Variable:
The_Division_of_Sociological_Labor

Mann-Whitney Test
Average Number of Classes Taught Each Year in the Past Five Years
Comparing Professional and Critical Sociologists

Ranks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The_Division_of_Sociological_Labor</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Sum of Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of classes taught</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>39.18</td>
<td>2625.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53.81</td>
<td>861.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of classes taught</th>
<th>Mann-Whitney U</th>
<th>Wilcoxon W</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>347.000</td>
<td>2625.000</td>
<td>-2.239</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Grouping Variable:
The_Division_of_Sociological_Labor
Mann-Whitney Test

% of Time Devoted to Teaching
Comparing Professional and Public Sociologists

Ranks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The_Division_of_Sociological_Labor</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Sum of Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of time devoted to teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dimension1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>48.89</td>
<td>3324.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>66.20</td>
<td>2780.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% of time devoted to teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mann-Whitney U</td>
<td>978.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcoxon W</td>
<td>3324.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>-2.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Grouping Variable:
The_Division_of_Sociological_Labor
Name: John Harley Dickinson

Place and date of birth: Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, February 18, 1984

Permanent address: 2004 14th Street East, Saskatoon, SK, S7H 0B2

Schools attended:

Walter Murray Collegiate Institute, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, 1998.

Evan Hardy Collegiate, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, 1999-2002

Universities Attended:

University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, 2003-2008,
B.A. Honours in Sociology