

“Cracking the Council”
Intraprofessional Change in the
Sociology Teaching and Learning Movement

BY

RACHEL ELIZABETH LOVIS
B.A., University of Michigan, 2005
M.A., University of Illinois Chicago, 2013

DISSERTATION

Submitted as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Sociology in the Graduate College of the
University of Illinois at Chicago, 2020

Chicago, Illinois

Defense Committee:

Paul-Brian McInerney, Chair and Advisor
William Bielby
Barbara Risman
Pamela Popielarz
Elizabeth Grauerholz, University of Central Florida

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people have contributed to making this dissertation possible. First and foremost, I would like to thank my committee members Paul-Brian McInerney, William Bielby, Pamela Popielarz, Barbara Risman, and Liz Grauerholz. Paul-Brian, my dissertation chair, and Bill, who advised my Master's thesis, provided many years of guidance, patience, and professional mentorship as I navigated the many phases of graduate school.

I would also like to acknowledge the contributions of my participants, who shared abundant professional and personal knowledge drawn from long careers dedicated to teaching and learning and sociology. While the knowledge they contributed was largely professional, the excitement with which participants recalled their career experiences and remembered their colleagues lent a personal tone to the theoretical contributions of this dissertation. I hope I did justice in recognizing these sociologists' longstanding contributions to the discipline.

Thank you to my colleagues and dear friends Emily Ruehs, Jes Cook, Tim Adkins, Carolina Calvillo, and Lu Rollins for keeping me company during long hours at coffee shops all over Chicago. And a warm thanks to the rest of my Chicago community for being consistent and supportive friends. Most importantly, I am forever indebted to my parents for their unwavering support over the years. I am honored to be the next Dr. Lovis – it's you and me, Dad.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. DEFINING SOCIOLOGY: FIELD THEORY AND INTRAPROFESSIONAL CHANGE	1
A. The Teaching and Learning Movement	5
B. Theoretical Framework	6
C. Chapter Overview	22
II. METHODS	26
A. Methodology	26
B. Data Collection	28
C. Data Analysis	37
III. FOUNDATIONS AND OBJECTIVES	40
A. Birth of the Movement: 1972-1980	43
B. Formation of Initial Goals	52
C. Teaching Resources Center	54
D. Establishment of Primary Goals	58
IV. 1980s-2000s: OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT AND REINSTITUTIONALIZATION	64
A. Teaching Services Program	66
B. Wingspread Conference on Postsecondary Instructional Improvement	68
C. Evolution of the Department Resources Group	76
D. Curriculum Reform: The Era of Liberal Learning and the Sociology Major	79
E. TRAILS: Teaching Development Resources	90
V. CRACKING THE COUNCIL	106
A. Historical Evidence of the Teaching vs Research Dichotomy ...	114
B. Field Positioning of Movement Leadership	124
C. Did They Crack the Council?	124
D. Diffusion	141
VI. CONCLUSION	149
VII. REFERENCES CITED	154
VIII. VITA	162

ABBREVIATIONS

AAC&U	American Association of Colleges and Universities
ASA	American Sociological Association
DRG	Department Resources Group
HEW	Department of Health, Education and Welfare
NSF	National Science Foundation
PFF	Preparing Future Faculty
PUE	Project on Undergraduate Education
TDP	Teacher Development Project
TRAILS	Teaching Resources and Innovations Library for Sociology
TRC	Teaching Resources Center
TSP	Teaching Services Program
T&L	Teaching and Learning
SUE	Section on Undergraduate Education

SUMMARY

This dissertation examines a historical change movement within the sociology profession beginning in the 1970s. A longstanding imbalance in the prestige structure of the profession was identified by a small group of sociologists, who undertook efforts to improve the quality of sociology instruction in the undergraduate classroom. The case study examined here contributes to research on intraprofessional change using the theoretical lens of field theory. Using a combination of qualitative methods including semi-structured interviews and archival documents, this research documents the history of intraprofessional change efforts from 1972-2012. Analysis of official newsletters of the American Sociological Association in addition to interviews with Teaching and Learning movement actors illustrate the many advancements achieved. Markers of institutionalization included the creation and dissemination of teacher training materials, the creation of a standardized set of curriculum guidelines, and myriad training conferences. However, the path of reinstitutionalization fell short of achieving the goal of professional identity change such that teaching is embraced as an equally valued professional task to that of research and scholarship. I demonstrate that this inability to diffuse a new professional identity was due to the social positioning of change agents. Although movement leadership gained access to the council of the American Sociological Association through their positions as executive staff, the lower prestige of skilled movement actors perpetuated the prevailing view that the movement represented a disparate segment of the profession with which incumbents did not identify and ultimately have not embraced.

CHAPTER 1

Defining Sociology: Field Theory and Intraprofessional Change

Change is a ubiquitous aspect of society shaping the options available to social agents. Understanding the ways in which social actors engage in purposive action to form change movements reveals the nature of power relationships that control the production of knowledge that drives the social world. Empirical sociological analysis is rich with examinations of how social change takes place, and the impact change movements can have on prevailing social arrangements.

In this opening chapter, I introduce the empirical case that forms the basis of this research and justify its contribution to scholarship on organizational and professional change. The Teaching and Learning movement in sociology serves as an exemplary case to illustrate the many directions from which the production of knowledge is constructed. Sociological research on intraprofessional change is ripe with analyses of how institutional arrangements affect change outcomes, yet the institution of higher education poses a particularly salient unit of research due to the power of this institution to dictate what knowledge is expected of future practitioners. The movement examined here sought to reshape the prestige structure of sociology to embrace the teaching of undergraduate sociology as an equivalently valued professional task to that of research. I ask why, despite significant progress in institutionalizing myriad initiatives from the Teaching and Learning movement, the professional identity in sociology continues to be defined primarily through research endeavors, and not teaching.

In order to understand this empirical dilemma, I first provide an overview of the professional characteristics of sociology that serve as the backdrop to the Teaching and Learning movement examined here. I briefly describe how this movement originated, and what goals were identified as in need of change within the profession. Having introduced the case study for this analysis, I then conduct a review of the three intersecting areas of scholarship that form the framework with which I analyze this movement for intraprofessional change. I briefly address the foundations of organizational theory that contribute the language largely employed to explain organizational change. More directly, I then home in on sociological research on the professions, which incorporates intersecting research from social movement scholarship and new institutionalism. Finally, I make the case for the use of field theory as a pertinent theoretical lens through which to view the trajectory and outcomes of the Teaching and Learning movement.

Defining the Professions

The professions are categorized as a distinct form of occupation due to a characteristic autonomy that allows professional actors to shape the norms that dictate their work. The normative values of a profession are shaped at the individual level as practitioners engage in interactional process to define what constitutes the practices, values, and training requisite to the profession (Abbott 1988, Evetts 2012). Specifically, sociology as a profession has long been characterized by a multifaceted jurisdictional identity. Methodologically speaking, sociologists continually debate the merits of quantitative versus qualitative analysis, yet the body of sociological knowledge has been advanced through bridging these methodologies. Topically, for example, we range from interactionist approaches that examine the minute details of human

social exchange, to multi-level analyses of structural racial inequality, to social constructionist explanations of gender and sexuality.

Although the symbolic marker of a Sociology degree requires a broad understanding of all disciplinary topics, scholars in our profession tend to specialize in discrete research areas and rarely claim fluency in all. And, the daily craft of an academic sociologist involves a balancing act dedicating time both to the pursuit of advancing sociological knowledge through research and teaching undergraduates and graduate students the foundations of the discipline. For many sociologists, teaching and research remain segmented activities within their professional life and, as autonomous professionals, the proportion of time and resources dedicated to their various work activities is impacted by the expectations of individual colleagues, departments, and institutional pressures.

The story of institutional change subsequently documented is one of many disciplinary initiatives occurring nationally to draw increased attention to the quality of teaching and learning amidst an expanding emphasis in higher education on outcomes assessment and curriculum reform. Despite its active involvement in teaching and learning efforts in higher education, sociology maintains a bifurcated professional identity that largely bestows greater prestige on research than instruction. Compounded with a heterogeneous substantive landscape that allows sociologists to specialize in widely varying topical areas, achieving intraprofessional change in sociology is a complicated endeavor.

Internal debates around the standardization of a common core curriculum for the undergraduate sociology major illustrate the power of this professional bifurcation. While

concerted efforts have been made to create a set of guidelines delineating the knowledge that should be required of an undergraduate sociology major, and dissemination of these suggestions to sociology instructors nationally, there remains a broad variety in the material that students of sociology are taught (Berheide 2005). Undergraduate sociology students are exposed early on to a general sociological perspective that can be applied to an array of potential subject areas. Depending on the topical, methodological, and theoretical orientation of individual professors, students may learn disparate approaches to sociology compared to peers in other classes and other institutions. There are dozens of introductory sociology textbooks available to choose from, covering a number of potential topics from myriad theoretical perspectives.

Moreover, graduate students rarely receive formalized training in the specific content that should be taught in undergraduate sociology courses, if they receive any formal teacher training at all. This exacerbates the heterogeneity of sociology material taught by, in some cases, graduate student instructors and adjunct faculty, who are increasingly being relied upon to teach at the undergraduate level. New tenure track faculty, alike, are often expected to begin teaching upon their commencement of work as a professor, albeit many arrive without formal teaching training from their graduate programs. Just as sociologists embrace their ability to explore a spectrum of topical orientations, the freedom to teach according to personal preference and interests is generally accepted as the professional status quo. It is this inertia in teaching development that the group of sociologists documented in this project set out to change. Efforts to improve and standardize the teaching of sociology were initiated by a small

group of sociologists who found themselves positioned in a longstanding conversation over how to characterize the prevailing professional identity of sociology.

A. The Teaching and Learning movement in Sociology

This dissertation narrows in on a case wherein the social positioning of intraprofessional change agents impacted a unique trajectory of institutional change. Within sociology, a movement advocating for increased professional attention to the teaching and learning of sociology—referred to as the Teaching and Learning movement—emerged in the early 1970s, providing professional support and practical tools to help sociologists hone their teaching skills. The persistence of broad variations in professional interest in instruction begs the question as to why the sociology discipline, specifically, continues to be characterized by a bifurcated professional identity that bestows more prestige on research than teaching, despite over forty years of leading efforts to increase the professional status of teaching-oriented sociologists.

I conduct a qualitative historical analysis of the processes by which sociologists invested in teaching and learning formed a movement to enhance the status of teaching in the discipline, introduced change efforts within ASA, and attempted to diffuse these changes to affect structural and ideological shifts in the discipline. While, arguably, the movement resulted in a number of markers of successful institutional change, there remains limited diffusion of a collective professional identity that embraces teaching as an integral—and equivalently valued—aspect of a sociologist’s professional work. The prevailing professional identity and prestige structure within the American Sociological Association shaped the degree and nature of institutional change achieved by T&L movement actors. I argue that, while a number of concrete advancements in the teaching and learning movement suggest limited institutional

change occurred, normative changes to the collective professional identity of sociologists at large was measured due to the social positioning of change agents in the professional hierarchy.

At a basic level, this research contributes to existing scholarship on institutional change movements with a case study on intraprofessional change within the sociology discipline itself, which to this date has not been viewed from this lens. Furthermore, the sociology teaching and learning movement highlights the particular tensions that emerge in an *intraprofessional* cultural change movement. Scholarship on the sociology of professions has centered around case studies of *intraprofessional* change in practice-oriented professions such as medicine, law, and accounting. By analyzing sociology through the lens of field theory, I contribute an understanding of the particular constraints confronted by professions centered in the academy that must simultaneously navigate institutional pressures from higher education in conjunction with the demands of individual departments that are shaped by normative professional standards.

B. Theoretical Framework

Research on intraprofessional change has predominantly examined professions such as law, medicine, and accounting and, in one case, the high end culinary profession (Greenwood, Suddaby and Hinings 2002, Sauder 2008, Goodrick and Reay 2011, and Rao, Monin and Durand 2003). These analyses have utilized various frameworks intersecting scholarship on the professions, social movements, and new institutionalism to understand how change agents' social positioning mediates the outcomes of intraprofessional change. Moreover, this research has examined professions wherein work activities revolve primarily around practice; lawyers in

court, doctors in medical practices, and accountants in firms. These examined professions are practiced primarily outside of the higher education academy, an arena which presents unique institutional demands to which all practitioners are subject.

Professions that have been the prevailing focal point of research on intraprofessional change share in common a heterogeneity in which disparate professional 'sectors' compete for legitimacy amongst their peers. Sociology, like these other professions, is also characteristically heterogeneous, and practitioners generally hold jurisdiction over disparate professional sectors. Due to concurrent demands on all sociologists practicing in the academy to both teach and advance their research agendas, the specific change goals of the Teaching and Learning movement do not only impact the active change agents, but all academic sociologists. The goals of the T&L movement, therefore, seek to bridge professional segments and impact professional practice and expectations at large.

In the following review, I briefly discuss each of these areas of research as they inform the theoretical framework used here to understand the case of intraprofessional change in sociology. Organizational scholarship has traditionally been concerned with understanding why and how organizations adopt particular structures, whether maintaining structural stasis or undergoing processes of change. Organizational research on change efforts primarily examines institutional change, seeking to understand how organizations adapt to shifting institutional norms in order to maintain legitimacy. Social movement scholarship, for its part, originally undertook analyses of extra-institutional change processes, seeking to understand how groups of social actors mobilize to advance efforts for social change. In my review of the sociology of

professions, I home in on research that analyzes the particular processes of change within identity-based change efforts in the professions.

While each of these sociology traditions, respectively, have made rich contributions to understanding how change efforts unfold, Fligstein and McAdam's theory of 'strategic action fields' (Fligstein and McAdam 2012) is an umbrella framework encompassing various traits of this preexisting scholarship to analyze power dynamics as they unfold in a change movement. I argue that, in isolation, these areas of scholarship are insufficient to understand the particular case of reinstitutionalization that unfolded from the teaching and learning movement in sociology. An overview of strategic action field theory serves to unite the three areas of scholarship reviewed and proposes an overarching perspective to understand how the Teaching and Learning movement negotiated the introduction of a new collective professional identity.

Maintenance of Institutional Legitimacy

Organizations are "those stable elements of social life designed and created for the purpose of goal achievement" (Breckenridge and Savage 2014). The variation in these structured arrangements is referred to as organizational form, or "a blueprint for organizational action" (Hannan and Freeman 1977). Institutional theory, a branch of open systems organizational scholarship, departs from previous early organizational scholarship that focused on explaining variation in organizational structure based on technical demands and rather examines the processes by which organizations adapt to patterns and demands in the institutional environment (Suchman 1995), defined as "supraorganizational patterns of human activity by which individuals and organizations produce and reproduce their material subsistence and organize time and space" (Friedland and Alford 1991: 243).

New institutionalism, specifically, understands organizational structure according to how it is shaped by particular institutional patterns or arrangements, seeking to understand how the apparent uniformity in organizational form is a reaction to processes of institutional legitimization. Observed similarities in organizational form, according to new institutionalism, is a reaction to a competition for legitimacy in the institutional environment. Here, I draw upon Suchman's definition of legitimacy, which is considered "a generalized perception or assumption that the actions of an entity are desirable, proper, and appropriate within some socially constructed system of norms, values, beliefs, and definitions" (Suchman 1995: 574).

In the process of seeking legitimacy, organizations are both constrained and enabled by institutional norms, such that these governing principles become reflected in organizational structure. These norms have been referred to as rationalized rules or 'myths' that organizations tend to adopt from the surrounding institutional environment (Meyer and Rowan 1977), which are normalized and then rationalized through relational networks at different levels of the organization. Due to their strategic social positioning, organizational leadership interpret institutional norms as applicable to their particular organization and take action to incorporate those norms so as to ensure the maintenance of institutional legitimacy (Meyer and Rowan 1977). This process may occur formally, for example through the implementation of official mandates or procedural changes, or informally. At the informal level, shifts in organizational identity may occur as actors adopt changing ideologies reflected in the institutional environment, alongside formal structural change.

When organizations take on shared elements with others in the field, they are said to be isomorphic, or possessing similarity in form. Isomorphic processes are multifaceted. In some

cases, organizations may adapt form to mimic other organizations they deem to be legitimate, and in other cases, changes in organizational form may be a result of coercive forces such as political or regulatory mandates (DiMaggio and Powell 1983). For example, the increase in wheelchair accessible building facilities following the passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act, or affirmative action policies following the creation of equal opportunity laws, can be considered a form of coercive isomorphism in reaction to legal mandates. Coercive isomorphic processes, however, are more complicated in professional settings wherein norms are shaped and enforced from within by practitioners themselves.

Normative Isomorphism in the Professions

Normative isomorphism is a particular form of isomorphic tendency, whereby professional members collectively negotiate the values and rules that guide their work in order to achieve institutional legitimacy (DiMaggio and Powell 1983). Leadership thus engages in a cyclical process of iteratively defining and redefining the internal activities that constitute the profession. Professional associations serve as one of the key field-level mediating bodies by which the myths, or logics, of the institutional environment – for example, higher education – are negotiated and diffused throughout disciplines (Friedland and Alford 1991). Venues such as annual meetings and convenings that gather professional leadership together are settings that facilitate the negotiation of professional norms. The American Sociological Association, in this case, served as the arena within which professional efforts to advance teaching and learning unfolded, both at annual meetings as well as in the ASA executive office.

Because organizations adopt organizing principles that are shared by others also seeking institutional legitimacy, they begin to take on similar forms. Shared institutional rules, then,

foster uniformity within the organizational field, defined by DiMaggio and Powell (1983: 148) as “sets of organizations that, in the aggregate, constitute a recognized area of institutional life; key suppliers, resource and product consumers, regulatory agencies, and other organizations that produce similar services or products”. The organizing principles underlying field-level structuration are referred to as institutional logics, which are “a set of material practices and symbolic constructions—which constitutes its organizing principles and which is available to organizations and individuals to elaborate” (Friedland and Alford 1991: 248). Institutional logics are shaped by symbolic understandings of the institutional environment, vary over time, and are protected by institutional actors.

Purposive Action to Maintain Institutional Legitimacy

It has been suggested that the origins of institutional theory (DiMaggio and Powell 1983, Meyer and Rowan 1977, Meyer and Scott 1983, 1987) fail to account for the agency of institutional actors. Suchman (1995) argues that traditional institutional theory “adopts a more detached stance and emphasizes the ways in which sector-wide structuration dynamics generate cultural pressures that transcend any single organization’s purposive control” (Suchman 1995). Drawing on Friedland and Alford’s (1991) suggestion to ‘bring society back in’, Suchman instead employs a more nuanced conceptual terminology to elaborate on the purposive ways in which legitimation may occur, distinguishing between pragmatic, moral, and cognitive legitimacy. When organizational leadership draws upon institutional norms to leverage control over organizational structure, they are employing a strategic approach to legitimacy—what Meyer and Rowan have alternatively referred to as formal legitimacy. In contrast, an informal approach to managing legitimacy focuses on the normative power of the

institutional environment to impact organizational processes beyond the control of individual actors (Suchman 1995: 572). It can be deduced, for the purposes of this research, that the form of legitimacy-seeking that played out in the teaching and learning movement in sociology suggests a struggle for professional legitimacy which was shaped by strategic change efforts to shift the normative value structure of the profession.

Field theory contributes to a dynamic understanding of organizational structuration by examining the potential for conflict to emerge as various parties in an organization vie to maintain logics which may be competing. Communities of organizations in the field, then, are subject to contestation over what the prevailing logics should be. According to Suddaby 2010, examination of the interactions between competing logics has the potential to reveal the impact institutional processes have on organizational change (Suddaby 2010). In this vein of scholarship, the focus turns towards understanding organizational change processes as a result of struggles for legitimacy based on purposive action by organizational actors. Field theory serves as a framework to examine these strategic institutional change efforts.

The social positioning of organizational actors may impact their ability to affect change in the prevailing institutional logics. In particular, actors that are in positions to control the availability of resources tend to privilege and protect logics that ensure the maintenance of institutional legitimacy, regardless of whether privileged actors personally adhere to those logics (Besharov and Smith 2014, DiMaggio and Powell 1983, Oliver 1991, Pfeffer and Salancik 1978, Sauder 2008). Organizations that balance multiple logics more or less equally—often a result of multiple factions of an organization possessing similar degrees of power—are said to have high centrality, whereas organizations that adopt primarily one logic (due to the prevailing

power of one organizational faction) have low centrality (Besharov and Smith 2014). However, when an organization balances the precarious existence of multiple logics, the groups embodying each respective logic are likely to vie for dominance (Besharov and Smith 2014: 371). The sociology profession demonstrates a case of low centrality, wherein leadership in the professional association maintains the prevailing logic of research as the primary identity defining the discipline. From the perspective of field theory, T&L change agents posed a challenge to the prevailing professional identity. Their efforts destabilized the status quo and presented a new logic to the research-oriented professional identity—that of teaching as an equally valued professional endeavor.

Professionalization

Professional associations such as the American Sociological Association operate as a critical field-level stabilizing force to effectively manage external as well as internal organizational demands. One way in which professional leadership delineates the rules of internal membership, both figurative and literal—in the case of membership in a professional association—is through the process of professionalization. Professionalization is “...the collective struggle of members of an occupation to define the conditions and methods of their work, to control “the production of producers” and to establish a cognitive base and legitimation for their occupational autonomy” (DiMaggio and Powel 1991: 70). The normative control processes that internally dictate the grounds for promotion are so powerful that, at the upper tiers of the professional hierarchy, professional identity becomes standardized (DiMaggio and Powell 1983).

Professors in higher education, for example, are exposed to the particular demands of their respective disciplines. While nearly all tenure-track professors are expected to teach and conduct research, the criteria for promotion vary widely across disciplines and institutions. Professional associations add another arena through which the grounds for professional inclusion are established. In the case of professions that are primarily housed in the higher education academy, individual units (such as departments) are both governed by the professional norms established by the overarching professional body and constrained by individual institutional pressures. The guidelines for professionalization and inclusion, then, stem from multiple directions. Promotion within academic departments occurs formally through standardized institutional mandates, yet the grounds for determining which criteria are valued for promotion are controlled from within the profession and established by practitioners. As a result, informal norms surrounding professional identity dictate which practitioners—and departmental units—are successfully able to access and maintain positions of professional prestige.

Due to the coexistence of many decentralized professional units in the academy that interpret prevailing professional norms according to individual institutional context, the process by which the profession at large works to maintain institutional legitimacy may be contentious. When the central prevailing logic is challenged, professional identity may also become destabilized. Studies of intraprofessional change examine what happens when a group of organizational actors instigate change to the dominating logic and thus destabilize the professional identity. Greenwood, Suddaby and Hinings (2002) “suggest that at those moments [of deinstitutionalization and change], associations can legitimate change by hosting a process

of discourse through which change is debated and endorsed: first by negotiating and managing debate within the profession; and, second, by reframing professional identities as they are presented to others outside the profession. This discourse enables professional identities to be re-constituted” (2002: 59). Moments of institutional destabilization, then—such as the mobilization of a group of actors with shared interests that contradict the prevailing logics—present opportunities in which the professional identity may be contested and renegotiated.

The process by which deviations from the existing professional norms occurs is referred to as ‘theorization’ (Strand and Meyer 1993, Abbott 1988, Tolbert and Zucker 1996, Suchman 1995). When theorization successfully occurs, diffusion of new ideas should result. Professional associations play an important role in this process. The American Sociological Association, for example, poses a venue in which individual professional units can interact, both with colleagues with shared interests as well as those with differing ideologies, and can collectively play a role in shaping professional norms and expectations. Regular professional convenings such as the once yearly meeting of the American Sociological Association and meetings of smaller regional professional associations present opportunities for professionals to interact and negotiate the shared professional norms to which they are all subject.

Because professions are composed of a large number of individual units housed in different academic institutions, however, reaching consensus around the grounds for professional inclusion involves negotiations among multiple academic departments with varying degrees of power and input (Van Hoy 1993, Dezalay and Garth 1996, Greenwood, Suddaby and Hinings 2002). “Decision-making within professional associations occurs through a political process in which the competing interests of subcommunities are reconciled and

subjugated on an ongoing basis” (Van Hoy 1993). Professional associations are thus burdened with the job of negotiating and managing cohesion among often disparate academic departments while also reinforcing the profession’s institutional legitimacy.

Departmental prestige mediates the degree to which different professional units impact the professional structure, and the prestige of individual practitioners within those departments further impacts the position of that professional unit in the institutional field. A contingency of professional leaders that occupy privileged access to resources possess a superior ability to legitimate their version of the professional identity. This creates a hierarchy between other actors both within professional units and umbrella organizations—such as professional associations—that impacts which practitioners possess the ability to shape changing professional norms. Due to these prevailing organizational arrangements (Meyer and Rowan 1977), groups of actors who seek to impact organizational change may not be optimally positioned to negotiate a shift in the professional norms that shape collective identity.

Nevertheless, professions undergo a continual process of negotiation and renegotiation of the norms that shape their discipline. Sometimes these negotiations affect intraprofessional change, in other cases they do not. All cases of intraprofessional change, though, are illustrative of the complex processes by which struggles for dominance over the prevailing professional identity occur.

Intraprofessional Collective Action

When a contingency of actors identifies a desire to shift the prevailing organizational norms and purposively seek to bring about change, the process can be understood as a form of intraprofessional collective action (Fligstein 1996, Haveman and Rao 1997, Rao 1998, and

Lounsbury, Hirsch and Ventresca 2003). The Teaching and Learning movement sought intraprofessional change in Sociology. Movement actors possessed agency to foment field-level change from within the professional organization, which challenges prevailing understandings of social movements as extra-institutional change efforts. In conjunction, new institutionalism and social movement scholarship help explain the mechanisms by which collective identity changes have occurred, and continue to unfold, from within the profession of sociology.

A number of field-level conditions may instigate collective action within an organization (Rao, Morrill and Zald 2000, McAdam, McCarthy and Zald 1996: 242). Conditions that can foment institutional change may include structural-level destabilizing events or political opportunities that cause reactionary mobilization, or changes in organizational alliances (Davis, McAdam and Scott et al. 2005). Here, collective action is triggered by changing field-level conditions and unfolds through power negotiations over competing institutional logics. As power arrangements and alliances between incumbent actors—those that seek to maintain the status quo, and challenger actors—those agents seeking change—shift, movement goals are transformed (Davis, McAdam and Scott et al. 2005).

Other branches of analysis on social change movements similarly consider how the degree of change that unfolds from collective action is mediated by the organizational positioning of movement actors (Cole 1999, Rao, Morrill and Zald 2000, Davis, McAdam and Scott et al. 2005). For example, fragmentation in the organizational field may occur when competing interests coexist amidst a weak professional authority structure (Abbott 1988). Even if the organizational infrastructure is unequipped to facilitate structural change, mass

mobilization by leading professional actors may trigger change through internal professional negotiations (Rao, Morrill and Zald 2000).

In the organizational coup, for example, a united group of optimally positioned actors may unexpectedly provoke change to traditional organizational goals, procedures, or policies. Successful change, in this case, is determined by the organizational positioning of mobilized actors (Zald and Berger 1978). This process is illustrated, for example, in the shift towards Total Quality Management (TQM) in US automobile manufacturing, which achieved institutional change as the movement diffused through the field hierarchy. While groups of low-status individuals initiated the movement, it was not until a number of activist organizations collectively advanced the issue among advantageously positioned corporate executives that TQM became institutionalized (Cole 1999, Rao, Morrill and Zald 2000).

Identity movements are a distinct form of social movement that offer challenges to old professional identities and foster adoption of new ones (Bernstein 1997). Cultural shifts within an identity-based social movement have the power to reshape professional norms, from collective identity down to individual practices, but the ability to successfully affect change may be similarly constrained by the social positioning of activists. Professions value both autonomy and a cohesive collective identity, so shifts in logics that support these are likely to promote change, whereas logics that pose a threat to autonomy are more likely to be challenged depending on the professional prestige of activists advancing these changes.

Rao, Monin and Durand (2003) explain how, within the culinary profession, the transition from *haute cuisine* to *nouvelle cuisine* was initiated by central actors who held the requisite prestige to successfully impact professional identity change. What they refer to as

'identity discrepant cues' exposed challenges to the dominant professional logic. Specifically, it was the sociopolitical legitimacy of activists that allowed for the successful negotiation and theorization of a new identity that proved critical to securing a shift towards the "*nouvelle*" *cuisine* logic (Rao, Monin and Durand 2003).

Furthermore, Greenwood, Suddaby and Hinings (2002) illustrate how accounting firms internally legitimated professional change from traditional accounting services to include multidisciplinary firms offering business advisory services. The profession's identity was reshaped as core values were expanded to include multiple arenas, encompassing not only accounting but also a new logic around business advising services (Greenwood, Suddaby and Hinings 2002). The maintenance of core values preserved a cohesive professional identity while allowing for the change process to occur, further demonstrating the key role that professional associations play in socially constructing professional identity (Greenway, Suddaby and Hinings 2002).

Strategic Action Fields

Change movements that are triggered by a discrete network of actors indicates a dissatisfaction among one group of professional members and a desire to change the prevailing logics or, as in the case of the Teaching and Learning movement, the collective professional identity. Examining the contentious organizational processes that unfold in this attempt to provoke change reveals the many colors of institutional change. Fligstein and McAdam conceive of *strategic action fields* (SAF) as the meso-level arenas within which social meaning is contested across groups as institutional change is negotiated (Fligstein and McAdam 2012). SAF

theory views the process of change as a volleying of ideas between actors at different levels of the power structure. This understanding embraces a fluid understanding of how the rules of the institutional legitimacy game are perpetually in flux.

Strategic Action Fields (SAF) are “socially-constructed arenas within which actors with varying resource endowments vie for advantage” (Fligstein and McAdam 2012: 10). Multiple groups of actors and organizations coexist in a strategic action field, with one group often possessing some degree of power and advantage above others. Actors’ behavior is reflective of their field-level position, so responses are dictated by an actors’ own interpretation of the cultural landscape of the field.

Field theory uses the language of incumbents and challengers to distinguish between change agents and actors who represent the status quo (Fligstein and McAdam 2012). *Incumbents* are the actors who hold power and influence in the SAFs and whose shared meanings tend to be legitimated. Their interests are more likely to be reflected in organizational processes and decision-making. *Challengers* possess less power and privilege and are generally expected to conform to incumbents’ rules and shared understandings. And, *Internal Governance Units (IGU’s)* are field-level bodies that manage compliance within the SAF and its associated rules. These include organizations such as accreditation bodies and professional associations in higher education. Governance units often reflect the prevailing logic of incumbents and reinforce the status quo (Fligstein and McAdam 2012).

In the Teaching and Learning movement, I refer to the professional change agents as T&L *challengers*, and *incumbents* are research-oriented members of ASA executive council who

represent the interests of Research One (R1) universities. Incumbents reify the logic that research is the most prestigious professional activity, thus maintaining the professional identity of sociologists as researchers first and teachers second. ASA executive council is the field-level *internal governance unit* that—despite collaboration with sociologists from institutions of varying size and prestige levels—represents primarily the interests of research-intensive sociologists and R1 institutions. ASA council will be understood as the entity that represents the interests of the incumbents that are in the position to maintain the professional identity status quo.

Skilled actors are challengers who are specially positioned to represent the institutional change goals by bridging field-level boundaries with incumbents. They are both constrained by the norms of the institutional environment, while also acting as change agents who take purposive action to affect change in the collective identity. Skilled actors often perceive their social environment in such a way that they understand the stakes involved in their attempts to implement change. Political opportunities or constraints, resource dependence, etc., are all factors of consideration as skilled actors shape their plan of action. They likely understand the risks and potential roadblocks, and their subsequent behavior may help circumvent barriers.

The Teaching and Learning movement's skilled actors were Hans Mauksch and Carla Howery, who will be discussed in detail in the following chapters. Both individuals possessed the ability to build trust among challengers while also straddling the social network of incumbents, which played a key role in reinstitutionalizing teaching initiatives in ASA. Although they occupied strategic organizational positions on ASA council over the years, which helped

advance key goals from the movement, individually they lacked the requisite social capital to be fully adopted into incumbents' professional networks.

C. Chapter Overview

This dissertation is structured as follows. In the next chapter, I outline the methods used to collect my data, justifying the use of multiple qualitative research methods to analyze this case study of intraprofessional change. These included a focused sample of interviews with key actors involved in the Teaching and Learning movement in addition to comprehensive archival analysis of professional publications of the American Sociological Association. In Chapter Three, I outline in detail the foundations of teaching and learning initiatives in sociology, and frame these as an intraprofessional identity-based social movement. Social movement research cites factors such as resource allocation and political opportunity structures as key determinants in the formation of a social movement. I demonstrate that the Teaching and Learning movement was founded based on the securing of monetary and human resources, and initial mobilization can be attributed to a particularly supportive political opportunity structure that supported cultural change movements such as that undertaken in sociology. I identify four primary goals that were identified at the outset of the movement and pose these as a measure by which to evaluate the inroads made by the T&L movement over the period of time analyzed. Three of these goals represented measurable objectives that help illustrate the process of reinstitutionalization triggered by the T&L movement. The last goal differs from the others due to its focus on normative change.

Chapter Four outlines the phases of institutionalization of intraprofessional change and delves deeper into explaining the tactics used to advance movement goals. Tracking the

progression of the movement from the 1980s through the 2000s, I discuss in detail the development of particular T&L initiatives and demonstrate that partial institutionalization of the change efforts of the teaching and learning movement occurred due in large part to the mediating role played by the American Sociological Association. The three concrete goals I use to analyze the reinstitutionalization process include:

- 1) creation of a recommended core curriculum which coincided with the national outcomes assessment movement in higher education,
- 2) proliferation of teaching development resources, workshops and conferences to improve the teaching of sociology across institutions, and
- 3) dissemination of these development opportunities vis a vis a departmental consulting group of teaching and learning scholars.

In the final substantive chapter I argue that, although several of the initially identified goals of the movement became institutionalized in the profession, the soft goal of shifting the professional identity of sociology to instill greater value on the importance of teaching remains in flux. The failure of this final goal is attributed to the hierarchical positioning of skilled movement actors in the professional structure. While Teaching and Learning actors occupied strategic positions in ASA that helped advance concrete movement goals, the ongoing discourse regarding the tensions between teaching and research impacted how these skilled actors were perceived by more prestigious professionals in ASA, and their subsequent ability to effectively shift the value structure of the profession.

A 2004 essay published in *Footnotes*, the formal publication of the American Sociological Association, astutely summarizes the story of intraprofessional change I subsequently document in this dissertation:

“Let 50 Flowers Bloom”:

The professional culture and reward structure of our discipline have evolved gradually over the past half century and are now so much the taken-for-granted reality that most sociologists are oblivious to their functions. Ralph Linton once observed that the last thing a fish in the depths of the sea would discover is water. The late Stanley L. Saxton was a particularly perceptive denizen of the deep. In A Critique of Contemporary American Sociology (1993), he noted, “The conditions of work for a small but powerful minority of sociologists at research universities need not and should not imprint the whole discipline” (p. 247). Unfortunately, they do. The practices of this disciplinary elite have produced a stratification system for both individuals and institutions within the profession of sociology . . . I am only saying aloud what has long been whispered. The intent of this essay is to initiate a conversation, a dialogue of equals. Sociology’s latent function not only divides us but also hinders our ability to engage wider audiences—we need to practice what we preach. We invite more of our research university colleagues to join us in state organizations, just as we have joined you in the ASA. Our local associations and practices might, once again, make our discipline relevant to the well-informed citizen. Let 50 flowers bloom.

- Monte Bute, Metropolitan State University, *Footnotes* 2004v32n2

CHAPTER 2

Methods

A. Methodology

I used a combination of qualitative methods to understand the various historical phases of the teaching and learning movement and the particular path of institutionalization that it spawned within the sociology profession. Research methods including ethnography, interviews, participant observation, and discourse analysis provide alternative lenses through which to understand the social world while taking the positionality of the researcher into account, counter to the prevailing quantitative methods traditionally used to support positivist frameworks (Prasad and Prasad 2002). Data collected via qualitative methods reveal the thoughts, emotions, contemplations, and interactions of social actors, lending to an inductive understanding of the processes by which social meaning is created (Weiss 1994). Accordingly, I determined that my aim to understand how my participants navigated their positioning within the profession in order to advance a goal of intraprofessional change would be optimally revealed through multiple qualitative methods.

Interpretive qualitative methods, specifically, are well suited to inform research that examines how meaning is created and constructed in the social world (Prasad and Prasad 2002). Much of the qualitative research examining organizational change has drawn upon Berger and Luckman's framework of social constructionism (Berger and Luckman 1966). Instead of viewing organizations as social objects that exist independent of social actors, Berger and Luckman examine how social behavior is both influenced by the institutional environment and

reified by social actors as they constantly navigate and redefine the guidelines for behavior in their institutional environment (Berger and Luckman 1966).

Topical orientations in sociology that examine social change, both in the context of extra-institutional social movements as well as institutional change, use social constructionism to examine how actors engage in social action to maintain the status quo, or facilitate change processes. Research on institutional logics in organizational scholarship, and frame analysis in social movement research, respectively, rely upon qualitative methods to understand how stasis or change occurs based on how social actors interpret and act upon the norms of their social environment. Case studies abound documenting social movement actors' interpretations of their goals for change, their relationships with other movement participants, their relationships with the movement target, and their understanding of the political environment and resource allocation. At its core, social movement research reveals how groups create and maintain internal cohesion among movement actors even as they mobilize to affect change in a group with competing interests.

Analyses of institutional change, similarly, have also relied upon qualitative data to understand how organizational actors make meaning out of their institutional environment and how this translates into social action. While social movement frame analysis and institutional logics stem from distinct areas of sociological scholarship—albeit theoretical orientations that are increasingly being used in conjunction—they are similar in their approach to understanding how distinct ideologies may impact change efforts. Increasingly, scholars at the cross-section of social movement and organizational theory have advocated for analyses of how social actors

may engage in purposive action to change their environment by negotiating which prevailing ideologies drive institutional action.

Prasad and Prasad (2002) echo the importance of analyzing not only organizational stasis, but also organizational change specifically, suggesting that organizational scholarship would also benefit from more critical interpretive analyses that examine the outcomes of conflicting social realities. My research falls in line with this area of research by utilizing field theory to examine the dynamics of organizational change via an interpretive analysis of teaching and learning scholars' intraprofessional positioning. I examine intraprofessional change in sociology using qualitative methods to understand the complex negotiations that sociology challengers used to gain legitimacy for the Teaching and Learning movement.

B. Data Collection

In order to accomplish this, I determined that qualitative interviews with members of the sociology teaching and learning movement would be best suited to reveal and elaborate upon movement actors' understanding of their intraprofessional change efforts. I classify the actors in the teaching and learning movement as the field-level challengers that are attempting to shift the prevailing ideology and thus the professional identity. Along with content analysis of archival data, semi-structured interviews with challengers congruently gather information about participants' perceptions of their positioning in the field as well as the degree to which the meaning-making they engage in shapes the professional identity of the field. By asking T&L challengers about their history with and understandings of the movement, we get a snapshot of their worldview, and can interpret this worldview as it aligns with the concrete institutional timeline revealed from the archival data.

Furthermore, the Teaching and Learning movement is couched within a rich historical context that has shaped sociology as we know it today. Many of the challengers that played central roles in the course of the movement have since passed away and I was therefore unable to interview them, and many historical professional changes occurred that have escaped the memory of the participants who were available to be interviewed. Given these particular circumstances, I determined that qualitative interviews alone would not be sufficient to collect the requisite data; my research would need to be heavily supplemented with historical documents. Together, I determined that the most appropriate methods for this research included a combination of a sample of open-ended interviews with leading teaching and learning scholars in the movement as well as extensive archival data from the professional newsletter *Footnotes*, an official publication of the American Sociological Association.

Each of these data sources is key. In addition to the interviews, the archival data informs a complete institutional mapping of the teaching and learning movement while also documenting the fluctuations and frequencies of written documentation of teaching and learning efforts in the publicly available professional records. Content analysis of these archives serves to situate the T&L challengers' framing of their movement within the field over time. These contextual data not only provide in depth historical records of the Teaching and Learning movement's public dissemination of their accomplishments, but also reveal how their efforts were lauded publicly by professionals outside of the movement.

Archival content analysis: Footnotes

Altheide (1987) asserts that qualitative content analysis can reveal the "communication of meaning" behind social behavior vis a vis purposively selected, symbolic material (Altheide

1987). The 'symbolic material' I used for this content analysis consists of *Footnotes*, which is the official newsletter publication of the American Sociological Association that was first circulated in 1972. Prior to this year, a publication called *The American Sociologist* was issued sporadically, featuring research highlights from recent journal articles and professional discussion over sociological issues of the time. At this juncture, the publication was renamed *Footnotes* and was henceforth used as the regular news source for issues of professional interest.

Over time, *Footnotes* has undergone a variety of content and formatting changes. Its rich historical content includes such diverse material as nominations and announcements for ASA Section award winners, ASA council meeting minutes, requests for grant proposals, debates over disciplinary jurisdiction and topical orientation, announcements of the establishment of new ASA Sections, open forum discussions over race and gender inequality within the profession, collaborations with national foundations and research agencies, and, importantly, a plethora of material about the teaching of sociology. These newsletters document the many phases of the teaching and learning movement, the actors involved, the timeline and functions of teaching and learning initiatives over the period of time examined, and reactions to the T&L movement from actors both within and outside the movement.

Archives of all *Footnotes* newsletters during this period are publicly available on the American Sociological Association website and were downloaded from this source. I gathered all available newsletters published from 1972-2012 for content analysis, which included an average of nine issues per year over the forty-year period and ranging on average between 10 and 20 pages. In all, I collected and coded a total of 367 *Footnotes* newsletters over a period of six months. I had initially planned to use the newsletters in a limited manner to document the

frequency of mention of teaching and learning initiatives as this fluctuated over the forty-year period. Once I began coding, however, it became clear that the newsletters would provide the primary data needed for this research and would reveal extensive information beyond quantifiable data. I thus determined that my research would benefit from a more detailed archival coding strategy to reveal the rich information housed in the newsletters.

I began open coding of the newsletters while also interviewing participants. Themes were initially broad, documenting the mention of teaching workshops or availability of teaching resources. Quickly, I began to notice familiar names of the projects I had heard referenced by participants, and increasingly focused coding to take note of the specific nomenclature used for each teaching initiative discussed, the timing of these, and projects' stated goals. As my codes continued to narrow, it became possible to document precise phases of the Teaching and Learning movement specifically, and more broadly to reveal historical shifts in the sociology profession that would provide a backdrop to my data. The goals of specific initiatives and associated timelines that I discuss in this dissertation were all categorized based on information drawn from *Footnotes* newsletters.

The themes that became most salient in the newsletters addressed topics such as resource allocation—both monetary and human—to teaching and learning initiatives, the organization and dissemination of teacher training opportunities, the creation of a teaching resource clearinghouse, the featuring of recipients of awards for stellar teaching both in individual institutions and the ASA, discussion of the outcomes assessment movement in higher education and the resulting initiatives of the ASA that emerged in reaction to it, and the availability of a group of rotating consultants to assist departments with internal restructuring

and streamlining of curriculum. The patchwork of these themes drew a detailed map of the teaching and learning movement within which I could couch interview participants' recollection and interpretation of these various phases of initiatives. In my analysis, however, I determined that not all of these initiatives were critical to the functions of the social movement and therefore I focus more heavily on some over others.

In addition to Footnotes archives, I also conducted an analysis of teacher training offerings in Sociology PhD-granting programs based on listings from the ASA 2019 Guide to Graduate Departments of Sociology. Universities were first categorized based on the Carnegie Rankings for 2019 as reported by Indiana University, including R1, R2, and 4yr+. The 4yr+ category included Master's programs, Specialized and/or Professional programs, or not listed.

The data from this manual did not include detailed, standardized questions. The data that was coded was listed in response to the broad question about whether "Teacher Training Available". Each university provided their unique description of and information about their program, which may have addressed or included any of the following categories listed below. If nothing was listed, then it was categorized as "no response". If listed as available, it was marked. Those programs that indicated they had 'teacher training available' were then broken down according to categories based on the information provided. This information was coded according to the following questions:

- 1. Is a formal teacher training course available? (credit-bearing)*
- 2. Is a teaching workshop available? (non credit-bearing)*
- 3. Is a formal teaching course required?*
- 4. Is a formal teaching course required but only for TAs or Instructors?*
- 5. Is there a formal teaching course available in the department?*

6. *Is there a formal teaching course available in the university, e.g. graduate school, other?*

7. *Is teaching experience available as TA or Instructor?*

8. *Is a TA experience required?*

9. *Is an Instructor experience required?*

If a university did not specifically state details such as, for example, whether a teaching course was required, or whether it was in-house in the department or generally available at the institution, this does not necessarily indicate a lack of these opportunities. Rather, it should be taken as an indicator that these departments did not specify those details in their program descriptions. Additionally, conclusions drawn from this data should be understood based on a number of caveats. These questions include:

1. Who provided the information in the manual?
2. Were the categories filled out with complete and relevant information?
3. Did the person who responded know all of the relevant information?

While this data does provide useful information regarding the degree to which graduate departments now incorporate teacher training opportunities in their programs, and how this varies based on university ranking, it should not be considered comprehensive.

Semi-Structured Interviews

I utilized purposive and snowball sampling to identify central actors involved in the sociology teaching and learning movement with whom to conduct qualitative, semi-structured interviews. I identified participants based on the names that emerged frequently in articles and *Footnotes* newsletters beginning in the 1970s, as well as scholars who are currently active

members of the Section on Teaching and Learning. I identified the first round of interview participants based on their co-authorship on any of the three Liberal Learning and the Sociology Major task force reports in the last thirty years (Eberts et al. 1990, McKinney et al. 2004, Pike et al. 2017), due to the important role these publications played in the Teaching and Learning movement. These individuals served as my initial points of contact to gain access to other participants through snowball sampling. Several of the primary actors were involved from the early 1980s and were nearing, or had already reached, retirement at the time of their interview. The two primary individuals who I identify as key skilled actors in the movement, and who were employed in the ASA executive office over a number of years, are both deceased. Any descriptive data about them I include in this research was drawn primarily from other participants' recollections, or from their written contributions to *Footnotes* newsletters. Praiseworthy commemorations and the obituaries of the two key skilled actors also provided summary overviews of their background and career accomplishments and were useful sources of data.

I sent out a standard recruitment email requesting participation from identified interview respondents. Participants were, in most cases, quite willing to participate, and excited to discuss at length their experiences with and perceptions of the teaching movement that integrally shaped their careers. Many of them have had professional relationships with one another over a number of years—sometimes decades—so I could not guarantee complete anonymity through the use of pseudonyms. Nevertheless, participants were assigned pseudonyms at random. The interviews were primarily conducted remotely via telephone or an online video platform such as Zoom, since participants resided in locations across the United

States. Interviews varied in length, but most fell somewhere between the duration of one hour and one hour and a half. In several cases, I coordinated meetings in person at the 2018 ASA annual meeting and was able to recruit and conduct interviews face to face.

I organized the interview schedule into several overarching themes. I began each conversation by asking participants about their own professional history regarding how they initially became interested in teaching and learning, and what their participation in teaching initiatives consisted of. After gathering a general understanding of each participant's professional entrée into the movement, I directed questions more specifically towards understanding participants' recollections of movement characteristics including goals, activities, resource allocation, recruitment, and nomenclature. The third part of the conversation homed in on participants' perceptions of the impact the movement has had on the professional identity of the discipline, and the degree to which teaching and learning initiatives have become institutionalized in the profession at large. I concluded each interview inquiring about the current state of the T&L movement, and where participants thought the current trajectory of the movement is leading.

Qualitative methodologies tend to emphasize the quality of data over quantity (Crouch and McKenzie 2006), and hold that the desired number of interviews can be assessed when research arrives at a saturation point, where no new information is being revealed in data collection (Gold 1997, Dworkin 2012). Data from the interviews quickly reached a point of diminishing returns, to my surprise. Given the focused nature of this movement and the tight network of professionals involved, many participants' historical recollections echoed one another. Dates and locations were sometimes difficult for participants to recall because the

events under discussion had taken place decades prior to their interview, so particular details such as these were primarily drawn from the *Footnotes* archives.

Participant narratives of their movement involvement did provide rich contextual data as a backdrop to findings from the *Footnotes* newsletters. Yet, the timeline that unfolded through data drawn from the newsletters, as well as the discourse around the movement, ultimately proved to be the richest source of information. Once I determined that interview data was reaching the point of saturation, I began to slow my recruitment efforts and focus more heavily on content analysis to glean detailed information from the archival data. Twenty-three interviews were collected in total. I did not directly ask participants about their identified race, ethnicity, or gender. Based on my observation, all but one of the participants were white, which is reflective of the predominantly white membership of the Section on Teaching and Learning that I observed at the annual meetings. Twelve men and eleven women were interviewed in total.

Participants' professional status was also taken into account. Many of the main actors in the movement who were first identified and recruited were reaching the end of their careers, or were already retired. In total, 9 participants were retired at the time of the interview, and 14 were still active in their professional careers. There was also a balance between sociologists who held faculty positions at top research universities and those employed at smaller public and private institutions who do not have graduate programs in Sociology and thus were not ranked in the 2019 Carnegie rankings. Those institutions categorized as 4 yr+ encompassed departments offering Master's degrees, Specialized, and/or Professional programs, or that

were not listed. The following table provides an anonymized summary of participants' professional status and the categorization of their home institution:

Participant	Professional Status	Institution Type	Ranking
P1	Active	PhD-granting State University	R1
P2	Active	PhD-granting State University	R1
P3	<i>Retired</i>	PhD-granting State University	R1
P4	<i>Retired</i>	4 yr+ Public Institution	N/A
P5	<i>Retired</i>	PhD-granting State University	R1
P6	Active	4 yr+ Private Institution	N/A
P7	<i>Retired</i>	4yr+ Public Institution	N/A
P8	Active	PhD-granting State University	R1
P9	Active	4yr+ Private Institution	N/A
P10	Active	4yr+ Private Institution	N/A
P11	Active	4yr+ Private Institution	N/A
P12	<i>Retired</i>	4yr+ Private Institution	N/A
P13	<i>Retired</i>	Professional, non-academic	N/A
P14	<i>Retired</i>	4yr+ Private Institution	N/A
P15	<i>Retired</i>	PhD-granting State University	R2
P16	Active	4yr+ Public Institution	N/A
P17	<i>Retired</i>	PhD-granting State University	R1
P18	Active	4yr+ Private Institution	N/A
P19	Active	PhD-granting State University	R1
P20	Active	PhD-granting State University	R1
P21	Active	4yr+ Private Institution	N/A
P22	Active	Professional, non-academic	N/A
P23	Active	4yr+ Private Institution	R2

C. Data Analysis

After I had concluded the interviews they were transcribed. I used Atlas TI™ coding software to organize and analyze the data. I began open coding on the early years of newsletters at the same time that I was recruiting participants and conducting interviews. Because I was at first unfamiliar with the structure of the newsletters, I began coding for anything that seemed of potential interest, keeping an eye out specifically for any mention of teaching, teaching projects, or resource allocation for teaching. Multiple other organizational

changes were happening in the profession during this time, so there were myriad potential areas of interest to expand upon that were only peripherally related to the research topic.

I eventually focused content analysis more directly on issues pertinent to teaching, many of which were addressed in the interview schedule that I used to guide the qualitative interviews. Due to my familiarity with the teaching movement in addition to knowledge gained from interviews, I became aware of key initiatives and events that were of primary importance and could direct my questions to these topics specifically. Gradually, the open coding became increasingly focused to reveal the most salient themes regarding the teaching and learning movement.

Because the archival material drawn from the *Footnotes* newsletters is so extensive, and activities around teaching and learning proliferated so greatly during the time analyzed, there were times at which sorting through the data and categorizing various phases of the movement proved difficult. Indeed, I observed that even in my position as a researcher who was deeply engaged in this archival data, it was difficult to differentiate between the dozens of different projects—and name changes—of the Teaching and Learning movement over the forty-year period analyzed. During coding I frequently had to recategorize my themes according to the renaming of projects over time. It was only once I had finished coding all newsletters that I was able to review the various changes in nomenclature and identify which projects were separate initiatives, and which were extensions of a project started in previous years that had undergone one or several name changes. In a number of cases, the name that was coined in the 1970s is not the current project name that I refer to in my analysis.

In order to sort through these mixed data as my analysis unfolded, I determined which of the T&L initiatives that were spearheaded at the beginning of the movement persisted in mission—if not in name—throughout the duration of the period under examination. In some cases, these name changes were arbitrary, such as the many iterations of what I refer to as the Department Resources Group. In other cases, however, name changes signified a shift in project jurisdiction. What is currently called the Section on Teaching and Learning, for example, was renamed as such in the early 2000s from its original name the Section on Undergraduate Education. The name change, in this instance, signified a change in the mission of the Section to expand its focus to encompass teaching K-12 sociology and graduate education, and not only sociology instruction at the undergraduate level. It is worth noting that the multiple name changes of Teaching and Learning projects, and slight modifications in project jurisdiction, may be a factor in occasional confusion from other professionals regarding the focus and jurisdiction of sociology teaching initiatives.

In summary, the four projects of the Teaching and Learning movement that I discuss in greater detail in the following chapters were categorized as a result of multiple rounds of coding. In the next chapter, I discuss the circumstances under which these initial movement objectives emerged and how they were developed about during the foundational years of the movement. I trace the current objectives of each of these four movement goals back to initial T&L projects that received grant funding—both external and internal from ASA—that were awarded to the project in the 1970s, and outline development of these objectives through the duration of the forty-year movement.

CHAPTER THREE

Foundations and Objectives of the Teaching and Learning Movement

The wave of new social movements that emerged in the 1950s and 1960s such as Civil Rights and second-wave feminism served as exogenous factors that exposed tensions around prevailing social power arrangements. These 'New Social Movements' were not only efforts for political change, but movements advocating for dramatic shifts in the cultural environment of the United States (Polletta and Jasper 2001). The emergence of the Teaching and Learning movement in Sociology is couched within this political opportunity structure. In the 1970s, the sociology profession confronted a call from within to increase sociologists' attention to the quality of their teaching and raise the status of teaching as a central professional task, signaling a challenge to the prevailing professional identity up until that time.

Social movement scholarship is broadly concerned with understanding multi-level mechanisms that trigger the organization and unfolding of social change efforts. Frameworks used to understand social movements have focused on strategies to mobilize resources (McCarthy and Zald 1997, Meyer and Minkoff 2004, Pedriana 2004, McAdam, Tarrow and Tilly 2001), political process models that examine how the opportunity structure impacts change efforts (McAdam 1999), and framing processes by which actors are seen as agents that construct movement narratives (Benford and Snow 2000, Snow et al. 1986). In this vein of scholarship, social movements are conceived of as *extra-institutional* collective groupings that utilize social, cultural, or symbolic processes to counter incumbent authority structures (Snow, Soule and Kriese 2004, Johnston and Klandermans 1995, Eyerman and Jamison 1991, Melucci 1996, Della Porta and Diani 1999, Crossley 2002, Rao, Monin and Durand 2003).

Intra-institutional movements, however, are subject to norms shaped by the institutional environment and thus present unique barriers to change. And, *intra-professional* movements confront additional constraints based on professionals' autonomy to define the normative conditions of their work. This chapter draws upon traditional social movement scholarship to establish initiatives undertaken in ASA to enhance the teaching and learning of Sociology as a social movement. Its nature as an intraprofessional movement, however, challenges prevailing understandings of social movements as extra-institutional change efforts and justifies an analysis of the impact that professional norms have on the outcomes of institutional change resulting from a social movement.

I demonstrate, first, that the emergence of the Teaching and Learning movement was facilitated by the allocation of resources—both internal and external, monetary and human—as well as an open political climate that was favorable to cultural change movements. This contributes an additional case to existing research on resource mobilization and political process theories of social movements, with a lens focused on an intraprofessional movement. Identification of a common set of goals directed movement activities, and mobilization by key leadership supported the successful recruitment of like-minded sociologists to act as challengers to advance the goals of the social movement.

While social movement scholarship is useful to explain the formation of the movement, it falls short of explaining the divergent trajectories of certain movement objectives. In this chapter, I look to the foundational years of the movement to first identify goals that were established at the outset, which will henceforth serve as a consistent point of reference in following chapters. Moreover, I distinguish between 'hard' and 'soft' movement goals as points

of analysis to understand the divergent trajectories of the Teaching and Learning movement objectives discussed in subsequent chapters.

Three hard goals were established from initiatives supported from grant money awarded to the Project on Undergraduate Education, and included:

- 1) advancement of teaching development opportunities for sociologists;
- 2) creation of a core undergraduate sociology curriculum; and
- 3) creation of a professional consulting group that could disseminate teaching development opportunities.

In the next chapter I demonstrate that each of these hard goals made significant advancements in reinstitutionalizing the professional structure. However, the soft goal of increasing the professional value for teaching, and thus changing the collective professional identity—did not diffuse to the point of full institutionalization wherein all members of the profession adopted the new identity. Understanding and explaining the unique trajectory of this soft goal is the subject of the last chapter.

The following overview of the Teaching and Learning movement explains in detail the many historical changes spearheaded by the original Section on Undergraduate Education (renamed the Section on Teaching and Learning in 2001 (FTN 2001v29n9) over time as the Section has navigated its jurisdiction within the professional association. The names of key actors and descriptions of the myriad T&L projects have undergone numerous historical shifts over time. In order to provide a general context to understand these many changes, the central efforts within the 1970s and 1980s can be categorized into several key professional initiatives

that provide the foundation for the four specific goals I discuss in this chapter. These overarching initiatives included drawing attention to the improvement of teaching sociology at the undergraduate level, organizing and publicizing opportunities for (and funding of) teaching development, collection and dissemination of examples of teaching resources and practices, and rewarding outstanding teaching. The specific professional programs tasked with advancing several of the above efforts, respectively, will be further explained below.

A. Birth of the Movement: 1972-1980

The specific teaching and learning movement analyzed here took shape in the 1970s, yet debates around the importance of teaching and strengthening the teaching skills of sociologists span the history of academic sociology. The first American Sociological Association (ASA) session on the teaching of sociology was held just several years after the association was founded in 1905. The session focused on how to standardize the introductory sociology course (Howard 2010). Within the last fifty years, however, the discipline has seen a marked increase in attention to the teaching and learning of sociology, particularly at the undergraduate level.

In 1973 the professional publication formerly known as *The American Sociologist* was renamed *Footnotes* (FTNv1n1), which became a roughly monthly newsletter reporting current events and advancements in the discipline. These newsletters document, among numerous other influential historical changes in the profession, the trajectory of the teaching and learning movement in sociology. Text from council minutes summarized in one of the first *Footnotes* newsletters noted a marked increase in attention to undergraduate education within the professional association (FTN 73v1n6).

Participants who were active in the Teaching and Learning movement, particularly those involved in the early years, cite the leadership of Hans Mauksch as fundamental to the initiation of the movement. Mauksch received his PhD from the University of Chicago in 1960. He held an administrative position at the Illinois Institute of Technology from 1962 to 1965, subsequently accepting a joint position in Sociology and the School of Medicine at the University of Missouri (FTNv22n1). It was during his time in Missouri that Mauksch developed an interest in teaching sociology at the university level. He took a position as Chair of the ASA Committee on Undergraduate Education in 1970, thus positioning himself to establish the Section on Undergraduate Education (FTNv22n1).

The American Sociological Association allocated \$2,200 of internal funding in 1973 to facilitate the organization of a preliminary workshop on teaching undergraduate sociology, directed by Hans Mauksch, who had become an outspoken advocate for strengthening teaching and learning practices in Sociology. The workshop spawned the Section on Undergraduate Education (SUE), which encompasses the specific activities undertaken by the Project on Undergraduate Education (PUE). Based on the allocation of monetary resources as well as the dedication of personnel to the teaching and learning initiatives in 1973, that year will be considered the foundational year of the ASA teaching and learning movement for the purposes of this research.

The establishment of the Section on Undergraduate Education was an important advancement for several reasons. SUE facilitated a network of communication among sociologists who placed particular value on their professional role as teachers many of whom were part of a generation of sociologists who felt that incumbent leadership in ASA did not

represent their interests. As this group gained increasing support and representation, they formed what I refer to as T&L movement challengers.

Furthermore, the Section on Undergraduate Education located a place in ASA for movement representatives to directly advance their interests in ASA council. I draw from field theory to refer to ASA council as the internal governance unit (IGU) that maintains order in the institutional field and represents the prevailing interests of incumbent professional actors (Fligstein and McAdam 2012). The Section on Undergraduate Education thus allowed T&L movement challengers to gain access to their incumbent professional counterparts vis a vis representation in the internal governance unit. Mauksch actively lauded this advancement in newsletters and emphasized its symbolic and practical importance to furthering T&L movement goals. He stated in a *Footnotes* entry:

“The Association’s mission to support instruction can be identified with the formation of an ASA Section devoted to teaching. Most ASA Sections represent conceptual and substantive specialization within sociology. *The ASA Section on Undergraduate Education differs by claiming a mission which is generic to the function of the discipline and to the objectives of the Association* (emphasis added)” (Mauksch, 76v6n4).

Mauksch’s above suggestion that the Section on Undergraduate Education occupied a unique place in ASA was a theme expressed throughout the movement and echoed by participants, as I elaborate upon in the final chapter. He acknowledged that T&L challengers represented professional interests different than those of other substantive professional areas that have ASA sections, which distinguished the Section on Undergraduate Education from

others. Behind this statement is an understanding that, while not all sociologists are engaged members of all substantive areas of sociology, all academic sociologists teach. The mission of SUE, then, was to create opportunities that could be utilized by all professional members of ASA and inherently implicated both challengers and incumbents, and everyone in between.

Challengers' explicit messaging that T&L initiatives were couched within a social movement to institutionalize professional change is a further consideration in understanding how the early dynamic between challengers and incumbents set the stage for later interactions. Mauksch's ASA obituary acknowledged this:

"The Undergraduate Section and Projects burst upon the scene almost simultaneously under Hans' inspired and creative leadership. It was clear from the beginning that both were to constitute a social movement to institutionalize change in the ASA and in higher education. The Section's task was to mobilize and lead the movement; the Projects were to provide its tools" (FTN94v22n1).

Doug, who spent his career at a small teaching university in the Pacific Northwest and is now retired, was one of the few participants who met and worked with Hans Mauksch. He echoed Mauksch's framing of teaching and learning initiatives as a social movement:

"Well initially as I remember it, initially what I did and what most people did was that we would go to these training workshops that would be held around the country because these leaders, Hans and Chip, were trying to do from bottom up were trying to get more sociologists involved with the initiative or the movement.

And if you call it a movement of course, that's exactly what you need. You've got to have more people involved" (Personal interview, 10/9/27).

Doug's interpretation of movement leaders' strategies suggest that they possessed an acute awareness of how social movements are formed. Mobilization of supporters who were invested in the proposed changes was the first step, but it also needed to be accompanied by the allocation of resources to support movement activities. Accordingly, Mauksch secured funding from ASA to spearhead the teaching and learning movement in 1973 (FTN87v15n6). The following year, he and other leaders sought additional resources from external funding sources. With support from council, ASA authorized the Section on Undergraduate Education to submit a \$533,262 request for funding from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, HEW to devote to a three-year "Program of Assessment, Articulation, and Experimentation in Undergraduate Teaching of Sociology in the United States" (FTN74v2n5). The Section requested that a portion of these funds, if awarded, would be dedicated to the creation of an internal ASA Executive Specialist in Education position (FTN74v2n5), which secured challengers' representation in the executive office through the allocation of human resources.

The Project on Undergraduate Education was successfully awarded the HEW grant for a three-year project, with the first year of funding amounting to \$99,960 (FTN74v2n6). Objectives of the project were classified under an umbrella of three task forces. These included, first, the streamlining of sociology curriculum in undergraduate institutions including two-year community colleges, four-year teaching-centered liberal arts colleges, and leading research universities. Curriculum development included the creation of a common core curriculum,

identification of the purposes of introductory sociology courses, and the distinction of sociology training compared to other social science majors (FTN74v2n6). The project would also devote attention to teacher training for sociologists to develop models for best teaching practices, and the dissemination of those models to sociology teachers nationally. Finally, the project sought to strengthen an understanding of the institutional context driving decisions around the structure of undergraduate sociology programs. It was explicitly noted that this was not meant to focus on external Accreditation mandates, but rather provide resources to department administrators to implement internal professional standards in teaching as developed by the ASA Project on Undergraduate Education (FTN74v2n6).

A continuation project was spearheaded by Mauksch upon conclusion of the three years of initial funding. Objectives to further advance the project included continued efforts to support regional associations' teaching resources, support departments to deliberately incorporate teacher preparation into their programs, enhance awareness among sociologists of availability of teaching resources and strategies, and create a more supportive and inclusive environment in ASA for two-year college teachers (FTN77v5n7). Mauksch expressed hope that the continuation project would "provide for the acceptance of its results by many populations which have to be simultaneously addressed if the fundamental processes of the discipline are to be affected" (FTN77v5n7).

Mauksch was an astute movement founder and leader. He was acutely aware of the necessary mechanisms needed not only to found the movement, but also to ensure that the Teaching and Learning movement would create enduring intraprofessional change. The above statement suggests that, while the specific activities of the Project on Undergraduate Education

were advanced by challenger members of SUE, the outcomes of the project had the potential to impact all professionals—in ways that he deemed to be positive. In his 1976 Report of the Executive Offer, Mauksch contributed an extensive discussion of the differences between how scholarship and teaching are viewed within ASA.

“A significant segment of the [ASA] membership are in positions where they devote all or most of their time to teaching. Many of them are in relatively isolated situations in which they must look to their association for resources and communications. Returning to the quote from the constitution which states that stimulation and improvement of instruction is one of the Association objectives, the proper question should not be whether this should be done by the Association, but what should be done and how should it be accomplished? Looking over inquiries I have seen since arriving at the Executive Office, I would place the demands for information first among the needs expressed. It is rather remarkable to observe that through formal and informal channels, through publications and direct exchange of mail, scholars tend to communicate with each other about scholarship and inquiry. No such pattern seems to exist in the area of teaching and, more importantly, very few structured vehicles for such exchanges are available. The dearth of this type of resource should be of concern to the Association”. (FTNv4n6).

Citing the ASA Constitution’s stated commitment to promoting teaching excellence, Mauksch identified a disjunction between how scholarship and teaching are valued practically within the

profession. Moreover, it is critically important that Mauksch drew directly from the ASA constitution to state that “stimulation and improvement of instruction” (FTN76v4n5), is an integral part of a professional sociologist’s work life, revealing a disconnection between sociologists’ perceived professional identity as researchers first and foremost, and that stated on the professional record. The discourse around teaching and research as dichotomous professional activities in the academy persisted in the institutional environment within which the Teaching and Learning movement unfolded. While the overarching teaching/research dichotomy played a role in the degree to which professional identity change occurred, as I argue in the last chapter, this dichotomy is not evident in official documents of the ASA governance unit.

Compared to widely available information sharing opportunities regarding research and scholarship, Mauksch claimed there was a lack of mechanisms to disseminate information and resources about teaching. Identification of this information gap provided a starting point from which to focus movement initiatives and led challengers to establish institutional mechanisms that would foster long term independence of the Project on Undergraduate Education and its associated activities. The recruitment of movement participants and allocation of resources was critical to the foundation of the movement, yet the creation of organizational mechanisms to disseminate advancements in teaching scholarship was an attempt to create enduring change. These included the sharing of teaching practices, models and resources, as well as promotion of an increasing reward system for teaching-oriented sociologists, objectives that are clearly stated in the goals of the three-year HEW grant (FTN74v2n6).

One of the strategies used to disseminate information on teaching to sociologists included the creation of resources featuring advancements in teaching and learning that were available to ASA members. The first newsletter of the ASA Project on Teaching Undergraduate Sociology was published in 1976 (FTN76v4n6), broadcasting a request for participation from interested sociological practitioners to join the section. The newsletter also included an advertisement for the sale of teaching resources in that issue (FTN76v4n9). The following year, it was announced that the newsletter would feature a regular column dedicated to “information pertaining to teaching” (FTN77v5n1).

Also in 1976, the Project on Teaching Undergraduate Sociology was awarded a grant of \$207,530 from the Lilly Endowment to organize teaching workshops and develop a nationwide group of teaching specialists (FTN76v4n6). This would be achieved through the development of a cadre of teacher sociologists who specialized in providing national consulting services with departments and individual teachers to improve programming. The creation of what was then referred to as the Teacher Development Project (TDP) was intended to “provide institutionalized support for the teaching function performed by sociologists...”, and “...is aimed at creating an environment in which teaching is more highly valued and more highly rewarded” (FTN76v4n6).

The functions of the Teacher Development Project as described above hint at the initial divergence between hard and soft movement goals. The primary functions of the TDP as outlined above propose a specific objective of creating teaching development opportunities and specialists to lead them, providing a measurable outcome. The mechanism to do this is explicitly detailed through the creation of a cadre of teaching consultants to assist

dissemination of these opportunities at the department level. In contrast, the conclusion of the excerpt also hints at a desire for normative professional change, which is not accompanied by stated measurable mechanisms through which to do so. Although both creation of the consulting group and encouraging a shift in the professional reward structure were alluded to, only one of these was formulated into measurable outcomes.

B. Formation of Initial Goals

While numerous Teaching and Learning initiatives were introduced and reformulated over the years, the three task forces proposed in the original HEW grant formed the hard goals of the movement that persisted over time. Specifically, these included:

- 1) Development of a sociology core curriculum
- 2) Regional and national teacher development opportunities
- 3) Department consulting on teaching

Departmental consulting services that stemmed from the Teacher Development Project, renamed the Department Resources Group (DRG) in the mid-1990s, would prove over time to be a critical source through which to disseminate advancements in the T&L movement. The Department Resources Group was the primary mechanism by which the Project fostered a deliberate and time-enduring dissemination of movement ideology.

The DRG was initially known as the Teacher Development Project, which was the outcome of a 1976 workshop in St. Louis that brought together a group of potential consultants that would contribute their experiences in teacher development, knowledge of teaching resources, as well as preexisting consulting experience. The initiation of the consulting program

was identified for a March 1977 deadline, at which time departments could request a visit from one of the 'teaching specialists' (FTN76n9). This group of consultants also participated in the development of the Teaching Resources Center, tasked with compiling teaching resources that would provide the materials on teaching development available for dissemination via TDP consultations.

In order for the outcomes of the TDP to be effective, however, consultants had to effectively transmit information across hundreds of departments to thousands of members nationwide. Challengers identified the need for departmental representatives to serve as points of contact with consultants, spawning efforts to standardize departmental positions for directors of undergraduate study. Not long after the announcement of the TDP, a *Footnotes* entry suggested that departments should create positions for Directors of Undergraduate Studies (78v6n4) and lauded a model sociology department that had created a position for a director of undergraduate education (FTN78v6n4).

Establishing directors of undergraduate study as a ubiquitous position across departments nationwide was important to advancing the goals of the T&L movement. Directors of Undergraduate Study could serve as points of contact at the departmental level to disseminate information from TDP consultants who could transmit best practices in the teaching of sociology to representatives explicitly charged with overseeing undergraduate sociology programs. Directors of Undergraduate Study ensured a point of contact within individual departments through which to spread movement initiatives communicated by the TDP.

Other disciplines were also devoting increased attention to teaching and learning at this time, yet sociologists stood out as central contributors to the teaching and learning movement broadly. The June 1977 issue of *Change* magazine featured a special issue on examples of excellent teaching among twelve social science disciplines. The strong representation of sociologists in submissions to the issue led to the creation of a supplemental booklet specifically for teaching sociology. In collaborative efforts throughout the years, sociology was often identified as a discipline at the forefront of teaching advancements, indicating a strong movement foundation.

While sociology was at the forefront of the teaching and learning efforts, the movement was also undergoing a change in leadership as Mauksch left his position in the ASA executive office in 1977. In a parting newsletter entry, he said: “Ultimately, the test of the effectiveness of these efforts will be the permanence of the improved conditions for teachers of sociology at the time when project support has ceased to provide financial aid and organizational leverage” (FTN77v5n6). Mauksch’s statement suggested an awareness that institutionalized change would be measured as the Project achieved independence from funding and resource allocation to teaching. This year was a critical juncture in the movement as Mauksch stepped back from his charismatic leadership and allowed the change mechanisms he had established to take shape on their own.

C. Teaching Resources Center

Making teaching resources accessible to all sociologists was a pervasive function of the Project on Undergraduate Education, and one that has made impressive gains over time alongside technological advancements to disseminate materials. Responding to a report of

increased sales of teaching materials 1978, Charles Goldsmid stated, “It looks like we are servicing a strongly felt need in the profession and the need for our service can only grow as we have yet to hear from the majority of sociologists engaged in teaching” (Goldsmid, FTN78v6n1). In response to this perceived demand, the Teaching Resources Center advisory board was convened in 1978 (FTN78v6n6). The Teaching Resources Center’s intended goals at the time included: “1) serving as a repository of information and resources on teaching sociology; 2) answering inquiries regarding the teaching of sociology broadly defined to include curricular and related materials; 3) making teaching resource materials available to sociologists at low cost; and 4) providing materials for literature tables at teaching workshops and professional meetings”. The TRC was moved in-house to the Executive office in the summer of 1978 (FTN78v6n6).

An additional repository for information about teaching included the ASA Teaching Undergraduate Sociology Newsletter. Subscriptions were made available at a cost in order to make the newsletter viable long term with self-sustaining funds (FTN78v6n4). Goals of the newsletter included:

“1) provide teachers with useful information about the practical problems they face; 2) increase the visibility of teachers and teaching in the discipline; 3) create a dialogue among teachers concerning the problems and prospects for improving instruction; 4) report on teaching activities in the discipline; 5) inform teachers of sources of support for their own development as well as for projects aimed at improving instruction; 6) *develop a culture within the discipline that is supportive of teaching as a significant aspect of a career in sociology...*” (emphasis added; FTN78v6n4).

Again, a reference to normative cultural change in the discipline was couched within other Project activities that posed concretely measurable outcomes. Stating the objectives of the newsletter presented not only an opportunity to make teaching resources available, but also to provide a venue for dialogue around the significance of teaching to the discipline. This last of the stated goals—to shift professional culture to be more supportive of teaching—is a statement from the challengers to express their aim of shifting the collective professional identity. The concrete goals identified during the creation of each new phase of teaching initiatives at the time, including the Teacher Development, the Teaching Resources Center, and the *Teaching Sociology Newsletter* represent demonstrable markers of institutionalization which, I argue, were successfully achieved by the Teaching and Learning movement. The more pervasive, yet difficult to measure, aspiration of professional identity change, however, was also imbued throughout.

Council minutes from 1978 reflected increasing support for the Project on Teaching Undergraduate Sociology, and authorized requests to pursue additional funding for their projects. Workshops catering to department Chairs were of particular interest, since “chairs serve as mediators between institutional administration and the process of teaching and because chairs have a significant influence on the use of faculty, the allocation of budgets, and the distribution of rewards and encouragement” (FTN78v6n5). Much like Directors of Undergraduate Study, department chairs were understood to be an important source of influence as intermediaries with the larger institutional context. Unlike directors of undergraduate studies, however, department chairs additionally possessed the ability to impact the reward structure in the departments they oversee (FTN78v6n5). Department chairs and

Directors of Undergraduate Study thus played a key role in transmitting information from ASA to individual professionals across hundreds of institutions. ASA Council's encouragement of teaching development for department chairs signals an understanding of the vital contributions departments make to professional development and transmitting professional norms throughout the field.

Activities in ASA as the internal governance unit (IGU), however, continued to play a vital role in shaping initial support for the Sociology teaching and learning movement. A 1979 announcement stated that "ASA Council Takes Actions in Support of Teaching", evidenced by

- 1) the creation of a Standing Committee on Teaching
- 2) support for expanding the Teaching Services Program
- 3) approval to develop a Departmental Subscription Service
- 4) creation of a declaration on teaching
- 5) creation of an annual award for teaching and learning (FTN79v7n6)

A "Sociology Teaching Month" was organized by the Project on Teaching Undergraduate Sociology, featuring ten workshops nationally during April of 1979 (FTN79v7n9). The idea behind this month was "to demonstrate to its own members, to colleagues in other disciplines, and to educational administrators that our discipline has made a commitment to teaching, has developed resources and programs to improve teaching, and is willing to demonstrate and to share its achievements" (Mauksch, FTN79v7n9).

By the end of the 1970s, the Project on Undergraduate Education had gained enough support from ASA council to create the myriad projects, described above, that were dedicated to enhancing sociologists' teaching expertise. Monetary and ideological support from ASA was a critical factor in supporting the expansion of the Project on Undergraduate Education.

Dedication of human resources in the national office to staffing positions that were dedicated primarily to teaching and learning initiatives greatly allowed the project to establish a strong foundation.

D. Establishment of Primary Goals

Identification of movement goals, as well as understanding movement actors' specific perceptions of movement goals, provides a measure with which to understand the reinstitutionalization of the T&L initiatives that were established in the 1970s. I distinguish the movement's goals between, on one hand, demonstrable (hard) goals that underwent a process of institutionalization and, on the other, an abstract (soft) goal of professional identity change. Movement objectives that were stated repeatedly in multiple *Footnotes* announcements and funded project descriptions identified clear goals of the movement and measures against which to understand the process of institutionalization of the intraprofessional movement.

Based on the objectives repeated in initial funding projects during the 1970s, I provide an overview of the primary movement objectives as evident in the historical documents. The degree of institutionalization of each of these stated goals is the subject of subsequent chapters. The first three goals I cite as evidence of partial institutionalization of the Teaching and Learning movement. The last – enhancing professional prestige for teaching as an acquired versus an ascribed status – will be discussed at length in the final chapter.

Objective 1: Standardization of a sociology core curriculum

An announcement about the Project on Undergraduate Education in an early *Footnotes* newsletter detailed the stated goals of the curriculum task force which was rolled out in the first year of the project (FTN75v3n6). The formal Invitation for Submission of proposed activities, posted in the ASA newsletter in 1976 (FTN76v4n5) stated: “The ASA project seeks to encourage the development of demonstration, innovation, and evaluation in undergraduate teaching of sociology”. Proposals could address a number of potential activities, including desired objectives for an undergraduate sociology degree, identification of a common core curriculum, and the goals and purpose of the introductory course (FTN76v4n5).

Professional discourse around whether and how to develop a core undergraduate curriculum in sociology gained prominence in the midst of the outcomes assessment movement in the 1980s. These efforts were advanced through the release of the Liberal Learning and the Sociology Major publication in 1990 and its subsequent updates (Eberts et al. 1990, McKinney et al. 2004, Pike et al. 2017). The development and implementation of a common core curriculum in sociology continues to be debated among T&L actors (Ballantine et al. 2016). However, the many phases of efforts to develop this are rooted in the creation of the curriculum task force in the first phase of the Project on Undergraduate Education (FTN: 75v3n6).

Objective 2: Creation of a department consulting group

The Departmental Resources Group (originally referred to as the Teacher Development Project in this chapter) has been a central effort of the movement since the conclusion of the first grant

project of the Section on Undergraduate Education. Identified by Mauksch as a key mechanism to disseminate the principles of the teaching and learning movement, the departmental resources group has been integral to making Teaching and Learning advancements available to interested departments nationally. Multiple participants were either currently or previously consultants of the DRG and identified it as an active branch of Teaching and Learning currently.

Objective 3: Regional and national teacher development opportunities

Teaching and learning workshops have proliferated ASA, regional sociological associations, and at individual institutions. The existence of the Teaching Resources Center, which made materials available to support improvements in teaching sociology, as well as the pervasive availability of opportunities for sociologists to engage with teaching and learning specialists, represent an outstanding accomplishment of the teaching and learning movement. While the degree to which these resources have sufficiently reached all corners of the profession is debatable, the early goal to make teaching development opportunities available to sociologists is one that has persisted prominently over time.

The *Teaching Sociology Newsletter* was an additional resource for teaching development opportunities. This newsletter eventually became a formal journal now known as *Teaching Sociology*, for which multiple participants served as editors. The journal has undergone changes in content over time, but the articles published in both the newsletter and the formal journal helped circulate publicly accessible resources that all sociologists could utilize.

Objective 4: Shift collective professional identity to embrace teaching as an acquired status

A repeated objective of the Teaching and Learning movement was pinpointed as “The identification of requisite understanding, knowledge and skills to develop teaching competence, ie the *demonstration of teaching as an acquired rather than an ascribed status*” (FTN76v4n5). While many of the goals identified in the initial three-year Project on Undergraduate Education had measurable outcomes, the addition of this statement as an area of attention—albeit one with ambiguously measurable outcomes—is a critical addition. Implied in this text is an understanding that teaching was, in the 1970s, considered a taken-for-granted skill, one which sociologists simply put into practice as a result of their professional status, as opposed to a skill that could be honed and strengthened according to identified professional standards, as research was. Changing sociologists’ perspective on their teaching status as one that is acquired, not ascribed, implies a fundamental shift in the professional identity that would require normative cultural change to become fully adopted by sociologists at large.

Amidst general expressions of support for the Project on Undergraduate Education, ASA also expressed some degree of hesitation early on. In deliberations over requests for additional funds for the Project, council expressed a “*concern over the possible implication that it might become an instrument for the promotion of orthodoxy*, and noted a number of suggestions to strengthen what it deemed in general to be a worthy and important enterprise” (FTN74v2n5). This statement conveys that, while ASA council members were generally supportive of teaching and learning projects, they expressed a corresponding concern over the impact that increased attention to the teaching of undergraduate sociology might have on the prevailing professional norms.

Advancements in the teaching and learning movement, it seemed, encountered positive reception from ASA so long as Teaching and Learning activities did not destabilize the prevailing normative arrangement that lauds research and scholarship as the most valued professional task of a sociologist. Council members represented a powerful, if small, fraction of prestigious sociologists, and their skepticism about the ‘promotion of orthodoxy’ suggests that shifting the professional status quo to become ‘orthodox’ in its promotion of teaching—and not research—was a topic worthy of concern. T&L challengers’ goal of intraprofessional cultural change was a move that had the potential to impact all sociologists and shift the status quo reward structure in the profession, which was not lost on ASA council as evident in the above statements.

Mauksch utilized the professionally available *Footnotes* newsletter as a source to disseminate discourse around the core objectives of the T&L movement, further reiterating the importance of the establishment of the Section on Undergraduate Education and Mauksch’s staff position in the ASA executive office. The ability to publicize movement objectives and advancements in *Footnotes*, broadly accessible to sociologists nationally, awarded challengers a pervasive yet subtle challenge to the research-centric reward structure and professional identity that predominated up until that point.

These professional documents provided an enduring venue through which advancements in the hard goals of the T&L movement could be reported on. Strategic action by Mauksch and other movement leaders to incorporate these hard goals into grant requests thus shaped the course of the movement from the base of T&L challengers while also being supported and sanctioned by incumbent leadership. The soft goal of identity change however, while alluded to in grants, was not accompanied by concrete measures with which to do so and

in fact confronted resistance from council. I demonstrate that ASA incumbents' early hesitation towards this soft goal signaled a resistance to normative intraprofessional change that has persisted throughout the course of the movement. While the hard goals provided opportunities for teaching development available to all professionals, they did not pose new mandates that would be demanded from all sociologists. Collective identity change, however, was associated with the possibility of professional shifts that would affect all sociologists and was therefore confronted with resistance from the outset.

CHAPTER 4

1980s-2000s: Outcomes Assessment and Reinstitutionalization

The previous chapter established the Teaching and Learning movement as an intraprofessional change movement and identified four key strategies used by leadership to affect change in sociology. In this chapter, I elaborate upon three of these objectives to illustrate how the T&L movement negotiated a process of reinstitutionalization in the field of sociology. Strang and Meyer (1993) assert that the renegotiation of institutional norms “must make the transition from theoretical formulation to social movement to institutional imperative”. During its formation, T&L efforts succeeded in introducing a new ‘theoretical formulation’ that fostered the emergence of an associated intraprofessional social movement. It is the transition from social movement to the final step of achieving an *institutional imperative*—the theorization phase of reinstitutionalization (Strang and Meyer 1993, Greenwood, Suddaby and Hinings 2002)—that I examine in this chapter.

Institutional theorists have suggested there are five phases through which institutional change occurs (Greenwood, Suddaby and Hinings 2002). The first phase is initiated by a *destabilizing event*, such as external social changes or changes in regulatory mandates. Following this initial shock to the organizational field, a process of *deinstitutionalization* ensues wherein institutional actors take purposive action to promote new institutional arrangements. The third phase is *preinstitutionalization*, or the introduction of novel innovations, followed by *reinstitutionalization* wherein changing institutional norms become legitimated (Greenwood, Suddaby and Hinings 2002). The final steps in institutionalization are *diffusion* and *theorization* (Strand and Meyer 1993, Abbott 1988, Tolbert and Zucker 1996, Suchman 1995). “In effect,

theorization (stage IV of institutionalization) is the process whereby localized deviations from prevailing conventions become abstracted and thus made available in simplified form for wider adoption” (Greenwood, Suddaby and Hinings 2002: 60). Successful theorization should, in theory, result in the diffusion of institutional change.

Highly institutionalized settings such as higher education confront particular challenges in the theorization process. Many highly institutionalized fields encounter constraints from external bodies such as market or political pressures yet, in contrast, the professions possess normative control to shape the boundaries of their professional jurisdiction. Institutional change within a profession thus necessitates an analysis of how professionals negotiate changes from within.

Regulatory agencies act as the internal governance unit within which these changes are negotiated. Professional associations such as, in the case of the Teaching and Learning movement, the American Sociological Association, thus play a critical role in the process of intraprofessional legitimation. Although it has been suggested that professional associations tend to represent the interests of incumbents, analysis of institutional change in the accounting profession (Greenwood, Suddaby and Hinings 2002) suggests that professional associations may also facilitate professional discourse so as to provide a renegotiation of professional identity.

What follows is an analysis of the theorization phase of the Teaching and Learning movement. I identify the organizational field as the sociology profession, and other organizational communities that operate at the field level include sociology departments, universities, regional associations, accreditation bodies, and national education organizations.

The activities in which T&L challengers engaged to advance movement objectives that I subsequently describe in detail necessitated interaction with various subcommunities in the field, and T&L skilled actors represented in the ASA executive office played an important mediating role. I demonstrate that the Teaching and Learning movement affected partial reinstitutionalization, largely through skilled actors' key representation in ASA.

A. Teaching Services Program

In the 1980s, higher education saw a series of ideological shifts that supported advancements in the teaching and learning movement. Initiatives of the Section on Undergraduate Education that were established in the prior decade, including the Teaching Resources Center and the Department Resources Group, encountered new institutional pressures and constraints that guided the activities of the movement. ASA functioned as an important field-level mediating body to support the T&L movement's negotiation of these changes. The presence of skilled actor Carla Howery in ASA allowed the interests of T&L challengers to be represented among incumbents, and the *ASA Footnotes* newsletters provided a venue for professional discourse around the institutional changes that were unfolding.

Amidst these changes in higher education, The Teaching Services Program was coined in 1980 as an umbrella project to carry on initiatives from the Project on Undergraduate Education. The TSP "continue[d] the institutionalization of the initiatives begun by the ASA Projects by adding the teaching workshop program and the Teaching Resources Group [Department Resources Group] to the responsibilities of the Executive Office" (FTN80v8n5). Teaching and Learning challengers' insight into the importance of maintaining representation in ASA is again evident in the establishment of the TSP. Teaching development opportunities and

the DRG consulting group were established T&L initiatives in the 1970s, but the formation of the TSP established the professional association's jurisdiction over these activities.

What is more, the TSP's association with the ASA executive office meant it fell under the new leadership of Carla Howery, who became TSP director from 1981-1990 (FTN09v37n5). Howery attended a sociology graduate program at the University of Minnesota in the 1970s, where her passion for teaching emerged. While she was a student, she organized the first teacher training program for graduate students in her institution, which became a departmental leader in the teaching and learning movement and the first home of the Teaching Resources Center (Obituary, FTN09v37n5). While she did not receive her PhD, Carla devoted herself tirelessly to enhancing the status of teaching in the discipline up until her early retirement due to failing health. In Howery's obituary in *Footnotes*, Theodore Wagenaar, who was a prominent actor in the movement, stated:

“Carla played the single most important role in the history of the ASA's concrete support for teaching. She began work at a crucial time. The Teaching projects were underway, funded, and led by Charles Goldsmid and Hans Mauksch, but institutional support via the ASA was still thin. Carla piloted that support and helped create structural legs for the teaching project” (Obituary, FTN09v37n5).

The importance of Carla Howery's role as a skilled actor among T&L challengers cannot be overstated. Further discussion of her personal role in the movement and the professional association is featured in the next chapter. Now, I direct attention to

describing in further detail the movement activities that she helped develop and advance.

B. Wingspread Conference on Postsecondary Instructional Improvement

Coinciding with the beginning of Howery's tenure in the early 1980s, teaching development opportunities were receiving increasingly positive support from sociology colleagues (FTN82v11n5). Attention to curricular reform and Outcomes Assessment in higher education was also garnering attention. The Association of American Colleges (AAC) issued a 1985 report called "*Integrity in the College Curriculum*" advocating for reforms in higher education to better harness students' potential to become inquisitive, critically thinking college graduates (Revans 1989). The outcomes assessment movement encouraged T&L challengers to reexamine their own profession's undergraduate curriculum, crystallizing in the 1985 national conference that presented new strategies for curriculum standardization and helped mobilize interested actors around the teaching and learning movement.

The Wingspread Conference on Postsecondary Instructional Improvement was held in Racine, WI, in 1986 (FTN86v4n1). Two out of three subsets of the conference were centered on teaching, including a workshop on consulting bodies such as that exemplified by the ASA Teaching Resources Group. Sponsored through funding from the Johnson and Johnson Foundation to support educational enhancement, the conference was organized by the ASA Teaching Resources Center (FTN85).

According to Mauksch, the goal of the Wingspread conference was "... to develop a publishable manual which incorporates the best and the most sophisticated of what we can

pass on to our successors in TRG” (FTN). Other issues to be addressed included creating dialogue among faculty regarding identification of important skills of their profession, creating a supportive environment to raise academic concerns, accreditation, student support, and understanding the role of the state in conferring undergraduate degrees (FTN86v4n1). Many of these topics echoed the goals underlying the sociology teaching and learning movement. In particular, the emphasis on creating a standardized set of teaching practices to disseminate to individual department units suggests the importance of the DRG to the advancement of the movement.

Wingspread was an important moment as it brought together the initial movement founders from the 1970s, as well as a new group of actors that were recruited early in their careers in the 1980s. Over 50 sociologists from both four-year universities and community colleges attended (FTN86v4n1). Five of the original attendees were successfully recruited for participation in this research, all of whom mentioned the conference as a key moment in their careers as teaching-centered sociologists.

The strategies used to recruit these new members were largely informal and suggest that social connections to Carla Howery, in particular, played an integral role in recruitment for attendance and involvement in the movement. Participants readily reflected this informal recruitment strategy. Betty received her PhD from a state university in the Midwest and recently retired from her tenured faculty position at another four-year university. In addition to her institutional obligations, Betty was also an active participant of the Teaching and Learning movement and occupied staff positions on various Teaching and Learning projects and at times in the executive office. Recalling Wingspread, she explained:

“It’s a Johnson and Johnson conference center called Wingspread, and they brought in...a bunch of people who had some kind of interest in teaching. But this was very early on in the movement, I call it a movement, I think it really was, um, very early on... So that conference brought together a lot of people, most of us fairly early in our careers. And those people have followed through, I mean I’ve known them now for a whole career, many of them. Um, and we’ve worked together on a lot of different things. So that was, that was a major point for me”.

(Personal interview, 8/25/17)

Mary is also a recently retired faculty member of a different four-year midwestern university, and devoted substantial time and energy teaching and learning towards the end of her career.

Mary echoed:

“I...met her [Carla Howery], and was in this small group somewhere, and that was sort of the impetus into, um, the teaching and learning movement and later the teaching, or T&L movement in ASA was that little workshop or event” (Personal interview, 8/24/17).

Mary and Betty are members of a small core group of T&L challengers that spent the duration of their careers engaged in activities advancing teaching and learning in sociology.

Wingspread proved to be a memorable and formative event for both, and their attendance at

the conference was made possible due to informal relationships with Howery that served as the impetus to mobilizing their participation in the movement.

Wingspread was described as a unifying moment, which gathered together a group of people with shared concerns. Interest in creating a core curriculum, strengthening sociologists' teaching skills, and providing a group of T&L consultants to disseminate this knowledge stand out prevalently as the primary shared concerns. The focus on these three topics are reflective of the hard goals established at the outset of the movement, as described in the previous chapter. Topics of interest at Wingspread focused particularly on the measurable objectives of the movement, including a streamlined curriculum and mechanisms to disseminate this knowledge.

Another of the three Wingspread conferences held that year featured a national meeting on "The Improvement of Undergraduate Education" (FTN86v4n1). This was also sponsored by Johnson and Johnson, the U.S. Department of Education, and other higher education organizations nationally. Topics included discussion of recently published national reports such as that released by the AAC, most notably by the Boyer Commission which addressed the substandard state of higher education with regards to curriculum standardization and outcomes assessment. Ernest Boyer gave the opening address, which he dedicated to discussing the "teaching-versus-research dilemma," and encouraged support for the role of teaching at universities. "The reports call for renewed attention to developing and rewarding undergraduate teaching and emphasize the centrality of faculty involvement in the process of change..." (FTN86v4n1).

Boyer's identification of a dichotomy between research and teaching in higher education at large suggests that similar discourse was occurring at the institutional level. Teaching and Learning challengers were not alone in addressing the disjunction between how teaching and research are characterized and rewarded in sociology. Institutional influences were thus reflective of T&L challengers' attempt to reshape the collective professional identity of sociology, thus supporting the process of reinstitutionalization and, eventually, theorization of the new identity. However, the fact that scholarship on teaching was lauded in *Footnotes* and reflected efforts for legitimation in higher education did not necessarily translate to the day-to-day practices of all sociologists.

Two T&L actors from sociology were invited to lead workshops that "reviewed approaches to curricular improvement and emphasized faculty development and efforts within individual disciplines" (FTN86v4n1). Teaching projects of the ASA were featured prominently and suggested that sociology's disciplinary focus on organizational and institutional change made the discipline well-suited to lead these efforts. Sociology was thus at the forefront of the national teaching and learning movement, evident through their leadership in national projects and workshops, and was also perceived as such by T&L participants. Multiple participants alluded to the advantage that sociology as a discipline has to acting as a leader in the teaching and learning movement, due to the substantive nature of the profession.

Betty said:

"Um, it, though if I can brag about sociology, I think we were ahead of the pack. I think we were early to accepting the idea that teaching deserves a claim, it deserves a role in promotion and tenure... sociology would be a natural place for

it to start. I think it was kind of a natural place to look at the group dynamics and, and how do people learn, what should they learn, that sort of thing". (Personal interview 8/25/17)

Mary echoed this sentiment:

"I would argue [sociology] is one of the leading disciplines in caring about teaching and learning and SoTL... Although maybe not over other social science disciplines, but certainly over some other you know non-social science or non-education, which is really social science because the research methodologies we use are ones that are also primarily the ones used in SoTL. Our theoretical perspectives, you know, whether symbolic interactionism or more modern versions of conflict kind of theories, or social psychology, you know we have substantive stuff in the discipline that can help us explain our SoTL findings". (Personal interview 8/24/17)

Harold is a currently active member in the ASA Section on Teaching and Learning and holds faculty and administrative positions at a small liberal arts college.

"Well I think sociology as a discipline has been at the forefront of this type of stuff... in many ways I think the institutional focus on assessment has been easier for sociologists to deal with as we study people and people in groups all the time. So, we know how to write surveys, we know how to do focus groups, we know how to create an interview guide and we know how to do content analysis, right? Like many social science disciplines, sociologists are at a huge advantage when it

comes to doing assessment types of work. I mean we're ready to jump in because we know how do to this type of research". (Personal interview, 11/13/17)

These participants attributed sociology's leadership in teaching and learning efforts to the discipline's topical focus as well as to its central research methodologies. Analysis of teaching and outcomes assessment is a natural extension of the study of human groups and interaction, and sociologists' fluency in both qualitative and quantitative methods and survey tools are particularly well suited for outcomes assessment.

Aside from the characteristics traits of the discipline that promoted interest in teaching evaluation and outcomes, there were particularities to the sociology teaching and learning movement, specifically, that were integral to its advancements. Peggy works at a small four-year university and is a dedicated member of the Midwest Sociological Society. From her perspective, sociology was at the forefront of the Teaching and Learning movement because of its strong leadership:

"I think sociology's been a leader across among disciplines in all of this thanks to Carla and Hans [Mauksch] and Kathleen and Ted and Ed and all of those people, that we've done things and set a model that other disciplines have looked at...This discipline has it's shit together". (Personal interview, 11/8/17)

The involvement of skilled movement actors Mauksch and Howery as well as new generations of T&L leaders was key in initiating and institutionalizing movement initiatives which made sociology stand out from other disciplines' teaching movements. In conjunction,

the traits of sociology that made it well poised to lead scholarship on teaching and learning combined with charismatic and skilled leadership suggest that the discipline posed promise not only as a legitimating force in the reinstitutionalization of the sociology profession, but perhaps also in higher education at large.

Several key outcomes of Wingspread point to its importance as a unifying event in the field. First, it crystallized the goals established in the initial teaching and learning projects from the 1970s, reiterating the primary foci of strengthening teaching development, curriculum reform, and providing an outlet for dissemination of vetted teaching practices. These objectives were concretely identified in sociology years in advance of the national outcomes assessment movement in higher education. The commentary from multiple participants lauding sociology's role in advancing teaching and learning initiatives further reiterated an internal professional understanding of sociology as a leader.

Shifting institutional norms towards assessment of teaching and learning in higher education, therefore, were modeled in the sociology discipline, thus lending power to the discipline as a leader in establishing the criteria for legitimacy. External funding from national education organizations facilitated the birth of the T&L movement in ASA in the 1970s, and its rapid internal professional advancements were supported through additional internal resource allocation due in large part to Mauksch and Howery's representation in ASA.

Furthermore, the Sociology Teaching and Learning movement in sociology was led by important skilled actors that played an integral part in mobilizing a cohesive group of supportive movement participants that shared a sense of internal solidarity and a common

professional identity. Participants' frequent allusion to the prominent influence of Mauksh and Howerly in their own initiation to the movement, as well as to the achievements of T&L in sociology, underscore these two figures as skilled movement actors. Both understood that internal mobilization among sociologists interested in teaching and learning was the foundation of the movement, yet long-lasting institutional change required more pervasive change across the profession at large. The Departmental Resources Group was their answer to this hurdle.

C. Evolution of the Department Resources Group

The Teacher Development Project (aka DRG) was one of the primary initiatives of the Project on Undergraduate Education that continues to be highly relevant today. The compilation of resources on teaching development by the Teaching Resources Center was an important first step, but the consulting group was the mechanism by which to streamline teaching standards across sociology departments nationally and set up enduring structures to permeate these goals through the profession.

The building blocks for the DRG were laid in a 1976 workshop in St. Louis that brought together a group of potential consultants for the proposed Teacher Development Project. These consultants would contribute their experiences in teacher development, knowledge of teaching resources, as well as preexisting consulting experience. The initiation of the program was identified for a March 1977 deadline, at which time departments could request a "teaching resource specialist" (FTN76n9). Information disseminated by teaching consultants was collected by the Teaching Resources Center, which was established as a centralized venue to compile teaching resources. Vicky, who occupied an executive staff position in ASA, stated

“The Department Resources Group is a cadre, a term that Carla Howery coined... um, a cadre of sociologists who receive training at the annual meeting every year and they are in regular contact about, um, teaching and learning matters in the discipline and in higher education more generally”. (Personal interview, 9/11/2017)

Active organizing to develop a “cadre” of sociologists who specialized in teaching was both a measurable initiative, and one that could gradually transmit consistent objectives for teaching and learning to departments nationwide. The DRG was a mechanism to transfer movement goals out of the sole jurisdiction of key leaders and diffuse the ideology of the movement amongst a broader group of challengers that could disseminate movement goals to various institutions, regardless of ranking or research orientation.

DRG workshops covered topics such as outcomes assessment, curriculum reform, and inter-disciplinary programming, among others. Thirty visits were made in 1981, with requests primarily centered around support for curriculum development and evaluation, teacher development and evaluation, department assessment, and teaching support services (FTN82v19n4). The year 1983 alone, for example, saw over fifteen DRG visits covering a variety of topics, including classroom environment and technology, program evaluation, teacher training and course development (FTN84v12n). Thirty-one DRG consultations were made in year 1985 (FTN85v13n2), and two dozen in 1986 (FTN86V14n4), suggesting a fluctuating demand in DRG services from year to year.

Although the DRG made considerable progress in disseminating best practices in teaching and learning, a survey to ASA members in the late 1980s suggested that, by and large, sociologists were still unaware how to access development materials on teaching (FTN:87v15n9). A program review was requested for the end of that year, and consideration of how to disseminate materials to other institutions and disciplines in order to sell more raise was suggested as a means to increase resource availability for the project.

The program review coincided with a notable decrease in the type and amount of space dedicated to issues of teaching in *Footnotes* newsletters. A survey to membership showed that “after twelve years of activity, the Teaching Resources Center materials are still not a “household word” for teachers” (FTN87v15n9). These survey results suggested that, despite sociology’s leadership in teaching and learning initiatives and active production of teaching development opportunities, these were still not being utilized by sociologists at large. Consequently, the Department Services Program was created in 1987 to centralize the dissemination of resources vis-a-vis departments. Resources could be purchased in bulk by sociology departments, relieving the cost burden on individuals and compiling materials that could be easily distributed to interested individuals (FTN87v15n9).

Despite the initial founding of the DRG as a mechanism to disseminate the practical and ideological traits of the Teaching and Learning movement across the discipline—and consistently positive reception of it from ASA—widespread engagement by sociologists at large remained measured. Absent a coercive mandate to employ the services of the DRG, individual departments are not obligated to utilize T&L’s opportunities for professional development. The creation of positions for Directors of Undergraduate Education thus facilitated a point of

contact between the DRG and departmental faculty who could disseminate information being produced at the level of ASA down to individual disciplinary units, thus offering potential as a legitimating mechanism during the theorization process.

D. Curriculum Reform: The Era of Liberal Learning and the Sociology Major

Information disseminated by the DRG was significantly shaped by a series of ASA publications in the 1990s and 2000s that fostered an internal professional conversation about the desirability of a core sociology curriculum for undergraduate majors. Throughout this phase, DRG consultations under the Teaching Services Program remained consistent. Funding of the TRC had renewed after the slump in the 1980s, which ASA touted as evidence of success and renewed demand for program (FTN:91v16n6).

Sociologists' interest in streamlining undergraduate curriculum coincided with efforts to encourage curriculum standardization nationally (Wagenaar 2002), occurring alongside a shift towards corporatization in higher education wherein university assessment models have increasingly turned toward measurable performance standards akin to the corporate world (Tuchman 2009). Measures such as quantity and journal rank of published articles and quality of teaching evaluations increasingly serve as the primary criteria by which professionals dictate professional norms (Tuchman 2009). Undergraduate sociology programs have not escaped this audit culture, as evidenced by increased attention to curriculum standardization and outcomes assessment models. Teaching and publications continue to serve as the primary criteria upon which academic sociologists are promoted, facilitated by these standardized assessment models.

A project by the American Association of Colleges, funded by FIPSE and the Ford Foundation, proposed a series of curriculum reforms to enhance learning outcomes in liberal arts disciplines (FTN:89v17n5). The report posed three key suggestions. These included a greater emphasis on:

- 1) Humanistic Strength (in the form of teaching values, art, international and multicultural experiences);
- 2) Intellectual rigor (emphasis on inquiry, understanding numerical data, science), and
- 3) Curricular coherence (which includes literacy, historical consciousness, study in depth) (Revans 1989).

‘Study in depth’ was defined as a student’s ability to independently master complex knowledge of a discipline in a critical and sophisticated fashion and contribute their knowledge to society (McKinney et al 2004). Sociology, and the social sciences at large, was again impacted by these shifting norms in the institutional environment. The profession entered a phase during which concerted efforts were made to incorporate curriculum standardization and outcomes assessment into the structure of the discipline, with T&L challengers leading these efforts.

The ASA Task Force on Liberal Learning and the Sociology Major was the first of three reports on the state of the sociology undergraduate curriculum (Kain 2007, Eberts et al 1990, Pike et al 2017). Initial findings demonstrated a lack of standardized requirements across undergraduate sociology departments (Nilsson 1995). T&L activists involved in the Liberal Learning task force suggested that streamlining curriculum across departments nationally would better—and more consistently—prepare undergraduate majors for professional pursuits

following graduation (Kain 2007, Wagenaar 1991). A sequential approach to curricular organization such as that suggested by the AAC was thus posed as a way to facilitate curricular alignment across sociology departments throughout the US.

Two additional reports on ‘Liberal Learning and the Sociology Major’ have been published, the second in 2004 (McKinney et al. 2004) and most recently in 2017 (Pike et al. 2017). The Task Force on the Undergraduate Sociology Curriculum was reconvened in 2001 to update the recommendations for the sociology major established in the 1990 report. Members of the task force cited a number of new developments in curriculum reform that should be analyzed and incorporated into the recommendations for sociology (FTN2001n4).

The political and institutional environment in the early 2000s was heavily impacting norms in higher education. In particular, the Spellings commission and its related publication further encouraged the implementation of systematic outcomes assessment strategies. Vicky suggested that the Spellings Report that was published during George W. Bush’s second term in office played a critical role in shaping the institutional landscape of higher education at that time:

“It’s really clear to me that the kind of accountability pressures that were coming out from the Spellings Commission, you know and Margaret Spellings and that whole report... would continue long after Margaret Spellings was no longer the, um, the Secretary of Education. But those pressures were continuing through Department of Education, through accreditors, the regional accreditors . . . through the administrators . . .” (Personal interview, 9/11/17)

Her statement suggests that changes at the government level, particularly in the Department of Education, triggered the initial reframing of the goals of higher education. This move towards accountability in instruction then permeated through other levels of the institution through government mandates and accreditation bodies, which then impacted universities and departments.

Mary similarly interpreted these changing institutional norms as a factor in ASA's renewed interest in curriculum reform and outcomes assessment in the early 2000s:

“But I also think an influencing factor, you know I think you just hinted at was that accreditation, you know regional accreditation societies were pushing for, you know, curriculum reform and uh, certain kinds of things, um and assessments. And then institutions were starting to do assessments and asked departments to do assessments, you know. And curriculum reviews and revisions. So there were uh, sort of university, college, institutional level influence as well as sort of the broader higher education influence and then ASA kind of got involved in that”.
(Personal interview, 8/24/17).

Following a report by the Task Force on the Undergraduate Sociology Curriculum to the Chairs meeting at the 2002 ASA conference (FTN2001n4), council approved the continuation of the project, renamed the Task Force on the Assessment of the Undergraduate Major (2003, FTN). The task force was charged with assessing the overall state of undergraduate sociology assessment, identifying best practices in assessment from leading sociology departments,

creating materials to assist departments in modifying assessment practices, and expanding opportunities for departments to learn about these best practices and obtain useful resources (FTN22003).

The complete second report was announced in *Footnotes* in 2004 and featured a public endorsement by ASA council (FTN2004n9). The announcement stated, “Departments are encouraged to use [the report] to discuss and modify their undergraduate program, from courses to advising, from curriculum to community-based learning, to prepare sociology students in a developmental and cohesive manner” (FTN2004v23n9). The update addressed changes in higher education and the impact this had on sociology departments of varying size and across a variety institutional structures, posing broad solutions to how individual disciplinary units could implement the recommendation of course sequencing. Sixteen specific recommendations were listed in detail in this volume of *Footnotes* (FTN2004v32n9), making the suggestions publicly available to all ASA members, regardless of their departments’ involvement in adopting the recommendations.

In the several years following release of the 2004 report, members of the task force took concerted efforts to make the recommendations widely available. Advertisements for the report were featured in the first three issues of the 2005 *Footnotes* volume. In 2006, the Task Force compiled a set of materials for distribution to departments for assessment of undergraduate sociology learning (FTN:2006v34n1). Attendees of the annual Chair conference received copies of the report at the 2005 meeting, in addition to distribution to members of the DRG consultants at that time. Free workshops on the recommendations were also offered at the 2006 regional meetings: Pacific, Eastern, North Central, and Midwest.

The DRG again resumed an important role in dissemination of the accomplishments of the Section on Teaching and Learning via its consulting services to departments undertaking program assessments. Findings and suggested best practices from the Liberal Learning reports have primarily been circulated through the Department Resources Group. In the proliferation of DRG advertisements in the 2000s (*Footnotes*, various), the DRG was touted as a program to help with “program review, assessment, and curriculum development” (FTN). DRG consultations have been the key mechanism to distribute advancements in curriculum reform and have adapted their recommendations to the subsequent phases of the Liberal Learning project.

Peggy emphasized the key role that the DRG has played in the broad circulation of the Liberal Learning reports. However, she mentioned that DRG visits are also dependent upon institutional funding and are thus subject to fluctuations regardless of departments’ interest in using the consulting services. She explained:

“Part of how is through the departmental program reviews that ASA does, right? You've got thirty people who go around. That's been falling off a little bit because schools are running out of money and not bringing external program reviewers anymore. But for a long time, you had this cadre of people out visiting a couple hundred schools over a five-year period and that's the way to gain that. I think the document itself has had an impact because it's so accessible. And Margaret right now is working really hard and we're all working really hard to get this document in people's hands so the chairs conference this year was focused on the new liberal learning guide”. (Personal interview, 11/8/17).

Wade—who, like many participants, had worked as a DRG consultant—explained that DRG reports to departments centered around a review of the Liberal Learning report and its recommendations (Personal interview, 1/30/2018). He further reflected on the role these documents played in articulating and disseminating the goals of the Project:

“They're [the Liberal Learning reports] the bible. When Margaret said that there were some funding problems at ASA and there might not be money to publish it, I said Margaret this is the bible, you can't not print the bible. It's true. When a department is undergoing program review even if they don't call an DRG when a department is undergoing program review, they look at that and they say okay here's how our program is and is not like this. To give you an example of that, in the first version I wrote the goals in the appendix. They're still there in modified form now. When I would go out and do a program review, they send you the self-study and they'd always have to list their goals. A lot of them just copied the goals from the back of the learning guide. That's the extent to which it was regarded as the bible”. (Personal interview, 1/30/2018)

The 1991 and 2004 reports from the Liberal Learning task force thus provided a standardized set of professional recommendations for departments to draw upon during internal reviews, both those mandated by accreditation agencies and voluntarily in departments wishing to update their programs.

This era marks an important phase in the reinstitutionalization process in sociology. The advancements in curriculum standardization were implemented in response to changing institutional norms and thus served to legitimize sociology in the changing landscape of higher education. Much of the Teaching and Learning movement's internal reflection around the desirability of a core curriculum was a response to a particularly loose and widely varying structure in undergraduate sociology programs. Other social science disciplines such as economics and psychology as well as the majority of hard sciences already structured their undergraduate programs around a concretely defined core curriculum and course sequencing. Sociology's concerted efforts to define the core principles of the undergraduate major and disseminate these recommendations widely helped the discipline maintain institutional legitimacy. Despite T&L's leading efforts in the national teaching and learning movement in the 1980s, the movement's intensive focus on curriculum standardization in the 1990s and 2000s was a response to institutional changes in higher education.

At the disciplinary level, reception of DRG visits by individual sociologists and departments was mixed. One department chair who attended an annual breakfast meeting said her department's use of the DRG helped turn their department into an exemplary model for assessment to which other departments on her campus aspire (FTN2011v39n4). During her time as a DRG consultant, Mary observed varying reception from departments:

“And we saw a lot of departments reading the curriculum and make use of those liberal learning, sort of, recommendations about the structure of the curriculum. So I think that a lot of departments—and mine included, we had a huge you know curriculum revision process over time. Um, I think a lot of the departments did try

to incorporate many of the recommendations, and actually there's been... one or two studies about the extent to which departments have done that. But it's highly variable, right? So a lot of departments, you know did re-do curriculum, incorporate a lot of the recommendations, a lot of departments have done nothing. And a lot did a long time ago but haven't done anything since. Now maybe the latest version, you know maybe the latest version and their recommendations will inspire some departments to do more. But I think internal pushes is a lot of it too. I think Soc departments were required to do assessment and program review by their institutions, um... and that led them to do things. Maybe, maybe not what was recommended in the ASA documents, but hopefully they had enough sense, you know to reach out to ASA and get those documents, you know." (Personal interview, 8/24/2017)

Again, Mary's statement suggests that institutional pressures mediated the degree to which departments utilized DRG services and adopted its recommendations. Mandates from universities and other institutional bodies evidently served as a coercive force for some sociology departments to adopt these changing expectations. Vicky has a detailed understanding of the DRG due to her role in ASA, and explained:

"Um, as well as just higher education trends . . . the primary role for that group at least at the moment is, um, to do external program review so where departments—and program review is required as part of the accreditation processes . . . So what that usually consists of is a external expert or a team of

external experts coming, reviewing curriculum, reviewing teaching, talking to faculty, talking to students, looking at student outcomes, um... you know and basically saying 'hey, is this thing working or not'. Um, you know, kicking over tires, looking under the hood, um, you know see if the windshield wipers work... like, okay. What needs to be done to set this up, is it still running well, is it still a good vehicle for delivering sociological knowledge to students?" (Personal interview, 9/17/2017)

Departments that were not subject to these external pressures had freedom around whether and how to incorporate DRG recommendations. This fact is an important consideration in understanding the theorization phase during the reinstitutionalization of the sociology profession triggered by the Teaching and Learning movement. Pressures exerted on sociology departments to incorporate outcomes assessment models in their undergraduate programs were filtered through ASA and, specifically, the Teaching Services Program. Although T&L challengers were actively engaged in this institutional conversation, sociologists at large were not necessarily concerned with adopting these changes.

Departments that utilized DRG services and underwent program reviews either did so voluntarily based on faculty interest, or in reaction to external mandates. Sociologists that were clued into the activities of the Teaching and Learning movement, then, were the most likely professionals to voluntarily use DRG services. Those professionals who were not engaged in or even aware of the sociology teaching and learning movement, encountered the DRG as a result of institutional pressures to change that were not necessarily welcome.

ASA, largely through the active work of Carla Howery to maintain Teaching and Learning work as a professional priority, thus played an important field-level role in facilitating the process of reinstitutionalization. However, institutional change was not a result of widespread normative consensus, but rather occurred from the bottom up from a group of professional challengers who did not necessarily represent the interests of all sociologists at large, particularly incumbents at R1 institutions. While the theorization phase of institutionalization occurred partially through the concrete activities of the Teaching Services Program and the Department Resources Group, the theorization of a new professional identity was not broadly diffused throughout the profession.

E. TRAILS: Teaching Development Resources

The activities of the Department Resources Group and heavy support for providing undergraduate sociology curriculum guidelines demonstrate the reinstitutionalization process of two out of the three hard goals initially identified by T&L challengers. The concrete goal of expanding teaching development opportunities gained further ground through the transition of the TRC to an online resource database.

The first reference to an as-yet-unnamed digital teaching resource clearinghouse was in 2008, to be debuted at the 2009 annual meeting (FTN08v36n9). The newsletter entry detailed the contextual background leading up to this new phase of the TRC, acknowledging the many phases the TRC had gone through since the beginning of the movement in the 1970s:

“Thirty years ago, the ASA Teaching Resources Center (TRC) was initiated as a “grassroots” movement of sociology faculty helping each other produce and

disseminate innovative ideas for teaching both the core and new content of the discipline. TRC editors collected and organized syllabi and other teaching materials related to a specific course within sociology; then those materials were printed and bound with a low production-cost, card stock cover. The role of the ASA was to facilitate the collection of materials, the production of the bound volumes, and their sale and distribution. While the format of the TRC has hardly changed in the past 30 years, a great deal has changed about teaching and higher education. Computers and the Internet have transformed the ways that professors prepare for class, gather information, and teach” (FTN08v36n9).

TRAILS: The Teaching Resources and Innovations Library for Sociology, was officially announced in 2010 (FTN10v38n3), during the first few years of Margaret Weiger Vitullo’s position as ASA Deputy Director, which she continues to hold. The resource was described as “A Cutting-Edge Tool for Facilitating and Diffusing Innovative Teaching” (FTN10v38n5). The steps leading to the creation of TRAILS, while rooted in Teaching and Learning initiatives begun in the 1970s, were supported by NSF funding in the 1990s to reform science instruction in higher education. NSF attempted to develop a digital teaching resource database for the sciences, which was found to be underutilized and unsuccessful by science disciplines (FTN10v38n5).

ASA drew upon the lessons learned from the NSF and took advantage of the building blocks already set in place by the Teaching and Learning movement to create their own digital teaching resource database. Sociology professors were purported to have adapted to technological advancements to enhance instruction and were thus well-positioned to take

advantage of the collaborative online clearinghouse of teaching resources. TRAILS was purposefully designed to allow sociologists from all varieties of institutions to contribute to the collective database that could be utilized by any interested practitioner (FTN10v38n5). In addition to the availability of resources to utilize for one's professional teaching development, the opportunity for all sociology practitioners to contribute provided a new venue for teaching and learning scholars to publicize their accomplishments in teaching, as fruit for promotion and tenure (Vitulo, FTN10v38n5).

While its most evident contribution was to centralize and increase the availability of teaching resources to practitioners based on digital accessibility, TRAILS was also touted as a new T&L development that incorporated the movement's pervasive goal to shift the value structure of the profession. Again referencing the 1990 Boyer report, TRAILS made a commitment to advance high quality teaching by encouraging a departmental reward structure that more greatly valued teaching (FTN10v38n5).

The explicit acknowledgement of a persisting need to shift the professional reward structure leads to two key points. First, it nods to a goal established in one of the early T&L projects in the 1970s to raise teaching to an acquired, and not simply an ascribed status. It was also reflected in participants' comments, evidence that this goal persists today. T&L challengers continue to hold the perspective that sociologists are not intrinsically good teachers simply because of their professional title, and that all sociologists can benefit from pedagogical training in their field.

Second, there was an explicit statement this goal could be further advanced by making teaching development resources more widely available. Providing widespread access to materials that would support quality sociology instruction removed the potential for persisting sub-par teaching of undergraduate sociology, regardless of one's orientation towards teaching or research or the particular characteristics of one's home institution. T&L actors' support for the TRC and TRAILS to provide progressively more accessible opportunities for teaching development suggests a belief among challengers that everyone has the ability to become an effective instructor provided they have access to useful resources and materials to hone their skills. As alluded to above, however, diffusion of a new collective identity encountered barriers due to professional disagreement over the normative nature of the sociology profession.

Preparing Future Faculty

While the Teaching Services Program and the Department Resources Group were each engaged in their respective tasks of producing and disseminating teaching development resources, an initiative was also created to formalize professional training of Sociology graduate students. The Preparing Future Faculty program (PFF) was a cross-disciplinary initiative to encourage holistic training of graduate students in preparation for their careers as faculty. The program was launched in 1993 as a collaboration between the Association of American Colleges and Universities and the Council of Graduate Schools. Funding from a number of institutions including the Pew Charitable Trust and the National Science Foundation facilitated the implementation of the project in 45 colleges and universities with graduate degree-granting programs, occurring over four phases from 1993-2003 (Preparing Future Faculty 2020).

Pew Charitable Trust cited the goal of the Preparing Future Faculty program as “articulating broader and more comprehensive definitions of professionalism among faculty members—and preparing future generations to attain them” (Gaff et al. 2000: 5). The identification of this goal emerged from the assumption that graduate programs nationally were ill-equipped to provide their students with requisite professional training prior to becoming faculty in the academy and did not possess the tools for adequate self-assessment of their programs. Couched within the strong focus on outcomes assessment in higher education in the 1990s, PFF served as a means for measurable standardization of graduate professional training across disciplines and across institutions. The Preparing Future Faculty program identified a three-pronged goal to support graduate departments in developing training opportunities in academic teaching, research, and service (Gaff et al. 2000).

The first three phases of the Preparing Future Faculty program were heavily focused on STEM graduate programs. In the fourth phase from 1999-2002, however, the program received additional funding that allowed its expansion into the social sciences. The results of a national competition run by ASA identified four R1 Sociology departments to receive funding and act as pilots of the program. The selected institutions were Indiana University-Bloomington, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Texas A&M University and North Carolina State University (Gaff et al. 2000).

These institutions represent just a handful of the over 100 PhD-granting Sociology departments nationally. Yet the outcomes of the Preparing Future Faculty program in Sociology are an important factor in considering how the institutionalization of professional development

opportunities broadly, and teaching development opportunities, specifically, can impact the preparedness of sociology teachers coming from research-intensive programs. Interviews with participants from three out of the four departments where PFF was implemented suggest that those graduate programs have incorporated intentional and enduring teaching development opportunities for their graduate students.

One participant, Peter, discussed being personally interested and invested in teaching development in his department. Early in his career at the state university that serves as his home institution, he identified a need for more teacher training. Peter opined that the idea of not training graduate students in something they would be required to do for their career was “unconscionable”. He claimed that he was set on challenging the assumption that:

“Teachers are born, not made, which is crazy. There is training, you know, period. And there is experience. And there are ways to acknowledge things... Such little support for something that is so important... makes no sense to me.” (Peter, Personal Interview, 3/19/20).

At the time, a prestigious university administrator was heavily invested in the PFF program, and secured funding from the graduate school at that institution and from ASA to roll out the program in the Sociology department. Peter collaborated with a colleague who was also a new faculty member in his department to design the teaching development program. In addition to the other facets of the PFF program such as mentorship and shadowing opportunities, they developed a three-course teacher training sequence. The first part featured a seminar about “surviving the first semester of teaching”; the second course examined teaching in higher

education, generally; and the third course required students to engage with the scholarship of teaching and learning through writing an article (Personal interview, 3/19/20).

Peter reported that there was some initial resistance from graduate students the first time he taught the course. Feedback that he has increasingly received over time, however, suggests that graduates of the department have grown to value the preparation they received. He is still an active faculty member at this institution and he and his colleague continue to teach this course, decades after the initial program was developed through PFF. Importantly, both Peter and his colleague are well-known for their research and scholarship, and each respectively served as elected ASA Council members. Peter recognized that his professional status as a productive research scholar might have contributed to the departmental support he received for his teaching activities.

Measured support for the PFF program was shared by sociology graduate students at North Carolina State University. A 2004 article summarized the formal outcomes assessment of the PFF program at North Carolina State. Students indicated that the mentorship opportunities they received were useful, but that more training in teaching and research was still needed. Originally, the external mentorship opportunities were focused on partnering students with faculty at teaching-intensive schools, since it was assumed that students already had access to research-intensive faculty life at their home institution. However, NCSU students requested more exposure to both teaching and research-intensive institutions so that they could compare differences (Jones 2004), suggesting that exposure to formal training in both teaching and research was desirable.

The underlying assumption that research training is naturally included in graduate education at an R1 institution is noteworthy. While the PFF program encompasses professional training at multiple levels, including research, teaching, and service, the program at North Carolina State University was specifically designed to incorporate mentorship opportunities with teaching-oriented sociologists because a need for more structured teaching preparation was identified. That student graduates of PFF at this institution requested formalized mentorship is reflective of the sentiment expressed by my participants that teaching, just like research, is an acquired status.

Sociology Faculty at NCSU expressed some reservations about the merit of continuing the PFF program. The termination of external funding meant it would be difficult to continue the program, and more so without institutional incentives to do so. Primary concerns with continuing the PFF program centered around how it would impact the reputation of NCSU's status as a research-intensive university (Jones 2004). Some faculty feared that PFF would divide the graduate department into separate "tracks" based on research or teaching, or even turn the program into an applied teaching degree instead of a research-centered PhD. Despite the concerns of some faculty, it was reported that PFF had been generally successful and the option of a PFF certificate was added to the degree options at NCSU (Jones 2004).

The reservations expressed by NCSU faculty to PFF are evocative of the underlying prestige difference between teaching and research in the academy. The PFF program was structured so as to institutionalize standardized professional training in both teaching and scholarship, yet it was perceived by faculty to privilege teaching training over research. This shared understanding

that academic sociologists can be either good at research or good at teaching, but not both—despite professional expectations that demand they do both—is deeply embedded in the culture of departments.

However, the participants I interviewed who were part of PFF programs at different institutions demonstrate that teaching and research are not mutually exclusive professional activities. As mentioned previously, Peter and his colleague are well-reputed scholars of sociology who also run a structured teacher preparation course at their institution. Amanda spent the duration of her career at an R1 university and is also a well-recognized name in the Teaching and Learning movement. These participants each have a personal interest in teaching and learning, which undoubtedly played a role in their ability to navigate their professional involvement in both teaching and research. Yet, the PFF program suggests that with additional institutional support and incentive, all academic sociologists have the potential to excel in both professional arenas.

While the Preparing Future Faculty program provided structured incentives for a set of universities to develop professional training for graduate students, because it was contingent upon limited external funding the program confronted barriers to widespread dissemination. As the review of the program at North Carolina State University revealed, the ability for departments to institutionalize the PFF program was hampered by the withdrawal of external funding. In order to provide a means for formal dissemination and support for the program, PFF identified professional associations as a way to disseminate the program. It was at this phase that the American Sociological Association became involved in supporting PFF.

Ruth is a lauded research scholar who was a faculty member in one of the PFF department grantees and was involved over many years in implementing the principles of the PFF program. Ruth explained that a solution to this barrier to dissemination was for PFF to partner with professional associations. A stipulation of PFF funding required that university recipients organize panels and workshops at professional meetings at the regional and national level. In light of limited funding that would allow the program to be implemented across all graduate departments, professional associations were a formal venue through which to disseminate the tenet of the Preparing Future Faculty program that increased professional training for graduate students was necessary (Ruth, Personal Interview, 4/23/20).

Ruth's experiences also demonstrated an informal way in which the Preparing Future Faculty program could disseminate across departments that were not grantee recipients. When she undertook a career transition to another institution, Ruth drew upon her knowledge of the PFF program at her previous institution and applied it to her new department when she served as Chair. The graduate program at this institution – also a research-intensive public university – now has a formally-structured teaching preparation sequence which includes a required teaching development course as well as required classroom experience in which graduate students enter the classroom as Teaching Assistants and eventually progress to working as lead graduate student instructors. Ruth's involvement in PFF at two institutions suggests that programs like Preparing Future Faculty hold the potential for widespread informal dissemination in addition to the formal partnerships with professional associations to spread the program.

A longitudinal analysis of the degree to which PFF graduates have implemented professional teacher training in their own departments would reveal the long-term impacts of programs like PFF. While this it is beyond the scope of this project, an analysis of the ASA's 2019 Guide to Graduate Departments of Sociology provides a cursory look at graduate teacher training currently. The 111 Sociology departments in the United States listed in the guide were ranked according to the Carnegie Rankings for 2019 as reported by Indiana University, and the qualitative information about teacher training listed in the manual by each department was coded. These data suggest that there remains high variability in teaching training across sociology graduate departments. While the majority of graduate departments do offer some degree of teacher training, more information is needed to understand the depth and nature of available development opportunities and how they compare across institution types.

The degree to which PFF programs impacted comprehensive change in graduate preparation across sociology departments broadly is debatable. However, the case studies discussed here suggest that, with support from ASA, home institutions, and internally in departments, the standardized implementation of concrete teacher training opportunities pose strong benefits to the professional preparation of graduate students. Lessons from the Preparing Future Faculty program further highlight ASA's commitment to enhancing teaching development opportunities. While the PFF was not a direct project of the Teaching Services Program, it provided a venue within which the resources and materials that were created by the TSP could be disseminated and applied to support the teaching development of future sociologists.

F. Professional Recognition of Teaching and Learning achievements

The normative changes that resulted from the Teaching and Learning initiatives discussed here are mixed. My data have shown that concrete movement goals were indeed reinstitutionalized. Commentary from ASA council members lauding the accomplishments of the teaching and learning movement further conveys an internal professional recognition that efforts by T&L actors have provided vastly improved resources and opportunities for sociologists to strengthen their teaching of undergraduate sociology.

1997 marked the 25th anniversary of the “Section on Undergraduate Education” in ASA (FTN97v25n6). Newsletter entries summarized the many accomplishments achieved since the Section was first founded:

“Under Mauksch’s leadership, the Section [on Teaching and Learning] took a social movements approach to improve the quality of instruction. To mobilize the masses, the Section reached out to teaching colleagues, primarily those at community colleges and small liberal arts colleges. In the research-dominated ASA of the time, these were two under-served constituencies...The Section and The Project have succeeded in institutionalizing an emphasis on teaching within the ASA. *The Section continues to provide an intellectual and social home for those interested in undergraduate education. It ensures that undergraduate teaching and teachers are fully recognized, respected, and rewarded within the discipline and academic institutions (emphasis added)*” (FTN97v25n6).

The last two sentences in the above statement clearly highlight points of divergence in the institutionalization of movement goals. On one hand, the Section on Undergraduate Education provides an “an intellectual home... *for those interested in undergraduate education*”. As discussed in Chapter 3, Mauksch asserted that the Section on Undergraduate Education was unique due to its nature not as a substantive topic, but as a professional activity in which all academic sociologists are engaged to some degree. The above statement, however, set T&L challengers apart from other sociologists based on their substantive interests. In the next sentence, the Section is presumed to play a role in more highly rewarding teaching and learning scholars. At the same time, the Section is presumed to provide a home for SoTL challengers with substantive interests in teaching, while also changing the normative value placed on teaching by incumbent sociologists who are not actively engaged in these conversations.

Further acknowledgement of milestones achieved by the Teaching and Learning movement were alluded to in the above newsletter feature, including: the positive reception of the Teaching Resources Group across departments nationally; the physical move of the Teaching Resources Center to the ASA central office; the extensive professional collaboration that succeed in pooling teaching materials together to be widely available; ASA’s re-purchasing of *Teaching Sociology* from SAGE in 1985; and the many awards doled out in support of prominent teacher-scholars and increasing membership in the Section on Teaching and Learning (FTN97v25n6). Again, the above accomplishments represented institutionalization of concrete goals achieved *within* the movement, but not necessarily diffused throughout the professional structure.

Several columns by Felice Levine in 1998 and 1999, who was then the executive officer, were further dedicated to lauding achievements of the teaching and learning movement in the 1990s. She addressed ASA efforts on curriculum reform as one of the outstanding professional accomplishments and summarized the thirteen recommendations outlined in the first Liberal Learning report. Reportedly, the publication was mentioned frequently among chairs at the annual meeting and had become “practically a “household” term at our annual conference for chairs (now in its sixth year)” (FTN99v27n5). The DRG was also later addressed as a mechanism for strengthening sociology departments (FTN99v27n8).

Roughly ten years later, following continued advancements by the Section on Teaching and Learning, an important turning point occurred in the movement. Carla Howery, who had acted as a long-term T&L leader through her position in the ASA executive office for nearly three decades, had reached retirement due to her failing health. Sally Hillsman had assumed the position of executive officer at that time, and dedicated her column to acknowledging the movement’s contributions to the discipline (FTN07v35n4).

In her piece titled “ASA’s Engagement in the Teaching of Sociology”, Hillsman wrote:

“There have been different phases and evolving objectives in the teaching sociology movement over the 30 years since Mauksch received funding from the Department of Education’s Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education and the Lilly Foundation. Locating and institutionalizing teaching concerns within ASA resulted in the creation of the ASA Section on Undergraduate Education. ASA began publishing a newsletter on teaching, which has been replaced by a

substantive journal, *Teaching Sociology*, that ASA took over from Sage. Soon, the Executive Office had staff (Carla) and operating funds allocated to issues of teaching and higher education. A distribution system was created for disseminating teaching materials that is now the ASA web-based bookstore and electronic publication sharing. Sociologists' need for continuing education became a major function at the Annual Meeting. There are now about 80 workshops on teaching every year as well as teaching-related sessions at the meetings of other sociology associations and freestanding workshops... Another objective has been to provide support to the core of sociology education--the sociology department. Drawing on expertise in sociology, education, and other relevant fields, ASA has emphasized the importance of the academic department (and the college or university) as well as the individual teacher" (FTN07v35n4)

Hillsman's comments reveal important markers of institutionalization of the Teaching and Learning movement. The accomplishments she discusses that were made under Carla's leadership—including the collection and dissemination of teaching materials, the proliferation of teaching development opportunities at the annual meeting, and opportunities to support department-level improvements in teaching and curriculum design—align with the initially identified goals.

In this chapter, I have demonstrated the development of three key initiatives of the sociology teaching and learning movement. Stemming from shifts in higher education emphasizing outcomes assessment initiatives, the Teaching and Learning movement undertook

curriculum reform of the undergraduate sociology major. Projects of the Teaching Services Program included the provision of resources for teaching development, the creation of core curriculum recommendations for the undergraduate major, and dissemination of these via the Department Resources Group. Teaching and Learning challengers' concerted work on these efforts was a response to shifting norms in higher education that demanded professional change in order to maintain institutional legitimacy.

Data drawn from *Footnotes* newsletters demonstrated institutionalization of these concrete initiatives, and T&L participants echoed this understanding. Reinstitutionalization of these three specific goals, I argue, is a result of successful theorization reflected in ASA executive officers' public recognition of the achievements of the movement since the 1970s. ASA played a critical role in facilitating these changes. Howery's position in ASA ensured consistent communication with the internal governance unit and contact with incumbents. Moreover, *Footnotes* newsletters served as a formal professional publication to host discourse around the institutional changes being negotiated.

Data from *Footnotes* demonstrate strong representation of the Teaching Services Program and its associated activities in the professional discourse and increasing dedication of resources over time. Yet, these efforts were advanced by a segment of the professional community that was challenging the prevailing professional identity and affecting changes that would impact all sociologists, regardless of their interests. While the written professional record suggests theorization occurred, diffusion of a new professional identity to reward teaching as an equally valued professional activity as that of research, has not been adopted by all

sociologists. Further analysis of this internal professional conversation is the subject of the next chapter.

CHAPTER 5

“Cracking the Council”

In this chapter, I discuss how Teaching and Learning movement challengers’ ability to impact the professional identity of sociology was shaped by their social location in the professional prestige structure resulting from a long-standing institutional and disciplinary dichotomy between research and teaching in the academy. Movement leaders who held positions as skilled actors were aware of this dichotomy, and thus sought to affect change from within the professional structure through representation among incumbents on ASA council. Despite purposive efforts to do so, however, and real progress made in gaining representation on ASA council, the reward structure of the profession remains skewed in favor of research.

While other movement goals made significant progress in institutionalizing intraprofessional change, the desire to shift the collective professional identity to embrace teaching as an equivalently rewarded professional activity to that of research, remains unmet. Even at the outset of the movement, Mauksch identified the need to break into the social network of ASA incumbents—what one participant astutely referred to as “cracking the council”. I demonstrate that challengers did, in fact, crack the council. T&L skilled actors had a consistent presence both in the ASA executive office and on ASA council, allowing challengers to make strategic network ties that should have facilitated an increase in the social capital of movement actors and the professional value of their efforts.

What then, accounts for the persistence of this imbalance? The prevailing collective identity of sociologists as researchers, first and foremost, mediated the way in which challengers approached their interactions with incumbents, and how incumbents responded to

their efforts. Individuals' experiences at their home institutions further reified status differences between professionals oriented towards teaching and those more heavily focused on research.

Participants consistently reported an enduring perception that teaching-oriented sociologists and institutions were undervalued, evident through participants' experiences with promotion in their home institutions and personal interactions with ASA incumbents. Data from *Footnotes* newsletters demonstrates the larger institutional context that perpetuated the teaching and research dichotomy, and commentary from participants reveals a collective ambivalence towards ASA incumbents, which I argue mediated their ability to diffuse their theorization of a new collective identity among the profession at large.

Field theory posits that skilled actors play a critical role in field-level professional change. However, the characteristics of skilled actors' social networks must also be considered in shaping the degree of power skilled actors can achieve and possess to impact intraprofessional change. Scholarship in network theory illustrates how the nature of social ties can impact an individual or group's access to strategic information. Field theory contributes a power analysis to these network dynamics, identifying the outcome of prestige differences as challengers navigated institutional change.

According to Granovetter (1973), a social network that has weak ties to an out-group with higher prestige can provide access to strategic resources. In professional settings with limited networks, convenings that regularly gather professionals in a shared space can provide ready access to developing such weak ties. "Information and ideas . . . flow more easily through the specialty, giving it some 'sense of community', activated at meetings and conventions.

Maintenance of weak ties may well be the most important consequence of such meetings” (Granovetter 1973: 1373). Over the years, annual ASA meetings and more frequent meetings of ASA council presented consistent and structured opportunities for challengers to make strategic weak ties with incumbents to advance the interests of the teaching and learning movement.

Other research, however, has demonstrated that more weak ties between an in-group and out-group may increase the possibility for destabilization of the in-group (McPherson et al 1992). According to McPherson, a shared sense of membership creates strong social ties among the in-group which predicts longer term group membership, and strong external network ties may in fact destabilize membership from the in-group (McPherson et al 1992). Therefore, although weak network ties between T&L challengers and incumbents were perceived as advantageous to gaining access to capital and prestige, they may also have been contradictory to maintaining in-group solidarity. Challengers conveyed a strong sense of kinship within the teaching and learning movement, evident through the consistent and long-lasting participation of many movement actors. My participants expressed this often, describing a welcoming and supportive environment within the movement amidst strong in-group solidarity among challengers, alongside a perceived disinterest in their cause from incumbents.

Challengers in the Teaching and Learning movement thus occupied a precarious position in which, on one hand, they needed to create purposive network ties to advance their interests among incumbents, while also maintaining the in-group solidarity that facilitated the initial formation and ultimate longevity of the movement. The ambivalence with which T&L challengers approached their network ties with incumbents resulted in a careful balancing act

to both crack the council and maintain camaraderie amongst movement participants. Challengers' internal cohesion functioned as a sort of 'sticky floor', maintaining strong ties among movement actors even while perceiving the structural advantages that could be accrued by making weak ties to ASA incumbents (i.e. cracking the council). This ultimately impacted how challengers maneuvered internal recruitment strategies as well as networking with incumbents, compounded with a heavily institutionalized reward structure that already undervalued their cause to enhance the prestige of teaching. Despite the fact that T&L challengers "cracked the council" and held consistent representation on ASA executive staff, perceptions of skilled actors as challengers, first and foremost, limited the strength of their professional ties with incumbents.

Despite skilled movement actors' perceptions of the structural advantages that could be accrued via weak ties to ASA council, perception alone was not sufficient to fully develop the social capital held by research-centered professionals that was necessary to affect a shift in collective professional identity. What follows here is an analysis of how T&L skilled actors navigated their positions straddling leadership in the movement with representation in the prestige structure of the profession. While skilled actors were trusted as representatives of the teaching and learning movement among the incumbents, their social capital within the profession remained equivalent to that of other teaching-oriented scholars prior to the initiation of the movement. Ultimately, this limited the impact that the Teaching and Learning movement had on diffusing a new collective professional identity at large. Normative expectations at the institutional and departmental level that continue to reward research more

heavily than teaching further limited the ability of skilled actors to holistically shift the value structure of the profession, despite concerted efforts to do so.

Identifying Collective Professional Identity Shift as a Movement Objective

Interview participants readily reflected an understanding that the Teaching and Learning movement had a long-term objective of professional identity change based on increasing the prestige of teaching. The nature of what this professional change should look like, however, varied among participants. Generally, although there was some uncertainty about whether widely agreed-upon goals currently exist, participants shared an understanding that they were engaged in an effort to enhance respect for their work on teaching and learning among their professional colleagues. Several participants described a movement ideology that centered around increasing the visibility of and respect for efforts to improve the teaching and learning of sociology. Simon is a tenured faculty member at a small college on the east coast and recently served as an editor for the *Teaching Sociology* journal. He emphasized normative identity change as one of the primary movement goals:

“I think that there's been a *resonant objective to advance the stature of teaching within the discipline* (emphasis added). I think that that's one of the primary to represent. I would say that that's one of my primary drivers. Is to say that teaching is a valued activity, that it should be recognized as important as the other aspects of our discipline. I think that that's the driver. I think then what happens is you have different aspects of teaching...but I think SOTL is an element of that broader concern of advance and relevance of teaching”. (Personal interview, 9/6/2017)

Wade shared this perspective. He asserted that the first step in institutionalizing change was to create widespread awareness of the movement. Presumably, a change in the reward structure would follow suit:

“The younger goals were *to get people to pay attention to it* (emphasis added) and to have it become part of the reward structure and to get institutional engagement”. (Personal interview, 1/30/2018)

Peggy, who was one of many coauthors of the 2017 *Liberal Learning* publication, echoed that cultural change was an underlying goal of the movement. She also suggested that more rigorous research and scholarship on teaching and learning would help raise the stature of the movement in the discipline:

“That culture change to get people to understand that we need to work at this and *we need to bring intellectual research to bear on* (emphasis added) this has really been part of the goal of the movement of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning”. (Personal interview, 11/18/2017)

Later discussion of the *Teaching Sociology* journal further emphasizes participants’ perception that scholarship on teaching and learning would gain status and respect by increasing the rigor of substantive research on this topic.

These challengers’ reflections suggest a shared understanding that, at its core, the movement sought to put teaching and learning on the professional map. This meant both drawing sociologists’ attention to the quality of their teaching, as well as impacting the

institutional reward structure to more greatly value teaching efforts. There was some variation, however, in how participants thought the Teaching and Learning movement should approach this goal. Mary opined that scholarship on teaching and learning as a subject area of sociology should be a required topical focus of all sociologists, because it is a subset of the work that we all do and therefore is unique.

“We’re not all into deviance, we’re not all into social psych, we’re not all, you know. But the difference is that we all, in some way or another, teach. And are interested in promoting learning, and should be interested in data and evidence about our teaching and learning. You know, we didn’t all choose to specialize in deviance, or social psych and organizations, but we all have a vested interest in teaching and learning”. (Personal interview, 8/24/18)

This was not generally shared by other participants, and one disagreed. Simon explained:

“And so I don't think the driving goal should be to have every academic become a SOTL academic, *but I think a driving goal should be to advance the stature and relevance of the discipline and we do that in part through our classes* (emphasis added), but we also do it through our research and through our community activism and all these other things and engaging in SOTL does take time and time is a limited resource.

. . . Well I don't know. I don't know that SOTL has goals, right? I think that people who practice SOTL might, but it's you know, I think it's sort of complex isn't it? That you know, you've got some people that want to advocate and prospective

for SOTL being a widely recognized and prevailing element of teaching and you know, and then other people are going to have very varying grades of interest in it". (Personal interview, 9/6/2017)

While participants did not use the specific terminology of professional identity, I interpret their use of words such as 'value', 'status', and 'prestige', 'relevance', and 'recognition' as defining the normative perceptions of professional membership. The use of this terminology suggests a general desire to raise the prestige level of teaching. The hard goals discussed in previous chapters that demonstrated evidence of institutionalization showed concrete measures by which to assess advancements. Impacting the reward structure of the discipline by raising the prestige of teaching activities, however, required a normative shift of the collective professional identity, and a permeation of these changes throughout institutions and departments in order to fully diffuse throughout the discipline.

Some of the data I have elaborated upon, such as executive officers' comments in *Footnotes* that recognize the accomplishments of the teaching and learning movement, suggest a degree of recognition for the accomplishments of the teaching and learning movement, which varied based on who occupied the position of ASA executive office. However, T&L challengers' experiences at their home institutions, interactions with ASA council over the years, and accounts from challengers, suggest that a normative change in the collective professional identity has not diffused to the same extent.

A. Historical Evidence of the Teaching vs Research Dichotomy

The Challengers' goal to shift the professional reward and prestige structure is couched within a long-standing historical dichotomy between teaching and research-oriented sociologists in the institution of higher education at large, and associated status differences of the various facets of sociology. Burawoy (2004) categorizes the field of sociology into four areas: professional, critical, policy, and public, and argues that there is a historical divide between sociologists focused on scholarship and those more heavily focused on social issues. Whether teaching falls under the category of public sociology and how this impacts the prestige of teaching has been the subject of debate. In Herbert Gans' presidential address to the ASA, he categorized public sociology as encompassing teaching, popularization, and the presentation of research findings in jargon-free language (FTNv30n6). For his part, Burawoy suggested that certain methods of teaching can be viewed as public sociology, but not all. Teaching practices such as active discussion and classroom dialogue to promote critical analysis poses an opportunity for to do public sociology in the classroom (FTN2002v30n6).

Whether teaching is considered a form of public sociology is relevant to understanding the deeply embedded status differences associated with different forms of sociological practice. Scholarship, teaching, service, and public engagement are not equivalently valued professional activities, and the degree to which sociologists associated with these different areas of focus engage in conversation with one another has implications for the development of a shared collective identity.

In 1991, a *Washington Post* article announced that Stanford University would invest 7 million dollars dedicated to improving undergraduate instruction. A *Footnotes* newsletter entry announcing the grant explains:

“Among the changes proposed is a limit on the number of articles expected of a faculty member applying for tenure. Also proposed are: faculty peer reviews, forms of scholarship related to teaching such as textbooks, instructional software programs, and books or videos geared to popular audiences. Incentives will also include ‘base salary increases and \$5,000 awards for superior teachers.’ Is this the key moment in a new social movement?” (FTN91v19n4)

In the same newsletter issue, a full page was dedicated to providing updates on various programs of the ASA Teaching Services Program, including recommendations from an NSF panel regarding how to obtain grants from the NSF Undergraduate Curriculum Development Program and an announcement recruiting new members to the Department Resources Group. Also featured was a reference to the ASA Task Group on Graduate Education (TAGGE) and the Sigma X Committee on Science, Math and Engineering Education, both engaged in activities to improve the training of graduate students to teach, and the quality of science instruction in K-12 education, respectively (FTN1991 v19 n4).

Jeanne Ballantine, a consistent leader among T&L challengers during the time documented in this project, was also featured as the new field coordinator of the Teaching Services Program. Her stated goals in this position included improving training for DRG consultants and organizing a series of trainings in targeted areas of the country. She expressed

a goal of inclusion, stating that “The ASA has a lot to offer departments of every size and composition... We want to be maximally helpful at minimal cost and to be of service to as many departments as possible” (FTN1991v19n4).

The ‘new social movement’ referred to in this newsletter entry was, at the time of writing, in fact a twenty-year old social movement. According to multiple markers of institutionalization, including the founding of and growth of the Section, resource allocation of staff positions in ASA to support teaching and learning projects, and hundreds of widely advertised local and national workshops since the 1970s, the teaching and learning movement was an established subsection of Sociology by the early 1990s and a disciplinary leader in the teaching and movement at large.

Despite decades of concerted advancements made by T&L challengers to raise the status of teaching in the profession the inclusion in *Footnotes* of Harvard’s statement in support of teaching suggests a persisting dichotomy between teaching vs research as disparate, and contradictory, professional activities. Evidently, challengers and incumbents were not talking to one another. Stanford’s expressed goals of limiting the expected number of published articles required for tenure, while increasing demonstrated activities around teaching improvement, reify the assumption that professional academic expectations qualify sociologists as either primarily researchers *or* primarily instructors, and not both. This distinction was not lost on participants. Michelle explained:

“And so, what’s challenging for me was the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning stuff and the teaching effectiveness stuff, is that every once in a while, in the last couple years somebody will say, “Oh, my goodness.

Teachings important," and I just want to smack my head on the table. It's like they're reinventing the wheel. And maybe it's just a generational thing, but each generation has to discover this. But I see stuff coming out now that we were talking about in the 80's that Carla was leading on in the 80's and they act like it's new. The physicist Carl Weimer ... who's at Harvard get all this press. We're thinking, "Oh, my God, maybe my boring physics lecture wasn't good enough," and they get all this press in the Chronicle. It just makes me crazy". (Personal interview, 1/22/2018)

Further evidence of this dichotomy is reflected in historical accounts of a "lost generation" of sociologists who abstained from ASA membership between the years 1974 and 1984. Comments from this group reveal a perception that sociologists who are not primarily focused on research—such as those at primarily teaching schools or community colleges—have long felt a disenchantment with the prestige structure of academic sociology, and a resulting disinterest in engaging in professional networking with high-status colleagues at R1 institutions. A longitudinal survey of this cohort sought to understand their resistance to joining ASA:

"The comments of nonmembers fell into two basic categories. The first includes those who feel that ASA does not meet their needs and/or is irrelevant and noninclusive, speaking only "to itself" (25 respondents). Lumped together in this category are sociology PhDs who champion applied work and resent the ASA emphasis on academic sociology; sociologists who "never hear from the ASA" and who feel like outsiders; and individuals who admit a basic disenchantment with

the field in general and/or ASA in particular, and who prefer being left alone” (FTN 1994v22n7).

Other findings included complaints of bias against sociologist teachers at small colleges who are not active in publishing, and a desire to strengthen the discipline through balancing a commitment to both research and teaching, valuing teaching more, and increasing graduate teacher training (FTN1994v22n7).

The lost generation coincides with the formative years of the Teaching and Learning movement. It cannot be assumed that any of these survey respondents were T&L challengers. However, these survey results suggest that there was a faction of disenchanted sociologists during the foundational years of the Teaching and Learning movement as well as discord between research-oriented incumbents and how they perceive those less active in publishing and research. Sociologists who were seeking a more welcoming professional environment abstained from membership in the professional association, which was perceived as disinterested in the priorities of these lower prestige professionals.

Participants consistently echoed a similar perception that, among T&L challengers, ASA was viewed as an unwelcoming professional venue that was disinterested in engaging with sociologists who prioritized teaching as one of their professional endeavors. Mary says:

“There are a lot of people at smaller institutions or teaching and learning institutions or departments that care that much about teaching and learning or whatever, who, who didn’t even you know, didn’t go to ASA. Didn’t feel welcome

at ASA. Um . . . for a long, for a long time. And, but there's a home now... you know, um, many of those people spend almost their entire time at ASA involved in teaching/learning section activities, and that's who their buddies are. And they feel comfortable, and they feel welcome. Um... so I think that's it contributed to, um . . . sort of a broader, more well-rounded, more diverse ASA and probably regional, uh, societies as well". (Personal interview, 8/24/2017)

Simon shared this opinion:

"You know, I think some people are insecure in that. I think some people, for instance, when they view the ASA, they view the ASA if they're teachers and they're isolated in their individual colleges, ASA is sort of this foreign body of researchers who nothing to do with what they do in their classes. And I think there's a large number of people who have been active in the ASA for years who are saying that's really a problem that those individuals that don't feel connected with the professional organizations should feel connected and a vehicle for being connected is through teaching and recognition of teaching." (Personal interview, 9/6/2017)

Betty, however, considered this discord a relic of the past. Her language use of 'Elitist' institutions are presumably R1 universities and research-oriented sociologists.

"I mean I think that was in a way, now may I say that I think early on . . . I, I don't sense it so much now. But I think that early on, there was a little bit of, um, you

know, from some of the more elitist, um, institutions maybe. Um, I think there was a bit of, you know, why do we need this, this is not serious sociology”.

(Personal interview, 8/25/17)

Further evidence that Teaching and Learning efforts were cast as ‘not serious’ sociology can be found in the ranking of *Teaching Sociology*, the main ASA publication on the practice and scholarship of teaching and learning. The journal, which was purchased by ASA from SAGE Publications in the mid-1980s (FTN85v13n6), served as an opportunity for T&L scholars to publish. It was described as “*the* (emphasis in original) journal of scholarship, practice, and news notes for the teaching profession” (FTN87v16n6).

However, the journal’s reputation was reportedly hampered by its prevailing inclusion of articles featuring case studies of best practices in teaching, and infrequent inclusion of empirical research articles. A 1998 survey by the Social Science Citation Index ranked the top sociology journals, and *Teaching Sociology* was not included in the list of 30 (FTN98v26n2). Multiple participants served as editors of the journal and expressed an awareness of the lower status of the journal based on interactions with editors from leading professional journals. Michelle, who was also a former *Teaching Sociology* editor, stated:

“In fact, when I became an ASA editor, one of the faculty members, a very distinguished theorist who was a faculty member in my doctoral program when I went through graduate school, he at the time was editor of an ASA journal and he came over and he took me by the elbow and he said, “. . . I really only have one set of advice for you.” And I thought, “Oh yeah here it comes.” And he said, “Go out and get the

best people with the biggest names and give them an invited article in your journal and get them to write for you." I thought, "Is that how you guys do this? I never knew that". (Personal interview, 1/22/18)

When prompted about whether she followed this advice, Michelle participant responded, laughing:

"No. No, I did not. And in fact it is hard to get people to write SOTL because it doesn't appear in the best journals. It appears in *Teaching Sociology* which is a great journal, but it has its place within the discipline and it is a hand mate to the discipline". (Personal interview, 1/22/18)

The fact that Michelle did not succeed in following her former colleague's advice is not surprising. As the editor of a more prestigious journal, this person conveyed an understanding that raising the of the *Teaching Sociology* could be achieved with a simple fix. All she had to do was invite incumbent sociologists to be contributors and prestige would follow. The functions of a professional network, however, are more complicated than that. Although Michelle did not attempt to invite incumbent contributors, it can be assumed that the benefits of publishing in a lower status journal would not be sufficient to convince research-oriented sociologists to publish in the journal.

Other participants described a degree of professional self-consciousness in their professional interactions with other editors. Doug also served as an editor on *Teaching Sociology*, and was acutely aware of prestige differences:

“You know, when I was the editor of *Teaching Sociology*, I was a member of the publications committee of the ASA because all editors had to go to the editors meeting of the publications committee and you might find this interesting but...the editor at the time . . . would want to sit next to me. He was the editor of the first-rate journal. I was the editor of the lowest rated journal . . . And I thought, is he taunting or is he making some sort of message or does he want to boost his own esteem. The editor of the lowest rated journal but we got along well. Because he was not comfortable, he was an S.O.B. in personal respects. I once had a special issue on *Teaching Sociology* called GIFTS. Great Ideas For Teaching Sociology. GIFTS. And when that issue came out and we had the publications committee meeting, he sat next me, and he sang my praises up and down, what a clever idea. Fantastic. I wish I could do this at the ASR. Now this could all be B.S. but I just thought I would give you that little personal effect”. (10/9/2017)

Mary also shared this sentiment:

“Along with all the other traditional research ASA journals, and we had an annual editorial meeting, uh editor’s meeting, you know at ASA every December. You know and *Teaching Sociology*, we were at the same table with all the major journals. Although I was felt a little weird (laughing) . . . just a titch out of place but that was just . . . that was probably just me being paranoid. (Personal interview, 8/24/2017)

Later in the interview, she added that the *Teaching Sociology* is still “sort of a little bit of a second-class citizen”.

Teaching Sociology has made changes to its content over the years, and several participants explained that the journal now more heavily emphasizes publication entries based on research on teaching as opposed to descriptive accounts and suggestions for teaching practices. Jeffrey Chin, who became editor of the journal in 1997, stated that his plans for the journal included a greater emphasis on empirical articles (FTN97v25n4). He later published an article documenting the trends in publications in *Teaching Sociology* between 1973-1999, concluding that articles published after 1984 were more often based on empirical assessment tools compared to experience-based articles in the decade prior. A ten-year low in manuscript submissions to *Teaching Sociology* was reported in 2006, coinciding with increasingly rigorous research expectations for articles published in the journal and an increasing number of journals dedicated to the scholarship of teaching and learning. It was noted that “presently, the types and extent of assessment data used vary widely, but no article or note in TS is accepted for publication without evidence that the approach or exercise is effective in producing desired learning outcomes” (FTN2007v35n4).

The low ranking of *Teaching Sociology* among other ASA journal publications suggests that its topical focus was not one that broadly appealed to sociologists at large, particularly those outside of the Teaching and Learning movement. Further, the scant inclusion of empirical articles in the early years of the journal’s circulation—which T&L challengers themselves acknowledged—may have further cast it as one with less rigorous standards for empirical research. *Teaching Sociology* editors’ recent efforts to emphasize empirical research

publications in the journal represent a move to enhance the legitimacy of the journal in a professional environment that bestows more prestige on research than teaching.

It was in this institutional environment that was already shaped by a deeply embedded dichotomy between teaching and research that T&L challengers attempted to raise professional awareness of and respect for the teaching and learning of undergraduate sociology. Below, I describe how the networking strategies used by T&L challengers to crack the council were couched within this dichotomy, impacting how they approached the need to make network ties with ASA incumbents while also maintaining cohesion and commitment within their movement.

A. Field Positioning of Movement Leadership

From the outset, Teaching and Learning movement skilled actors reportedly perceived their position as members of the challenger out-group and knew they had to gain social status among the top tiers of the profession in order to legitimize the cause. When he was appointed ASA Executive Officer from 1975 to 1977, Mauksch gained the ability to advocate internally for increased resource allocation devoted to teaching and learning. During his tenure, Mauksch made deliberate, well-crafted decisions to initiate the teaching and learning movement, and structured the Project on Undergraduate Education so as to support subsequent groups of challengers to carry on the work of the movement. His statements in the newsletters suggest that he was aware that purposive action was needed in order to sustain the movement in the long run. An isolated group of interested individuals, while instrumental, could not automatically diffuse a change to the disciplinary identity. Hans understood that incumbents

who held more social capital in the professional power structure must be incorporated in order for the movement to endure beyond institutional funding and support.

Mauksch conveyed this understanding of the organizational power structure to subsequent challengers, highlighting the need for incumbents and challengers to merge shared interests in order to make enduring institutional change in the profession regarding raising the status of professional teaching activities in the academy. Doug, one of the few participants who became involved early enough to work with Hans Mauksch, called this process “cracking the council”. He elaborated:

“The participants in the movement were from the bottom but you had to get the legitimacy bestowed upon you from the elite at the top . . . You have to knock on the council door and somehow they have to open it. Even a crack would be good if they opened it up”. (Personal interview, 10/9/2017)

Several key points emerge from this statement. Doug suggests that ASA council was composed of ‘elites at the top’, and thus primarily represented the interests of incumbents. Legitimacy would be ‘bestowed’ on the movement not from the broader institutional environment, but from within the professional structure itself. Achieving legitimacy by appealing to the interests of incumbents, therefore, was presumed to be a key step if the movement was to achieve institutional change.

Importantly, however, achieving intraprofessional legitimacy in ASA council was not the same as institutional legitimacy in higher education at large. T&L challengers’ efforts to crack the

council thus required a precarious balance between appealing to the legitimating demand of the institutional environment while also maintaining status and prestige among the professional colleagues.

Building Trust: Informal Recruitment

In order to crack the council, a base level of trust had to first be developed among challengers so that T&L movement actors would not perceive challenger leaders' closer involvement with ASA council as threatening to the longevity of the movement. Skilled actors Mauksch and Howery were the most consistently acknowledged challengers that occupied a network tie between the T&L movement and ASA Council, and were trusted to do so based on their ability to recruit movement members early on. Reflections from the 'lost generation' discussed previously illustrate the importance of skilled actors' recruitment strategies that conveyed a strong sense of in-group solidarity among T&L challengers.

Participants' recollections about how they initially became involved in the Teaching and Learning movement reveal informal recruitment strategies in which potential supporters were identified by leaders who perceived that they might be interested individuals. Beginning with the Section on Undergraduate Education, Mauksch is described as "bringing together" teachers from a variety of undergraduate institutions. Although the specific mechanisms Mauksch used to recruit actors cannot be verified due to the inability to interview him, archival documentation from *Footnotes* as well as participant accounts suggest informal networking strategies predominated. This often occurred around teaching development workshops or

conferences that T&L actors were invited to by movement leadership. Doug reflected on his early years of involvement:

“In 1976 there wasn't many of us involved. As I remember as I had gone to several of these training workshops, obviously what developed is, and eventually I don't know if it was one year later or a year and a half later, I became one of the people at one of the workshops to present and train others. That's how it worked. So initially you got to be known as an attendee or as a learner as it were and as a person who would be teaching something like-I can't remember-maybe some ideas for innovative teaching of race and ethnic courses for example. Something like that that you might then present at one of these workshops”. (Personal interview, 10/9/2017)

Peggy first became involved in Teaching and Learning workshops through Carla Howery, who introduced her to other movement actors:

“The other thing that helped me, and honestly, I'm sorry I didn't look up the dates. It was probably in the mid 90's that reinforced this was, the ASA got a National Science Foundation grant to go to . . . George Mason . . . and Carla was involved in that. And there were teams of people that came from all over the country, and there were probably thirty or forty of us there, to work on issues related to scholarship of Teaching and Learning and to try to produce papers and articles from that. I got invited to go to that and that was a really good earlyish career opportunity to meet people who have been leaders in the Teaching and Learning movement in sociology ever since”. (Personal interview, 11/8/2017)

These statements reveal a rapid progression in participants' involvement following their initial recruitment into the movement. Sociologists who expressed an interest in teaching and learning and became acquainted with movement leaders were identified as potential supporters and invited to T&L events. Movement actors' initial involvement generally began as attendees of development workshops, eventually—and in some cases, rapidly—progressing to the role of workshop leaders.

While Doug was the only participant who was present in the very initial phases of the movement, the Wingspread Conference discussed in the previous chapter was a key mobilizing moment referenced by many of my research participants that united challengers around a shared cause and a shared identity. Several participants explain that Howery reached out to them about Wingspread, and that is how they first became aware of the movement. A number of participants were involved in the Wingspread conference and collectively recall it as a key unifying moment in the movement.

Mauksch and Howery's strategies for recruitment facilitated a cohesive, inclusive identity that has characterized Teaching and Learning over the course of the movement. They both occupied key positions in ASA that allowed them to move the interests of the movement forward in ASA council, but they were also acknowledged by participants as personal mentors and leaders. The personal impact that other movement actors felt from these leaders facilitated a strong trust that helped build a sense of camaraderie within the movement. In nearly every interview with active T&L participants, they consistently praised both Hans Mauksch and Carla Howery. Doug, who knew Hans Mauksch, reflected on his important role:

“Hans was the visionary. Hans had the ideology and if I had to say it was anyone who started labeling what we were doing as a social movement within the discipline, within the professional organization of sociology, it was probably Hans . . . when I got involved with the initiative and as more people got involved, Hans definitely began to label it this is a social movement and we have to define it was a social movement within the discipline if we’re going to have an impact. If we’re going to change the discipline so that it legitimated the role of teaching in the professional’s life to more legitimacy and for a long time we didn’t think that that would ever happen because in the sixties-even now you can argue-in the sixties there was research that one university that were dominant in terms of reputation”. (Personal interview, 10/9/2017)

Mauksch’s framing of teaching and learning initiatives as a social movement was a common theme and one that has persisted since the foundational years. Doug conveys an understanding that naming Teaching and Learning as a social movement was important to understanding the prestige structure of the discipline and integral to cracking the council. As one of the few T&L challengers I spoke to who was recruited by Mauksch in the 1970s, Doug’s analysis of this movement suggests a critical framing of the professional power structure. From the outset, then, Mauksch and Howery’s recruitment of T&L challengers both facilitated trust building within the movement and set incumbents apart as representatives of the elite professional structure.

As I have established in previous chapters, Mauksch was regarded as the founder of the Teaching and Learning movement, yet Howery played an equally critical role in the reinstitutionalization of these initiatives within ASA and facilitated a notably inclusive sense of camaraderie among challengers. Upon assuming leadership as ASA Assistant Executive Officer in the early 1981 and continuing throughout her twenty-five year tenure with ASA, Howery carried on the teaching-centered efforts that were pioneered by Mauksch. (FTN09v27n5). While only some of the participants interviewed were able to recall some of their early teaching and learning activities with Mauksch in the 1970s, nearly anyone who participated in ASA teaching initiatives from the 1980s-2000s knew and spoke fondly of Carla. Personally, she is remembered by participants as a lively and charismatic presence in the teaching and learning movement. Betty fondly recalled:

“And I don’t know, that woman had more energy, she was just all over the place organizing sessions, encouraging people, through regional meetings, doing workshops at regional meetings. Um, and, at least towards the end of her career, most of them on teaching. That was her calling. So I think that institutionalized it in ASA”. (Personal interview, 8/25/17)

In his recollections on the role that Howery played in the movement, Simon alluded to a similar movement analysis to that reportedly conveyed by Mauksch. Reflecting on the institutional change that occurred under Howery, participants were able to attribute T&L movement advancements to Howery’s position on ASA:

“So the ASA doesn't have tons of money, but it does have choices on how it's going to allocate those resources. If that mechanism's prioritizing some initiatives over other and so having a voice within the organization, and again, if you trace back to the early nineteen seventies, that voice was absent and that's why Carla Howery was so incredibly important within the organization. She was very, very persistent and effective at focusing the leadership of the ASA on the issue of teaching and making sure that that was one of the focal concerns. *But you need somebody at the table* (emphasis added) to make that voice heard”. (Personal interview, 9/6/2017)

Much like cracking the council, Simon observed that institutional change could only occur if someone was ‘at the table’. That person was consistently Carla Howery. Harold explicitly states that Howery’s position in the ASA office helped institutionalize the Teaching and Learning movement:

“And Carla was very significantly influential in institutionalizing the many things that Hans Mauksch had started. By virtue of her role in the ASA office, Carla was able to get those things institutionalized into the ASA bureaucracy. So, they outlived the charismatic founder Hans Mauksch. Which as a sociologist we know that often when you have a charismatic leader if things don't get institutionalized into the bureaucracy, the movement tends to fall apart and go away when that charismatic leader is no longer around. So, Carla did a very effective job of institutionalizing those efforts. Because she was within the ASA office. So, she had

a tremendous impact teaching and learning by virtue of doing that. So, I tend to think of Hans as sort of the founder and Carla as the person who institutionalized those ages within the movement. And then of course lots of us contributing to one degree or another in various forms". (Personal interview, 11/13/2017)

Howery and Mauksch's charismatic leadership was effective in recruiting a strong movement base and transmitted a consistent framing of the movement goal to crack the prestige structure of the discipline. Both Harold and Simon echo a shared understanding among challengers of the importance of having a movement representative within the incumbents and identified Howery as that key skilled actor. Since Mauksch occupied the initial position within the executive office and was succeeded by Howery, T&L challengers had representatives on the ASA executive staff, and thus in contact with Council members, during the span of the movement. The procurement of initial funding for the project occurred as Mauksch was entering office in the early 1970s, and allocation of human resources supporting teaching and learning projects of ASA was henceforth secured. Due to Howery's longstanding representation in ASA, she was not only a charismatic figure but, more importantly, she was also an effective skilled actor that was able to navigate the intraprofessional boundary between challengers and the incumbents she interacted with on ASA Council.

The participants who knew and worked with Howery witnessed these many advancements. Mary explained:

"I think if we hadn't had Carla Howery, if we hadn't had Hans Mauksch, if we hadn't people that . . . supported them and were willing to be, sort of co-opted

into it by them . . . you know, we have this amazingly long history, probably one of the longest histories. Um, again before we even called it SoTL. So I think there were these key leaders. And then they were able to convince other people in, you know in particular in ASA and then maybe about the same time, maybe a little after in some of the regional societies, um . . . that this was a worthy endeavor and movement.” (Personal interview, 8/24/12017)

Informal recruitment was a strategic way to mobilize challengers given the charismatic leadership of Mauksch and Howery within an institutional environment that lacked support for the interests of teaching-oriented sociologists. Many of the key T&L actors who became involved early in the movement largely remained active over the period of time documented in this research and attribute their commitment to the Teaching and Learning movement to active mentorship by Mauksch and Howery. This core group became mentors and leaders to younger cohorts of teacher scholars that became engaged in similarly informal ways as the initial movement leaders. Harold summarized this generational transition of T&L challengers:

“And always with the NCSA I would organize for many years in a row, sessions related to teaching and learning which gives you an opportunity to meet others doing similar work. And then over the years you began to meet younger sociologists and have an opportunity to mentor them at least informally and help them get involved in the teaching and learning movement. So, somewhere along the way I became an old guy, you know? I'm not sure exactly when. But I'm one of the old dogs in teaching and learning in sociology now. So, the same thing with

the ASA. [T&L colleague] and I have done workshops on teaching in intro sociology for the first time. So, you have opportunity to interact with a lot of young up and coming sociologists and at least be a temporary mentor to them about how to get started in teaching and learning". (Personal interview, 11/13/2017)

Formal recruitment:

In addition to the informal networking that mobilized T&L challengers' early involvement, recruitment criteria for interested participants were included in *Footnotes* announcements. The 1974 announcement in *Footnotes* by the Project for Undergraduate Education stated that "Interested participants should submit statement of interest to Mauksch, and overview of their competence (FTN74v2n6). This specification had the potential to self-select professional members already interested in strengthening teaching, or who had an existing track record of involvement in teaching initiatives. By giving subjective power to movement leaders to identify what constituted 'competence', sociologists who primarily focused on research-intensive activities might have been deterred from involvement. Understandably, recruitment announcements used language to attract sociologists who had prior involvement and interest in teaching and learning. This was likely a strategic attempt to draw in well-qualified supporters who could become leaders and mentors, which Mauksch had identified as an important factor to institutionalizing the movement.

Given the Teaching and Learning movement's nature as a challenger movement among sociologists whose professional activities were undervalued by incumbent sociologists, their

recruitment tactics were an effective strategy to identify interested participants. Nevertheless, reliance on informal recruitment strategies may have played a role in segmenting T&L challengers within a group of like-minded individuals and creating an additional hurdle to permeating the incumbents' network to advance the goal of professional identity change. Strategies used by T&L leadership to recruit movement participants served as a sort of imprinting which impacted membership in the long run. The framing used to recruit new participants is important in considering which professional networks were appealed to, and how these early recruitment strategies reified a pattern of shared identity and interests among the challengers who would engage in the movement.

B. Did they Crack the Council?

Mauksch's position as Executive Officer on Council at the commencement of the movement allowed him to advance initial T&L initiatives. While Howery held a key executive staff position in ASA over many years, she was not an elected ASA Council member. As skilled actors, however, they had privileged contact with incumbents at Council meetings and other professional convenings and were thus able to advance the interests of the T&L movement among incumbents. When prompted to reflect upon the degree to which teaching and learning efforts had shifted incumbents' attitudes towards teaching and learning, participants gave varying accounts. In terms of challenger representation in ASA, substantial evidence from participants and archival data suggest that the T&L movement did crack the council, and this helped the movement make significant inroads to affecting the prestige structure.

Challengers acknowledged a degree of acceptance of T&L activities from incumbents in recent years, but not a genuine interest and adoption of teaching as an acquired and valued professional status. Harold remarked:

“Well I think the ASA as an institution has done a very good job with the department resources group, with the section on teaching and learning and then there are all kinds teaching and professional development sessions at the ASA beyond those offered by the section on teaching and learning. So, there are many ways in which the ASA has been supportive. *Now for me, the real measure of complete acceptance of the section with SOTL. The full acceptance of SOTL will be when someone who is primarily a SOTL researcher gets elected to ASA council. And then when someone who is primarily a SOTL researcher gets elected ASA president. Neither of those have ever happened* (emphasis added). Diane Pike and Ted Wagenaar have run for council or committee on committee type of thing. Maybe Diane was on the committee on committee once. But by and large SOTL scholars have been marginalized at those types of levels within the ASA. And I think it's primarily because SoTL scholars are not at major research institutions and don't have the prestige of a PhD granting institution in the top ten of the ranking in sociology to get themselves elected. The people who have run have not been elected. So, I think part of that has to do with institutional affiliation more so than SoTL. But until somebody breaks through that glass ceiling, I don't think SoTL has been fully institutionalized within the ASA”. (Personal interview, 11/13/2017)

I borrow from participants' use of metaphors to describe the phases of institutionalization. T&L challengers 'knocked on the ASA council door', 'cracked it open', and 'got a seat at the table'. Harold adds a new and final step to the power analysis, suggesting that 'the movement now needs to break through the glass ceiling'. As of 2012, the last year analyzed as part of this movement, all ASA elected Presidents and Vice Presidents came from Research One Universities (ASA 2020, accessed 6/3/20). Harold's analysis suggests that breaking the glass ceiling could be achieved when a Teaching and Learning challenger is elected to ASA council. This perspective is situated within Harold's current professional position as 'an old guy', able to reflect on years of professional contributions to the movement. Cracking the council, it seems, was not enough.

A longitudinal overview of the composition of ASA Council lends further insight into whether, as Harold suggested, the T&L movement cracked the glass ceiling. The composition of ASA Council was documented at two-year intervals from 1972-2020 by identifying the home institutions of elected Presidents, Vice Presidents, Secretaries, and Executive Officers during this period (ASA 2020, accessed 6/23/30). Executive Officers generally held office for longer intervals of time, and most held non-academic positions at research institutes prior to their positions at ASA. Therefore, although executive officers could not be categorized according to university research rankings, they were categorized as primarily research professionals due to their prevailing career experience conducting sociological research and not teaching.

For the years examined in the 1980s, and those between 1995-2010, all Council members came from R1 institutions. The secretary from 1990-1992, Beth Hess, was the only council member over the time period examined that was faculty at a 2-year community college.

Catherine White Berheide, ASA Secretary in 2012, came from Skidmore College which is a 4-year liberal arts college, while the President and Vice President that year were both from Research One universities. According to this analysis, the 1970s was the only decade during which there were multiple years that Council had elected officers coming from institutions other than R1 universities (ASA 2020, accessed 6/23/30). Notably, in 1972—which I identify in this research as the year the T&L movement began—there were two Council members who came from four-year liberal arts colleges. And in 1977, when Milton Yinger of Oberlin college was elected ASA President, Hans Mauksch held the position of Executive Officer which allowed him to advocate internally for Teaching and Learning initiatives (ASA 2020, accessed 6/23/30).

Evidently, the composition of ASA Council over the timeline examined in this project has not undergone significant changes towards higher representation from teaching-focused institutions. If anything, the highest diversity in elected officers' institutional rankings occurred in the 1970s, which aligns with the open opportunity structure which facilitated the early years of the Teaching and Learning movement to begin with. These findings suggest that, while T&L challengers were able to crack the council door to advance their initiatives in the professional association, their inability to crack the glass ceiling by being elected onto ASA council reified their disparate locations in the professional hierarchy.

Brad, who was an elected member of ASA council and is well-recognized for his research, described his recollections of Teaching and Learning efforts presented by ASA executive staff members at Council meetings.. When asked if he was aware of the activities of the Department Resources Group, he explained:

“Not really. I mean I've seen it [the DRG] referenced. I've probably seen presentations. I mean quite frankly when I was just on council and not in a position of responsibility, I would daydream when Carla would do her presentations. It just was, I mean I knew it was important for the profession, important for institutions that were primarily teaching institutions . . .

One other sort of indicator that it wasn't really I think on people's minds is my experience on council and to some extent when I was president, past president, was a lot of political work going on outside of the formal meetings where people whom were in your sort of coalition would talk about, "Hey how do we get something on the agenda? How do we get something talked about? How do we respond when this comes up?" Teaching and learning things, I never remember either sort of coming up with strategies to either get it on the agenda or responding to it in case it came up". (Personal interview, 10/11/2017)

While this participant expressed a general acceptance of the reports on movement activities, his account suggests a prevailing disinterest in T&L work from incumbents. Further, his observation that challengers were infrequently involved in professional interactions behind the scenes of council implies that challengers and incumbents were moving in different professional circles. Although T&L skilled actors held physical space in the ASA executive office and on council and utilized these positions to implement a degree of institutional change, disparate professional networks between challengers and incumbents created an additional barrier to affecting change in the prestige structure.

Reception of T&L activities from incumbents was not all negative, however, and varied based on T&L skilled actors' relationships with ASA executive staff. *Footnotes* publications in the late 1990s and early 2000s featured a notable increase in newsletter columns recognizing the accomplishments of the T&L movement. Carla Howery reportedly had close relationships with executive officers Felice Levine and Sally Hillsman during that time, which may account for this increased recognition in the newsletters. Furthermore, Howery's successor in ASA office, Margaret Weigers Vitullo, was brought on as a T&L representative during Hillsman's tenure, and reportedly was given freedom to develop new teaching and learning projects. TRAILS, the online teaching resource database discussed in the last chapter, was also created around this time, which reflects evidence of the progress that could be made when skilled actors had strong network ties to council. Vitullo's position in the ASA office carries on the legacy of T&L skilled actors holding a place in the internal governance unit.

Brad was held office in ASA council at this time and observed the strength of these relationships directly. He explained:

"Felice and Carla were really, really tight personally and intellectually and so on. And Felice was executive director of ASA almost to the very end. In fact we hired Sally Hillsman my presidential year. So from 1995 to 2003 it was almost the Felice, Carla and Janet Asner show. Felice was the executive director, Janet was the meetings, Carla was teaching and Karen Edwards was sort of both meetings and service areas. And again I think Felice saw it as part of her job and her mission to stay on top teaching and learning curriculum and all of that as part of the service in the entire profession". (Personal interview, 10/11/2017)

These advancements were made amidst a supportive professional opportunity structure in the professional association. It was during these periods of time that challengers received greater recognition for T&L initiatives, and greater institutional support to advance their efforts. Despite representation in the executive office, however, participants expressed a persisting understanding that the prestige of T&L scholars remained at a lower status than that of professional incumbents primarily dedicated to research.

C. Diffusion

The above discussion reveals mixed reception of teaching and learning initiatives and T&L actors from incumbent representatives in ASA. While interaction between challengers and incumbents was not always negative, participants conveyed an understanding that full institutional change had not occurred, evident through a perceived disinterest from ASA incumbents in teaching and learning initiatives. The inconsistency with which T&L challengers were able to effectively crack the council is based on skilled actors' disparate social networks with incumbents at the micro-level that mimic the prevailing institutional dichotomy between research and teaching. When skilled actors had strong ties to ASA council, more advancements in the movement were possible. T&L challengers' recruitment strategies reflected an ambivalence with which challengers approached networking with incumbents, which I attribute to their perception of being undervalued in the prestige structure of the profession.

Participants' experiences with promotion at their home institutions provide further evidence that teaching and learning remains undervalued and reflective of the larger

institutional dichotomy between teaching research. At the time of interviews, a number of my participants had retired, or were approaching retirement, and thus were able to candidly reflect on how their involvement in the movement had impacted their careers. There was a clear distinction between how T&L professionals were treated at teaching-oriented liberal arts colleges compared to research-one institutions. Wade, recently retired from a small midwestern college, explained:

“That varies so much by institution. At [home institution] we've always valued teaching and research. My entire career there I got money and support and salary increases for doing research. For example I spent a couple of years at the National Center for Education Statistics. I published stuff from that. I got as much support for that as I did for editing the *Journal of Teaching Sociology*. I published a fair amount on teaching techniques and curriculum. But that's not true at every institution. A lot of institutions if you published on teaching stuff it didn't count as much for promotion and tenure. It varies too much by institution to try to make any kind of global assessment. I would say overall increasingly institutions are incorporating it and using it as a measure of professional success”. (Personal interview, 1/30/2018)

Other participants who spent their careers at teaching-oriented institutions echoed a supportive reward structure for teaching. Harold, who also works at a small college that is supportive of teaching, explained that his institution pushed back against departments and faculty that did not consider teaching a legitimate criterion for promotion:

“I think faculty themselves as well as university administrators have to value SoTL equally with research within the discipline. Now, faculty often want to blame administrators. But it's usually faculty at the department level who are defining what counts and what doesn't count for promotion and tenure. It's typically not the dean, it's the faculty. So, faculty have to accept and value that. And I think at places like [participant's home institution], that's relatively easy. I mean we say we value high quality teaching and supportive greater student learning and ways of documenting that in a peer reviewed fashion count equally with traditional research within the discipline. So, for example I had in one of my first years . . . where I had a department that wanted to say, well in our promotion and tenure guidelines the only things that count, the only publications that count are the publications that are included in this database within our discipline . . . The problem was it only that particular database, only looked at disciplinary research and it excluded the scholarship of teaching and learning in that discipline. So, I had some senior full professors in that department who were very angry with me when I told them you can't do that. The university says, we value the scholarship of teaching and learning. You cannot create a departmental promotion and tenure standard that excludes publications in the scholarship of teaching and learning from consideration as part of a faculty members scholarly productivity. You can't do that. You don't get to trump the university's standards. And I had some real upset faculty with me. But I said we say we value teaching and learning, you cannot exclude that from your assessment of research”. (Personal interview, 11/13/2017)

At the university where Brad spent the majority of his career, praise for good teaching was an informal part of the university culture, yet did not necessarily count towards promotion:

“There was a strong teaching culture that I think sort of emerged by accident. People who were really, really good at teaching the large, large lecture courses... And then as we hired younger people and so on, there might have been something about our taste in scholars that made them just as effective in those big classes and we had like 1,000 majors, everybody loved those classes. And so it was something, it wasn't something that got much weight when it came time for promotion or anything, it was just sort of part of the culture”. (Personal interview, 10/11/2017)

In contrast, other participants reported resistance from their departments. Michelle explained a situation in which a colleague who has a professional interest in teaching left his program due to frustration with the department's skewed expectations for promotion:

“I have to say that [colleague's name] left the department primarily because he saw that teaching was not highly valued by many of the faculty and that while he received tenure on the basis of his research, he wanted to continue to focus on students and that just wasn't going to work in our PhD program. So yeah, he went into administration and eventually became one of our vice-chancellors”. (Personal interview, 1/22/18)

She further explained how teaching and research were weighted differently as criteria for promotion to tenure, which ultimately impacted her own desire to remain at her institution:

“Sixty percent of your annual salary increase was based on publication, twenty-five percent was based on teaching which was basically how much you taught, how many students you taught, and there had to be enough quality that there were no complaints coming to the chair on a regular basis. And the rest was service, ten or fifteen percent was service to the university, to the profession. So it was very clear that teaching was less valued . . . But there are some faculty who are much more verbal about telling graduate students that teaching is not valued, that they need to keep their nose to their research, that they separate research from teaching very clearly, that they don't value it. And those voices have become louder I believe in the last five to ten years and quite honestly that's why I retired early”. (Personal interview, 1/22/2018)

Mary reflected more broadly on how departmental reward structures that were skewed in favor of research over teaching impact T&L challengers career trajectories:

“Although, um . . . ironically probably more mid-level and later career people, because you're closer to tenure or promotion or have tenure. Uh, have rank, you know, have some status. And so you can take the risk of putting more emphasis on teaching/learning and SoTL, despite its lower value and reward in almost every institution, right? So it's not that there aren't junior people, there's grad students and junior people interested in teaching, learning and SoTL, but they have to be

careful about their level of involvement, uh, because of our sort of biased reward system". (Personal interview, 8/24/2017)

Over the duration of their careers, and despite significant advancements institutionalizing T&L projects in ASA, participants' experiences with the reward structure at their institutions were impacted by their professional dedication to teaching and learning work. As can be predicted from the dichotomy between research and teaching in the larger institutional environment, challengers whose home institutions were primarily teaching colleges received institutional support for their work. In contrast, T&L challengers housed in prestigious research universities confronted more barriers to promotion based on their dedication to teaching activities. The reward structure across sociology departments at large, then, continues to reflect the institutional dichotomy between teaching and research.

At all levels of the professional structure, therefore, the degree of advancements made by the Teaching and Learning movement was mediated by the broader historical and institutional context that bestows greater prestige on research than teaching. T&L challengers were acutely aware of the undervaluing of their professional activities, which is what initially fostered the formation of the movement in the 1970s. As sociologists with a deep understanding of the mechanisms of institutional change, T&L skilled actors instilled a movement analysis among challengers that framed ASA council as the jurisdiction of incumbents. In order to affect change in the professional identity and related reward structure, challengers had to gain representation on ASA council as the professional governance body.

Cracking the council, however, carried an associated risk of destabilizing the supportive environment that attracted T&L challengers in the first place. On one hand, then, movement actors valued the bottom-up nature of the movement, and much of the appeal of the movement was attributed to the very fact that it was not part of the prestigious networks of ASA. Even early on, challengers were protective of maintaining their movement as a safe and insular environment for people who care about teaching and want to embrace that. Therefore, strategies to create strong network ties with incumbents in order to affect a change in professional identity were approached with a careful ambivalence from movement actors.

In summary, T&L challengers DID crack the council. However, despite long-term representation in ASA, challengers were acutely aware of their lower prestige alongside incumbents, which was evident through their interactions during professional convenings. Cracking the council allowed the movement to reshape the professional landscape so as to facilitate institutionalization of their professional activities. However, this was not accompanied by a normative change in the professional value structure, evident through challengers' experiences with the reward structure at their home institutions. I have shown that disparate professional identities between T&L challengers and incumbents impacted the degree to which the movement diffused a new professional identity that views teaching as an acquired status for all sociologists. Despite skilled actors' consistent representation on ASA, the perceived dichotomy between teaching and research reified interactions at the individual level that perpetuated the maintenance of disparate social networks between challengers and incumbents on ASA council in the profession at large.

CHAPTER 6

Conclusion

This research advances existing scholarship on intraprofessional identity change by examining how the social positioning of change agents shapes the ability of movement challengers to affect normative change. I draw on Fligstein and McAdam's field theory to examine how these intraprofessional tensions played out in the sociology profession. In keeping with the call to emphasize intraprofessional heterogeneity and dispute, field theory provides an analytical framework with which to do so. The institutional context of higher education contributes an additional perspective on intraprofessional change, in contrast to prevailing research in this vein that has examined change in practice-based professions outside of the academy. Historical efforts to advance teaching and learning in sociology and impact the reward structure so as to more greatly value teaching as an acquired status were couched in a long-standing professional and institutional dichotomy between teaching and research.

I have demonstrated that Teaching and Learning skilled actors' representation as ASA executive staff, and thus their close contact and communication with ASA Council, facilitated the reinstitutionalization of a number of concrete objectives that were identified in the early years of the movement. Over the forty-year period analyzed in this dissertation, a proliferation of projects and teaching development opportunities have become widely available to individuals and sociology departments nationwide. Identifying the best ways to widely disseminate these resources—both material and human—to strengthen the teaching of undergraduate sociology continues to be a central goal of the T&L movement. The TRAILS online teaching resource database is now publicly accessible on the ASA website, and the

availability of DRG consultants to assist departments undergoing accreditation, curriculum reform, and other institutional restructuring is well-advertised.

More recent T&L projects include an expanded focus on the teaching of sociology not only at the undergraduate level, but also in K-12 and sociology graduate programs. In 2001, the Section on Undergraduate Education was renamed the Section on Teaching and Learning to reflect this broader focus (FTN01v29n9). The Preparing Future Faculty program served as an important professional resource to strengthen graduate teacher training in sociology departments. And, the third and most recent report from the Task Force on Liberal Learning and the Sociology Major includes substantial attention to addressing changes in instruction due to the expanding demand for online classes, as well as a condensed and concise overview of the recommendations for undergraduate sociology curriculum (Pike et. al 2017).

Nevertheless, my data demonstrates a prevailing professional prestige structure that continues to reward research more highly than teaching, and even the scholarship of teaching and learning, which has hindered the ability of the movement to affect normative change in the professional identity at large. I attribute this to a long-standing institutional environment in higher education that perpetuates a dichotomy between teaching and research, which permeated down to interactions between individual challengers and incumbents that maintained disparate social networks and lower social capital for incumbents. These findings expand upon other cases studies of intraprofessional change in the fields of accounting, law, and medicine, which assert that the social positioning of challengers is a key factor determining the ability of change agents to successfully affect a change in professional identity (Greenwood, Suddaby and Hinings 2002, Rao, Monin and Durand 2003).

Scholarship on intraprofessional change suggests that the holistic normative change required to institutionalize a new professional identity occurs during the diffusion phase of institutionalization, which is the last step to creating enduring change. Indeed, I demonstrate that normative identity change in sociology did not occur, despite successful reinstitutionalization of various T&L initiatives. My data have shown that, although challengers gained access to ASA council through their positions as ASA executive staff, incumbents continue to view the movement as a disparate segment of the profession that does not represent their interests. The prevailing representation of sociologists from R1 universities as ASA elected council members suggests that research-centered sociologists continue to hold the highest prestige levels in the discipline. Because teaching is valued less than research within the professional reward structure, research-oriented incumbents—both individual and institutional—have not adopted the new professional identity advocated for by this movement.

The Teaching and Learning movement took shape alongside shifts in higher education towards outcomes assessment, and adapted movement strategies to maintain legitimacy in the institutional environment at large. However, the legitimacy bestowed by higher education was not reflective of the legitimacy needed to enhance challengers' professional standing in sociology itself. Institutional funding, department ranking, and reward structures continue to be based on the rigor of a sociologist's scholarship and research. External pressures such as accreditation and program reviews, in some cases, coerce departments into taking advantage of the resources made available by the T&L movement. Yet, by and large, the expectations for departments to maintain institutional legitimacy remain centered around the proliferation of research and publication.

My data points towards the research and teaching dichotomy as the underlying context that perpetuated a disjointed professional identity in sociology that impeded the Teaching and Learning movement from affecting holistic change. However, there are multiple directions for future research that fell outside the purview of my data.

First, this story could be supplemented with more interviews with incumbents. When I began data collection, I did not identify incumbents as a necessary sample to interview because my original research question focused on internal tensions among challengers in the Teaching and Learning movement, not between challengers and incumbents in the profession at large. The narrative that unfolded, however, proved to be a larger story of institutional change that primarily emerged from professional archival documents. While my participants come from a variety of institutional types, including R1, R2, and 4 year teaching colleges, the majority of those that came from R1 universities were active members of the Teaching and Learning movement and therefore cannot be strictly categorized as challengers.

Out of twenty three participants, only two had career characteristics that would classify them strictly as incumbents due to their faculty positions at R1 universities and only peripheral involvement in the Teaching and Learning movement. The majority of my interview data, therefore, draws upon challengers' *perceptions* of their social positioning in the professional hierarchy, which contributes a social constructionist account of challengers' movement behavior and supplements archival data that illustrates the larger institutional context. Interviews with incumbents who are not involved in the Teaching and Learning initiatives regarding their awareness and understanding of the movement would provide a point of

comparison with which to further understand the process of intraprofessional identity change in the academy.

Finally, it would be useful to conduct a longitudinal assessment of the changes in teacher training in Sociology graduate departments over time. In particular, research on the dissemination of the goals of the Preparing Future Faculty program is warranted. As PFF graduates have entered into their own professional careers at various institutions, an analysis of the degree to which the PFF goals have been implemented would reveal the potential for informal dissemination mechanisms of the Teaching and Learning movement. While this project focused primarily on the role of ASA as the intermediary professional body that facilitated advancements in the Teaching and Learning movement, future research on the role that sociology departments play in institutionalizing these advancements would provide an additional lens on this story of intraprofessional change.

REFERENCES CITED

- Abbott, John. 1988. *The System of Professions: An Essay on the Division of Expert Labor*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Altheide, David L. 1987. "Ethnographic Content Analysis." *Qualitative Sociology* 10(1): 65-77.
- American Sociological Association. "Elected Officers." Washington, DC. American Sociological Association. Retrieved June 2020. <https://www.asanet.org/about-asa/asa-story/asa-history/elected-officers>
- Ballantine, Jeanne, Nancy Greenwood, Jay R. Howard, Edward L. Kain, Diane Pike, Michael Schwartz, R. Tyson Smith and John F. Zipp. 2016. "Does the Center Hold? Reflections on a Sociological Core." *Teaching Sociology* 44(3): 151-162.
- Bourdieu, Pierre and Loic J. D. Wacquant. 1992. *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. University of Chicago Press.
- Berger, Peter L. and Thomas Luckman. 1966. *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. Doubleday & Company, New York.
- Berheide, Catherine White. 2005. "Searching for Structure: Creating Coherence in the Sociology Curriculum." *Teaching Sociology* 33(1): 1-15.
- Bernstein, Mary. 1997. "Celebration and Suppression: The Strategic Uses of Identity by the Lesbian and Gay Movement." *American Journal of Sociology* 103(3): 531.
- Besharov and Smith. 2014. "Multiple Institutional Logics in Organizations: Explaining Their Varied Nature and Implications." *The Academy of Management Review* 39(3): 364-381.
- Breckenridge, R. Saylor and Scott Savage. 2011. "Organizations." In Jeff Manza (ed) Oxford Bibliographies Online: Sociology
- Burawoy, Michael. 2004. "Public sociologies: contradictions, dilemmas, and possibilities". *Social Forces* 82(4): 1603-1618.
- Burt, Ronald S. 1999. "The Social Capital of Opinion Leaders". *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*.
- Cole, Robert E. 1999. *Managing Quality Fads: How American Business Learned to Play the Quality Game*. Oxford University Press.
- Crossley, Nick. 2002. *Making Sense of Social Movements*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Crouch, Mira and Heather McKenzie. 2006. "The logic of small samples in interview-based qualitative research." *Social Science Information* 45(4).

- Davis, Gerald F., Doug McAdam, W. Richard Scott, and Mayer N. Zald. 2005. *Social Movements and Organization Theory*. Cambridge University Press.
- DiMaggio, Paul J. and W.W. Powell. 1983. "The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields." *American Sociological Review* 48(2):147-160.
- Dezalay, Yves and Bryant Garth. 1996. "Fussing about the forum: Categories and definitions as stakes in a professional competition." *Law and Social Inquiry* 21: 285-312.
- Della Porta, Donatella and Mario Diani. 1999. *Social Movements: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Dworkin, Shari L. 2012. "Sample Size Policy for Qualitative Studies Using In-Depth Interviews." *Archives of Sexual Behavior* 41(6): 1319-1320.
- Eberts, Paul, Carla B. Howery, Catherine White Berheide, Kathleen Crittenden, Robert Davis, Zelda Gamson, and Theodore C. Wagenaar. 1990. *Liberal Learning and the Sociology Major*. Completed in Conjunction with the Association of American Colleges National Reviews of Arts and Sciences Majors. Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.
- Emirbayer, Mustafa and Victoria Johnson. 2008. "Bourdieu and Organizational Analysis". *Theory and Society* 37 (1): 1-44.
- Evetts, 2012. Professionalism: Value and Ideology. *Sociopedia isa*.
- Eyerman, Ron and Andrew Jamison. 1991. *Social Movements: A Cognitive Approach*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Friedland, Roger and Robert Alford. 1991. "Bringing Society Back in: Symbols, Practices, and Institutional Contradictions." Pp. 232-262 in *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*, edited by W. W. Powell and P. J. DiMaggio. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Fligstein, Neil and Doug McAdam. 2012. *A Theory of Fields*. Oxford University Press.
- Fligstein, Neil. 1996. "How to Make a Market: Reflections on the Attempt to Create a Single Market in the European Union". *American Journal of Sociology* 102: 1-33.
- Gaff et. al. 2000. "Building the Faculty We Need: Colleges and Universities Working Together." Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities and the Council of Graduate Schools.
- Goodrick, Elizabeth and Trish Reay. 2011. "Constellations of Institutional Logics: Changes in the Professional Work of Pharmacists". *Work and Occupations* 38(3): 372-416.

- Gold, Raymond L. 1997. "The Ethnographic Method in Sociology." *Qualitative Inquiry* 3(388).
- Granovetter, Mark S. 1973. "The Strength of Weak Ties". *The American Journal of Sociology*. 78 (6): 1360-1380.
- Greenwood, Royston, Roy Suddaby and C.R. Hinings. 2002. "Theorizing Change: The Role of Professional Associations in the Transformation of Institutionalized Fields." *The Academy of Management Journal* 45(1): 58-80.
- Hannan, Michael T. and John Freeman. 1977. "The Population Ecology of Organizations." *American Journal of Sociology*. March (82): 929-964.
- Haveman, Heather A. and Hayagreeva Rao. 1997. "Structuring a Theory of Moral Sentiments: Institutional and Organizational Coevolution in the Early Thrift Industry." *American Journal of Sociology* 102(6): 1606-1651.
- Howard, Jay R. 2010. "2009 Hans Mauksch Address: Where Are We and How Did We Get Here? A Brief Examination of the Past, Present, and Future of the Teaching and Learning Movement in Sociology." *Teaching Sociology* 38(2): 81-92.
- Johnston, Hank and Bert Klandermans (eds). 1995. *Social Movements and Culture*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Jones, Angela L., Davis, Shannon N. and Jammie Price. 2004. "Preparing Future Faculty: A New Approach at North Carolina State University". *Teaching Sociology* 32(3): 264-275.
- Kain, Edward L. 2007. "The Sociology Major at Institutions of Higher Education in the United States." *Teaching Sociology* 35(1): 31-47.
- Larson, Magali Sarfatti. 1977. *The Rise of Professionalism: A Sociological Analysis*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Lounsbury, Michael, Marc Ventresca and Paul M. Hirsch. 2003. "Social Movements, Field Frames and Industry Emergence: A Cultural-Political Perspective on US Recycling." *Socio-Economic Review* 1(1): 71-104.
- McAdam, Doug, John D. McCarthy and Mayer N. Zald, editors. 1996. *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- McCarthy, John and Mayer Zald. 1973. *The Trend of Social Movements in America: Professionalization and Resource Mobilization*. Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.
- McKinney, Kathleen, Carla Howery, Kerry Strand, Edward Kain, and Catherine White Berheide. 2004. *Liberal Learning and the Sociology Major Updated: Meeting the Challenge of*

- Teaching Sociology in the Twenty-First Century*. Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.
- McPherson, J. M., P.A. Popielarz, and S. Drobnic. (1992). "Social Networks and Organizational Dynamics." *American Sociological Review*. Vol. 57: 153-170.
- Melucci, Alberto. 1996. *Challenging Codes: Collective Action in the Information Age*. Cambridge University Press.
- Meyer, John W. and Brian Rowan. 1977. "Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony." *American Journal of Sociology* 83(2): 340-363.
- Meyer, John W. and Scott. 1983. *Organizational Environments: Ritual and Rationality*. Beverly Hills, Sage.
- Nilsson, Andrew. 1995. "A Survey of Sociology Curricula in Connecticut." *Teaching Sociology* 23: 35-8.
- Oliver, C. 1991. Strategic responses to institutional processes. *Academy of Management Review* 16: 145-179.
- Pfeffer Jeffery and Gerald R. Salancik. 1978. *The external control of organizations: A resource dependence perspective*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Pike, Diane L., Teresa Ciabattari, Melinda Messineo, Renee A. Monson, Rifat A. Salam, Theodore C. Wagenaar, Jeffrey Chin, Susan J. Ferguson, Margaret Weigers Vitullo, Patrick Archer, Maxine Atkinson, Jeanne H. Ballantine, Thomas C. Calhoun, Paula England, Rebecca J. Erickson, Andrea N. Hunt, Kathleen S. Lowney, Suzanne B. Maurer, Mary S. Senter, and Stephen Sweet. 2017. *The Sociology Major in the Changing Landscape of Higher Education: Curriculum, Careers, and Online Learning*. Washington, DC: American Sociology Association.
- Polletta, Francesca and James M. Jasper. 2001. "Collective Identity and Social Movements." *Annual Review of Sociology* 27:283-305.
- Prasad, Anshuman and Pushkala Prasad. 2002. "The Coming of Age of Interpretive Organizational Research." *Organizational Research Methods* 5(1): 4-11.
- Preparing Future Faculty Program. Accessed June 3, 2020. <https://www.preparing-faculty.org/>
- Rao, Hayagreeva, Calvin Morrill and Mayer N. Zald. 2000. "Power Plays: How Social Movements and Collective Action Create New Organizational Forms." *Research in Organizational Behaviour* 22: 237-281.
- Rao, Hayagreeva. 1998. "Caveat Emptor: The Construction of Nonprofit Consumer Watchdog Organizations." *American Journal of Sociology* 103(4): 912-961.

- Rao, Hayagreeva, Philippe Monin and Rodolphe Durand. 2003. "Institutional Change in Toque Ville: Nouvelle Cuisine as an Identity Movement in French Gastronomy". *American Journal of Sociology* 108 (4).
- Revans, Reg. 1989. "Integrity in the college curriculum." *Higher Education Review*. 21(2): 26-62.
- Royston Greenwood, Roy Suddaby and C. R. Hinings. 2002. "Theorizing Change: The Role of Professional Associations in the Transformation of Institutionalized Fields." *The Academy of Management Journal* 45 (1): 58-80.
- Sauder, Michael. 2008. "Interlopers and Field Change: The Entry of U.S. News into the Field of Legal Education". *Administrative Science Quarterly* 53(2): 209-234.
- Snow, David A., Sarah Soule, and Hanspeter Kriesi, eds. 2004. "The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements." Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Strang, David and John W. Meyer. 1993. "Institutional Conditions for Diffusion." *Theory and Society* 22(4):487-511.
- Suchman, Mark. 1995. "Managing Legitimacy: Strategic and Institutional Approaches." *Academy of Management Review* 20: 571-610.
- Suddaby. 2010. "Challenges for Institutional Theory." *Journal of Management Inquiry* 19(1): 14-20.
- Tolbert and Zucker. 1983. "Institutional Sources of Change in the Formal Structure of Organizations: The Diffusion of Civil Service Reform, 1880-1934." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 28(1): 22.
- Tolbert and Zucker. 1996. "The Institutionalization of Institutional Theory." S. Clegg, C. Hardy, W. Nord, eds. *Handbook of Organization Studies*. Sage, London, 175-190.
- Tuchman, Gaye. 2009. *Wannabe U: Inside the Corporate University*. University of Chicago Press.
- Van Hoy, Jerry. 1993. "Intraprofessional Politics and Professional Regulation." *Work and Occupations* 20(1): 90-109.
- Weiss, Robert S. 1994. *Learning From Strangers: The Art and Method of Qualitative Interview Studies*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Wagenaar, Theodore C. 2002. "Outcomes Assessment in Sociology: Prevalence and Impact." *Teaching Sociology* 30(4): 403-13.
- Wagenaar, Theodore C. 1991. "Goals for the Discipline?" *Teaching Sociology* 19(1): 92-95.

Zald, Mayer N. and Michael A. Berger. 1978. "Social Movements in Organizations: Coup d'Etat, Insurgency, and Mass Movements." *American Journal of Sociology* 83(4): 823-861.

Footnotes References

January 73v1n1. <https://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/asa.01.1973.pdf>

August 73v1n6. <https://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/asa.08.1973.pdf>

May 74v2n5. <https://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/asa.08.1973.pdf>

August 74v2n6. <https://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/asa.08.1974.pdf>

October 74v2n7. <https://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/asa.10.1974.pdf>

August 75v3n6. <https://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/asa.06.1975.pdf>

May 76v4n5. <https://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/asa.05.1976.pdf>

August 76v4n6. <https://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/asa.06.1976.pdf>

December 76v4n9. <https://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/asa.09.1976.pdf>

January 77v5n1. <https://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/asa.01.1977.pdf>

August 77v5n6. <https://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/asa.08.1977.pdf>

January 78v6n1. <https://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/asa.01.1978.pdf>

April 78v6n4. <https://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/asa.04.1978.pdf>

May 78v6n5. <https://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/asa.05.1978.pdf>

August 78v6n6. <https://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/asa.08.1978.pdf>

December 79v7n9. <https://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/asa.12.1979.pdf>

May 80v8n5. <https://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/asa.05.1980.pdf>

April 82v10n4. <https://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/asa.04.1982.pdf>

February 84v12n2. <https://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/asa.02.1984.pdf>

April 84v12n4. <https://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/asa.04.1984.pdf>

August 85v13n6. <https://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/asa.06.1985.pdf>

January 86v14n1. https://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/asa.01.1986_0.pdf

August 87v15n6. <https://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/asa.06.1987.pdf>

October 87v15n9. <https://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/asa.07.1987.pdf>

May 89v17n5. https://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/asa.05.1989_0.pdf

August 91v19n6. <https://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/asa.06.1991.pdf>

July/August 97v25n6. <https://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/asa.06.1997.pdf>

May/June 99v27n5. https://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/fn_1999_05_may_june.pdf

April 201v29n4. https://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/fn_2001_04_april.pdf

December 01v29n9. "Section on Undergraduate Education Changes Mission, Name".
<https://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/asa.01.1973.pdf>

December 04v3n9. https://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/fn_2004_09_dec.pdf

February 04v32n2. Bute, Monte. "State of the State Sociology Societies: Let 50 Flowers Bloom".
https://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/fn_2004_02_feb.pdf

January 06v34n1. <https://www.asanet.org/Footnotes-2006>

April 07v35n4. https://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/fn_2007_04.pdf

December 08v36n9. https://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/fn_2008_09.pdf

March 10v38n3. https://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/fn_2010_03.pdf

March 10v38n5. https://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/fn_2010_03.pdf

April 11v39n4. https://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/fn_2011_04.pdf

Rachel Elizabeth Lovis

Vita

2020

EDUCATION

University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago, IL.

Ph.D., Sociology. May 2013-August 2020.

Concentration: Work, Organizations and the Economy

Dissertation, August 2020: *“Cracking the Council’: Intraprofessional Change in the Sociology Teaching and Learning Movement”.*

M.A., Sociology, August 2010-May 2013.

Preliminary Examinations, August 2013. Concentration: Organizations

Master’s Thesis, May 2013: *“Everybody’s Money is Green: Institutional logics in the Food-Service Industry of a New Immigrant Destination”.*

The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI.

B.A., Latin American and Caribbean Studies, 2005.

Minors: Anthropology; Spanish

Senior Thesis, May 2005: *“The Coffee Economy of Nicaragua: Can Fair Trade Help Improve the Lives of Small Coffee Farmers?”*

ACADEMIC INTERESTS

My interests include work, organizations, and the economy, social movements, and the scholarship of teaching and learning in sociology.

RESEARCH

Dissertation Research. Sociology, University of Illinois at Chicago. January 2016 – 2020

- Qualitative interviews with ASA members involved in teaching and learning of sociology
- Participant observation at ASA convenings of SoTL scholars
- Content analysis of academic journal articles on the Sociology core curriculum

Graduate Research Assistant, Farmers Market Project. University of Illinois at Chicago. 2013 - 2014

- Carried out participant observation at weekly farmers markets in Chicago

- Identified research participants
- Interviewed vendors about farmers markets

Graduate Research Assistant, Chicago Area Study, Lake County IL. Sociology, University of Illinois, Chicago, IL. June - July 2010.

- Identified research participants and administered open ended qualitative interviews
- Transcribed and coded qualitative data
- Tracked and mapped employment agencies

Northwest Michigan Health Services, Inc. Traverse City, MI. June 2006 - August 2006.

- Conducted enumeration study and needs assessment of the migrant and seasonal farmworkers
- Provided educational health services in migrant camps

Field Survey Volunteer, UM Sock Experiment, Lincoln Park, Michigan; University of Michigan. January - May, 2005. Directed by Ian Robinson, Department of Sociology.

- Investigated consumer interest in paying higher prices for ethically made products.
- Surveyed customers' purchasing habits from a research test display.

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

University of Illinois at Chicago. Chicago, IL. 2010 – 2017

North Central College, Naperville IL. 2016 – 2018.

Lead Instructor:

- Introduction to Sociology
- Social Problems
- Sociology of Work
- Gender and Society
- Qualitative Research Methods

Teaching Assistant:

- Introduction to Sociology
- Social Problems
- Sociology of Work
- Gender and Sexuality
- Research Methods
- Senior Research Experience

English as a Second Language Instructor. SEIU Local 1. Chicago, IL. September 2015 – May 2016.

- Instruct adult learners of English as a Second Language.

English as a Second Language Tutor. Truman College. Chicago, IL. May 2009 - October 2010.

- Assist adult learners of English as a Second Language, including Speaking, Pronunciation, Grammar, Reading, and Writing.

PROFESSIONAL PRESENTATIONS

“Community Revitalization in a New Immigrant Destination: Economic Incorporation of Immigrant Entrepreneurs”. Midwest Sociological Society, Minneapolis, MN. March 2012.

“Learning About Lithics in Lawrence County, Archaeological Analysis on the Pearl River, Mississippi”. Poster presentation, Undergraduate Research Opportunity Program (UROP), University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, May 2002.

PUBLICATIONS

Journal Articles

Ruehs, Emily, Regina Pessagno, Rachel Lovis, William Scarborough, Michael De Anda Muniz, Maximillian Cuddy, Jesse Holzman, and Dennis Kass. 2018. “A Relevant Pedagogy: Outcomes from a High School Sociology Research Practicum”. *The Journal of Public and Professional Sociology* 10 (2), Article 2.

Book Reviews

Book Review: *Ways of Social Change: Making Sense of Modern Times*. 2nd ed. Rachel Lovis. *Teaching Sociology* 46(1):75-77.

UNIVERSITY SERVICE

- Member, Organizing Committee, Chicago Ethnography Conference, 2016-2017
- Representative, Graduate Student Council, 2014-2015
- Secretary, Sociology Graduate Student Organization, 2011-2012
- Member, Public Sociology Working Group, Fall 2011

VOLUNTEER SERVICE

UIC Graduate Student Mentor, Little Village Infinity High School, September 2015 – May 2016.

- Mentor senior high school students on advanced sociology research projects
- Meet students weekly to assist in research activities and writing skills

OTHER EMPLOYMENT

SAGE Publishing, Oct 2018-present

- Identify digital materials to support multimedia learning assessments
- Write test bank and assessment questions for digital textbook content.

Testing Coordinator, Disability Resource Center, University of Illinois Chicago, Aug 2017-Dec 2019

- Coordinated testing operations for students with disability accommodations

Program Assistant, Multilingual Chicago, Chicago IL, February - July 2010.

- Conducted administrative duties including program, supply and material management
- Prepared class materials for foreign language classes

Development Assistant. National People's Action. Chicago, IL. May 2009 - November 2009.

- Assisted Development Director with grant writing and reports to Foundations
- Coordinated Direct Mailing Appeals
- Managed contract maintenance with Foundations

Director/Organizer. San Lucas Workers Center, Chicago, IL. May 2008 - March 2009.

- Coordinated worker rights campaign against Chicago day labor agencies
- Conducted leadership development among temporary workers
- Managed budget and finances

Campaign Organizer. Farm Labor Organizing Committee (FLOC). Dudley, NC. July 2007 - March 2008.

- Visited domestic labor camps to empower workers about their labor rights
- Coordinated events to mobilize supporters around organizing campaigns
- Managed bookkeeping and finances

Program Assistant. International Labor Rights Fund (ILRF). September 2006 through June 2007.

- Provided support on campaign work in Latin America
- Assisted in fundraising activities, including grants management and database upkeep
- Provided general administrative support to ILRF staff

Circulation Assistant. University of Michigan Libraries. Sept 2002 to May 2005.

- Performed library catalog searches for items relevant to School of Social Work
- Assisted in general upkeep of library and associated computing site
- Staffed checkout desk in order to service library patron needs

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS

American Sociological Association
Midwest Sociological Society

SCHOLARSHIPS AND AWARDS

Latin American and Caribbean Studies Travel Grant, University of Michigan, March 2005.
Dean's List, University of Michigan, Fall 2002
Michigan Merit Award Scholarship, 2001-2002.
University of Michigan Alumni Association Scholarship, 2001-2002.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE SKILLS

- Spanish - Fluent in Speaking, Reading, and Writing