

Article



Bureaucracy, Demography, and Midwest Sociology

Boyd Littrell, Larry T. Reynolds, Rachel Campbell

ABSTRACT This article proposes a framework for analyzing the impact of social change on universities, using Midwestern states to flesh out the perspective. The framework draws together political, economic and, demographic changes by using the concept of bureaucratic organizations. More specifically, it uses the notions of the internal and the external environments of universities as organizations to examine the impact of societal change upon universities in general and, by extension, on sociologists' knowledge. The internal environment is viewed as the administrative effort to rationalize the external and internal environments with programmatic changes. The central concerns here are financial control and privatization. To examine the external environment, the article includes demographic and economic data as well as the importance of for-profit higher education programs. Efforts to rationalize the university with the external environment have led to greatly increased use of contingent faculty and disturbing, even shocking, levels of student debt. The advantage of the framework lies in its ability to integrate diverse actors in higher education into the context of wider societal forces.

For decades, sociologists and others have warned against an "invasion" of corporate influences into colleges and universities (for example, Duggar 1974). The invasion ranges from hiring corporate executives with no educational experience into the highest posts of university administration down to the hiring of the lowest positions of part-time, adjunct faculty members. These overworked and underpaid employees have proportionately increased during the last two or three decades. These changes and many more are often lumped together as corporate or market influences.

Against this background, the authors address a question with roots deep in the sociology of knowledge: What might sociologists reasonably expect to happen to their own discipline given the sweeping changes wrought by privatization? More specifically, do the corporate influences shape sociological knowledge? To answer these questions, sociologists must devise both conceptual and empirical frameworks. In this article, the authors develop a framework to focus their investigation. In the final section, we provide an empirical illustration of the ideas set out in the first parts of the paper. This is an early step, not a final word, about analyzing the impact of privatization on sociological knowledge.

The first section outlines a methodological framework needed to clarify some of the issues associated with the theme of a "corporate invasion." We use the term "framework," rather than "model," because the latter term is widely used to call attention to the integration of variables and measurement for testing purposes. We are concerned with a methodological inquiry in the sense Mills suggested (1959:58). Methodology seeks to understand the relationship between theory and evidence. In this case, how can concepts and empirical investigations be integrated into a study of the impact of social change on a discipline and the knowledge it produces?

We construct the framework around key ideas from organizational sociology. Organizational sociology provides a basis for a wide view of the internal environment of universities as organizations. Rather than focusing separately on faculty or students or administrators (among others), we address a broader concept, a situation which involves all groups within the university. The coping decisions and action plans developed in response to the internal and external environment are reflexive: by devising action plans to adapt to changes in these environments, the relevant groups reconstitute the university and the kinds of knowledge it produces.

The second section looks toward the external environments of universities as organizations. Social, political, and economic forces create the external environment from the standpoint of university organizations. We present demographic and closely related political and economic data to illustrate important empirical features of universities' external environments. University administrators and policy makers must rationalize the relationship between the external and internal environments, as must other groups within the university. At least two senses of rationalization are involved. First, policy makers and managers must, in the words of W. I. Thomas, "define the situation" (1923:22). They must sense the scope and impact of changes in the external environment on the internal one. The second sense of rationalization requires them to

formulate and implement concrete plans and policies in keeping with external pressures; these policies and plans reflexively reshape the university in great or in small ways.

The third section discusses specifically the future of Midwestern sociology. No predictions are made here. Instead, we explore the constraints and opportunities imposed by university environments. We address the future possibilities of disciplinary organizations and knowledge. The section is an applied work in the sociology of sociology. James McKee observed, "Even good sociological work leaves behind readable tracks of its social origins and the handprint of authorial intent and value" (2000; 2001). By focusing on the Midwest region, we can illustrate the constraints and possibilities of the framework. While we focus there, many of this region's pressing difficulties and concerns are applicable elsewhere.

BUREAUCRACY AND PRIVATIZATION: THE INTERNAL ENVIRONMENT OF UNIVERSITIES

We begin with bureaucracy as our orienting concept. In Max Weber's (1968:956,7) delineation of the ideal type "bureaucracy," he envisioned a method for organizing power to achieve utilitarian ends. He emphasized the importance of specialization and subordination in organizations. Bureaucracy subordinated specialized offices and their full-time incumbents into a hierarchy of control. Records kept in files (now digitized) were essential for controlling large undertakings and the people who undertook them. Bureaucracy sought legitimacy from subordinates and from outsiders by appealing to universal rules and to calculations of efficiency.

THE FINANCIAL CONTROL OF BUREAUCRACY

No one, including the authors, thinks Weber had the last word on bureaucracy. In some respects, the sociological sub-specialty of complex organizations documents the history of refining, re-conceptualizing, and disagreeing with Weber. One important contemporary figure, Fligstein, observed a crucial change he called "the financial control of the corporation" (1990:3-32). He observed that financial managers had ascended to the highest levels of corporations and that financial controls became the technique for subordination and control. Financial control affirms Weber's view of a structure of power, but it alters his view of specialized expertise and the rationale for subordination.

Financial control, employing accounting methods and new (at the time) computing technology, provided a means of making every position in an organization financially accountable to managing authorities. All positions, regardless of expertise, could be evaluated in terms of their position in the cost structure of the organization. Within universities, faculty members whose medium of exchange was status (expertise, knowledge) found this change more than irksome: they rightly saw that knowledge would be subordinated to financial considerations whenever the two came into conflict. Faced with declining state revenues, university managers would have to decide how to reshape their institutions to balance cost and revenue. In the end, if it came to that, financial criteria would become definitive.

A thought experiment illustrates the logic. Think of a language department with degree programs in Arabic, Chinese, German, Farsi, French, Italian, Russian, and Spanish. A suggestion is made to drop Farsi because of limited student interest, low enrollments, and, therefore, little revenue from tuition and fees. Managers asking an economic question would ask "how can we offer Farsi more economically?" Under financialized criteria managers would ask how we can improve the cost structure of the university. They would not have to look far: marketing programs, teacher education programs, or some other program could easily produce higher financial yields than Farsi. Under conditions of financial control and in conflict with the value of knowledge, managers could justify the elimination of Farsi by invoking the utilitarian principle: the greatest good for the greatest number. Unfortunately, this principle invariably sacrifices minorities of all kinds.

In this and in many real situations, the proponents of the traditional university's interest in knowledge could argue that Farsi was part of a rich, world-historic Persian history and culture and that 300 to 400 million contemporary speakers of the language reside in Middle Eastern regions of the world. In the real world, the lack of Farsi programs had national security implications in the aftermath of 9/11. At that time security agencies reportedly urgently sought Farsi speakers to translate intelligence documents which had piled upon on their desks.

As the thought experiment illustrates, when university managers and policy makers face budget shortfalls, as they inevitably do, their choices in realigning programs reshape universities. The introduction of technology, including web-based instruction, across-the-board budget cuts, reallocation of funds to programs, and lower priced labor (adjunct faculty) have all reshaped universities in the recent past.

The case of contingent faculty is noteworthy. The term refers to non-tenure track or limited term contract instructors. Several kinds of contingent teachers work on campuses. Some are technical experts who teach a class; for example, a realtor with a master's degree may teach a real estate course in a business school or an English department may hire several people to teach first-year writing courses. However, contingent faculty members increasingly teach more advanced university courses. One such sociologist (a PhD) refers to herself as a "freeway flier," because she drives from college to college in the area getting together enough courses to make a modest living. She must teach about 1.5 times the number of courses ordinarily considered to be a full-time load in order to earn an income of about one-half the salary of a first-year, tenure-track faculty member. She receives no benefits. While tenure-track instructors are visiting with students or preparing for class, she is driving to the next town to teach another course.

The financial control of university bureaucracies is now a central feature of their internal environments. It also provides a rationale for the closely related development of "privatization," both within state universities and outside of them. Privatization has accelerated in much of the world since the 1960s in part because it appeals to a basic bureaucratic formula for legitimacy: financial efficiency.

PRIVATIZATION

Privatization refers to replacing state-controlled entities with non-state or "private" entities. The rationale of financial control within organizations is invoked as a crucial reason for the transfer of control to private concerns. Here the line between internal and external environments blurs. We have included information about for-profit schools to illustrate the internal operations of those organizations. Admittedly, the for-profits also form an important part of the *external* environment of Midwestern and other universities. Our placement of the discussion here emphasizes the consequences for the internal environment.

Although the state universities in the Midwest continue to be state entities, they must increasingly act as private organizations. State appropriations have been eroding as a fraction of university budgets for many years. For example, tax support now provides just over 10 percent of the University of California's budget (Kirp 2013:13). According to the University of Wisconsin-Madison's publication "Budget in Brief for 2014 – 2015" (2015), state revenues constituted 17 percent of the UWM's revenues. Tuition revenues provided the same 17 percent, as did gifts

and non-federal grants; “auxiliaries,” including athletics and medical center revenues, added another 13 percent.

Even these hybrid universities operate in an increasingly privatized system of higher education. In 2006, the U.S. Congress, in the face of industry lobbying, permitted for-profit universities to receive federal funds for higher education. In that year, three such companies received \$5.3 billion dollars in federal revenues for 491,670 students on 200 campuses (*New York Times* 2006:17). In 2010, the General Accounting Office (U.S. GAO 2010) reported the total number of students in such schools had risen to 1.8 million. In 2009, “students received more than \$4 billion in Pell grants and more than \$20 billion in federal loans.

In 2012, the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee (HELP) under chairperson Senator Tom Harkin (U.S. Senate 2012) issued an 800-page report that revealed egregious misconduct by the for-profit higher education industry. Among the misconduct uncovered by the investigation, were outright fraud (advising students to misrepresent financial information) along with gross misrepresentations to students about the value of certification programs, prospective earnings, and debt load. These students are, in turn, defaulting on government guaranteed loans at higher rates.

Stefan Collini’s (2014:3) discussion of the privatization of higher education in the United Kingdom draws on the United States’ experience. Referring to the HELP report, for example, he wrote, “60 percent of Apollo students¹ dropped out within two years,” and that of those who completed their studies, “21 percent defaulted on paying back their loans within three years of finishing.” Collini added that Apollo wrongfully received \$3 billion in student aid and that 89 percent of its funding came from federal student loans. Had the \$3 billion been equally distributed among the 13 Midwestern states to be discussed below, each state would have received just under \$231 million dollars. Even spread annually over four years, *each* state would have received a welcome annual share of more than \$57 million in student aid.

Two clear consequences follow from the financial control and privatization of universities. First, it means an increasing proportion of adjunct, non-tenure eligible instruction. In 2015, half of the nation’s college and university faculty were part-time, non-tenure track instructors (Edmonds 2015:1-3; AAUP 2015). An associate provost at Hamline University in Saint Paul, MN, about the use of adjuncts: “Yeah, it is a way to save money; I don’t see any way around that.” (*Omaha World Herald* 2014:D3).

¹ Apollo owns The University of Phoenix.

A second consequence of lowered state support has been rapidly increasing tuition costs and, concomitantly, increasing student debt. To help grasp the situation of student debt quickly, Table 1 presents a summary of the ratio of student debt to average earnings by Midwestern states drawn from a report issued by the U.S. Joint Economic Committee (2013:8).

Remarkably, Missouri with the *lowest* student debt load is still more than half of the average earned income of persons age 30 and under who hold bachelor's degrees. The highest student debt load (Iowa) is more than three-fourths the average income of 30 year holders of bachelor's degrees in that state. In the Midwestern states, the median debt loan is roughly two-thirds (66.5 percent) of the average income of young bachelor's degree holders.

Table 1. Estimated student debt to earnings ratio in selected states and percent of borrowers delinquent for 90 or more days.

States	Debt to Earnings Ratio (annualized)*	% of borrowers 90 days+ delinquent
Illinois	60	13.8
Indiana	72	17.1
Iowa	76	14.3
Kansas	58	14.2
Kentucky	61	16.8
Michigan	71	17.2
Minnesota	69	9.8
Missouri	57	16.5
Nebraska	64	12.6
North Dakota	65	10.4
Ohio	75	17.1
South Dakota	66	9.8
Wisconsin	66	9.4

Source: U.S. Congress Joint Economic Committee, 2013. "The Causes and Consequences of Increasing Student Debt."

To summarize, we have employed the concepts of "financial control" and "privatization" within a bureaucratic context. Both concepts are crucial to any understanding of the internal environment of contemporary university organizations. We have also included them as crucial concepts for understanding

the external environment, as the case of the for-profit universities illustrates. In the next section, we address the external environment relying on 13 Midwestern states to provide a closer look at constraints imposed by the external environment.

Demography is not destiny, but, in most instances, it affects the future in two ways. First, the sheer number of people living in a territory is an important brute fact. Second, it influences our understanding of the present situation and of the future. Here we present demographic data and closely related economic and political data, e.g., income. These data describe important features of the external environment of university organizations.

PRIVATIZATION AND DEMOGRAPHY: THE EXTERNAL ENVIRONMENT OF MIDWESTERN UNIVERSITIES

The authors chose these 13 states to represent the Midwest based on membership in two regional sociological associations: The Midwest Sociological Society (MSS) and The North Central Sociological Association (NCSA). While this choice was arbitrary, most observers would agree that these states represent what most Americans mean when they refer to the Midwest region. It was also a fortuitous choice: three previously published articles with similar concerns have been published (see Ender and Huang 1999; Wilbert 1974; 1975).

The data presented in Table 2 describe basic demographic variables: by population size and by age groups. The states have several similarities. They have fairly stable populations, and the older and younger age groups are similarly distributed. While most of the states experienced more out- than in-migration (net domestic migration), the numbers of domestic migrants are too small to affect total population size.

With two exceptions, since 2000 the largest states have grown slightly faster than the smaller ones. North Dakota and, to a lesser extent, South Dakota, are the exceptions. Caution about the growth of these states is in order. First, an oil boom in North Dakota prompted the greatest growth rate of any state in the United States (U.S. Census Bureau 2012). The growth is real, but historically what oil booms give, oil busts take away. Second, part of the growth rate is artificial. The denominator in the rate calculation refers to population size. In part, then, North Dakota's growth is an artifact of a comparatively small population base in the denominator of the rate formula, and this also impacts its close neighbor South Dakota.

The aging population of these states point to future constraints. (U.S. Census 2014). Most people over the age of 65 have left their highest income

years behind. As a result, most people over age 65 will be making smaller tax contributions than they have in the past. Broadly, about five times as many persons over 65 live in these states as persons under 24. That is both good and bad news. The good news is there will be about five taxpayers to help pay for each potential student. The bad news is the tax pool they provide will be smaller.

Disposable income and tax appropriations by state legislatures for higher education are reported in Table 3. Given that state revenues depend heavily, though not exclusively, on taxpayers' contributions to states, the data reported in Table 3 are an important feature of the external environment. The information in the table shows that earners in the 13 states discussed here are close to the national average with relatively small variations.

Table 2. Descriptive demographic characteristics of selected states*

State	Population (in millions)	% < 24 years old (in millions)	% >65 (in millions)	<24 years Total Population (in millions)
Illinois	12.9	1.6	13.9	206,400
Indiana	6.6	1.8	14.3	118,800
Iowa	3.1	.9	15.8	279,000
Kansas	2.9	1.1	14.4	31,000
Kentucky	4.4	1.7	14.8	74,800
Michigan	9.9	2.6	15.4	108,900
Minnesota	5.5	1.4	14.3	77,000
Missouri	6.1	1.6	15.4	97,000
Nebraska	1.9	.5	14.4	9,500
North Dakota	.74	.2	14.2	1,480
Ohio	11.6	3.0	15.5	348,000
South Dakota	.85	.2	15.2	1,700
Wisconsin	5.8	1.5	15.2	87,000

*Source: U.S. Census 2014, as reported on American FactFinder. Downloaded, Nov. 15, 2015.

The first column shows in nominal dollars the disposable income (approximately after-tax income) in the states (U.S. Department of Commerce: 2015). The second column displays state variation around the national average. In general, disposable income among residents of the Midwestern states are near

the national average, though some differences exist. Five states have disposable incomes higher than the national average, while eight states are slightly lower.

Because income taxes constitute an important part of state revenues, we have reported state appropriations for higher education as a percentage of the total state appropriation. As column three shows, this percentage ranged from roughly 3 to 7 percent in 2012. Fluctuations occur from year-to-year because of economic and/or political changes. For example, at the time of this writing, the United States was slowly recovering from a national economic collapse. This played a part in revitalization, and an anti-tax ideology was very strong when these data were collected.

Table 3. Disposable income and state appropriations for higher education

State	Disposable* Income 2014	% of Nat. Disp. Income 2014	% State Approp.** Higher Ed 2012	% Increase Since 1990-91	Average Annual Increase
Illinois	41,889	1.02	2.9	40	3.6
Indiana	35,281	.87	4.2	60	5.5
Iowa	40,254	.98	4	30	2.7
Kansas	40,613	.99	5	64	5.8
Kentucky	33,925	.83	4	60	5.5
Michigan	35,941	.88	2.6	12	1.0
Minnesota	42,221	1.03	3.1	47	4.2
Missouri	37,267	.91	3.2	48	4.0
Nebraska	42,019	1.03	6.7	94	8.5
North Dakota	47,621	1.2	4.7	213	19.3
Ohio	37,800	.93	3.1	37	3.4
South Dakota	42,133	1.04	4	200	18.2
Wisconsin	39,543	.97	3	.9	.08

*Source: Data from the U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis, compiled by NJ Department of Labor and Workforce Development, March 2015. Downloaded from Google, Nov. 15, 2015.

**Source: National Center for Education Statistics, *Digest of Education Statistics 2013*. Table 330.30

The fourth column is a summary of the percentage increase in state appropriations for higher education over an 11-year period from 1990 to 2011. The fifth column displays the average annual increase in state appropriations.

Hidden from view is the fact that population size combined with the average disposable income in the states imposes a firm constraint on state legislatures. Illinois, for example, is only very slightly above the national average, but its population of nearly 13 million contributes vastly greater revenue to the state than does a state like Nebraska with an even higher relative income. This observation is an important fact about the external environment of universities in the smaller states.

In Table 4, the states were divided into Small, Medium, and Large states based on population size. We then rank ordered them on the basis of the 11-year increase in tax appropriations. The greatest increase in state appropriations was ranked first with the lowest increase ranked as number 13. By inspection, the results show an inverse relationship between state size and the growth of state appropriations for higher education. Smaller states appropriate proportionately more money to higher education than do larger ones. The two states that are out of the expected order are Iowa, a small state with a small increase, and Wisconsin, a medium-sized state with the lowest increase of all. For reasons not presented here, one suspects economic issues and political ideology are at work. Both North and South Dakota have exceptionally large increases that are probably related to economic growth triggered by the oil boom in North Dakota.

Table 4. Rank ordering of increases in state appropriations by size* of selected states

State	Large	Medium	Small
Illinois	9		
Michigan	12		
Ohio	10		
Indiana		5T	
Minnesota		8	
Missouri		7	
Wisconsin		13	
Iowa			11
Kansas			4
Kentucky			5T
Nebraska			3
North Dakota			1
South Dakota			2

*Source: Data from U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis, compiled by NJ Department of Labor and Workforce Development, March 2015. Downloaded from Google, Nov. 15, 2015.

*The states were divided by size on the basis of population: Large States > than 9 million population; Medium States 5 – 8.9 million; Small States < 4.9 million

Most important, however, are the six smallest states and their tax appropriations as a feature of their universities' external environments. With the exception of Iowa, all of the smallest states have had relatively large appropriations paid for by smaller population bases. Even acknowledging other revenues (namely, gambling revenues, federal subsidies under the American Recovery and Reconciliation Act, and taxes other than income taxes) the heavier reliance on state appropriations in smaller states means higher per capita taxes in those states.

It is noteworthy that at the time of this writing, political attacks on "big government" are being waged on anti-tax grounds, especially in the smaller states of the Midwest. For example, Governor Brownback's administration in Kansas is one of the national leaders in this regard, and Governor Walker of Wisconsin (a medium-sized state) has explicitly attacked The University of Wisconsin. How long this will be an effective political position cannot be known, but it is clearly a part of the external environment of Midwestern universities, especially in the smaller states.

A brief summary of our position will bring us to the final concern in this article. We have set out a framework that emphasizes bureaucratic organizations. Universities are such organizations. Within the organizational framework, we have emphasized the growth of financial controls and privatization as part of the internal environment of university bureaucracies. We have presented illustrative data about the role of the external environment of wider social, political, and economic conditions. We stated the commonplace observation that the task of university policymakers and managers is to rationalize the internal and external environments of universities. And, we have said that the specific decisions university managers make reflexively reshape universities. Likewise, adaptations made by such components of university organizations as students, faculty, administrators, and staff members are part of the reflexive process of university change. The final question has to do with how changes in university management shape sociology, including sociological knowledge, in Midwestern universities.

A SOCIOLOGY OF MIDWESTERN SOCIOLOGY OF KNOWLEDGE

Here we take up an explicit issue about the sociology of knowledge as it relates to the knowledge sociologists produce. Broadly, the sociology of knowledge assumes that knowledge is to a greater or a lesser degree a product

of the social environment in which it was produced. In this section, we apply this perspective to sociology. One should note that the sociology of sociology as a sub-field was vibrant in the 1960's and 1970's (see Krup 1961; Bramson 1961; Stein and Vidic 1963; Horowitz 1968; Gouldner 1970; Halmos 1970; Reynolds and Reynolds 1970; Reynolds and Littrell 2014; Tiryakian 1970; and Schwendinger and Schwendinger 1974; O'Neal 1972). Then it almost disappears as a matter of interest for most sociologists (see Berger 2004; Cole 2001; Keith 2000; 2004; Pfadenhauer 2013; Sica and Turner 2005; Swidler and Ardit 1994; Calhoun 2007; Nichols 2007).

Our concern here is to explore the impact the external and internal environments of university bureaucracies have had on sociological knowledge. At first the question seems impossible to answer. After all, knowledge is a notoriously ambiguous word. From ancient times to C.P. Snow's (1961) two cultures,² "knowledge" has been used in different ways and for many different purposes, but our framework recommends the site of organizations as a route to empirical investigation. Because professional associations are organizations that collect sociological knowledge, they provide a space to explore varieties of knowledge.

Programs from the annual meetings of the Midwest Sociological Society (MSS) provide empirical evidence about the kinds of knowledge produced and organized by Midwestern sociologists. Analysis of the subject matter and participants in the programs offer an assemblage of sociological knowledge (Wilbert 1974; 1975).

A review of the kinds of sessions held during the MSS annual meetings are explored here as a means of seeking evidence about the impact of financial control and privatization on sociological knowledge. Table 5 provides illustrative evidence. We examined programs from two annual meetings, 1968 and 2005. We divided the types of sessions into "substantive" and "teaching" sessions based on session titles and the titles of presenters' papers. Substantive sessions refer to common sub-fields within sociology, namely, family, gender and society, juvenile delinquency, crime, and inequality. Round tables and poster sessions were not included.

"Teaching" sessions is shorthand for sessions that emphasize pedagogy and learning even when substantive matters are mentioned. For example, a session "teaching about race," was classified as a teaching session though the

² Snow identified the two cultures as the sciences and the humanities and argued that their inability to communicate stood in the way of solving global challenges.

substantive matter of race was mentioned. The emphasis of such sessions was to provide information about ways of presenting sociology. The distinction between substantive and teaching sessions roughly describes two different kinds of knowledge: substantive and pedagogical knowledge, even though they are related.

Table 5. MSS annual meetings sessions, 1968 and 2005

MSS Annual Meeting (Year)	Substantive Sessions (No.) Percent	Teaching" Sessions (No.) Percent	Total (No.) Percent
1968	(21) 95	(1) 5.0	(22) 100
2005	(149) 81.8	(33) 18.2	(181) 100

In both years, the great majority of sessions addressed substantive matters, but by the 2005 meetings, the number of teaching sessions had increased noticeably. In 2005, about three times as many sessions were devoted to teaching matters as those in the meetings of 1968. The 2005 meetings added more kinds of substantive sessions as well. In 2005, such matters as gender and Latino/a concerns were addressed both in sessions devoted exclusively to them and in other substantive sessions, for example, women and crime.

This illustration can neither prove nor disprove broad conclusions about sociological knowledge. However, it does illustrate the possibility of social change affecting knowledge. Table 5 can serve as a guide in the search for relevant data for further inquiry. For example, does the proportionate increase in teaching sessions reflect the increased financial incentives for pedagogical material in universities? Has increased funding for student research and/or travel shaped the kinds of MSS sessions that are organized at the annual meetings?

A second observation involves the review of presenters at the MSS annual meetings. No senior faculty from the Universities of Chicago, Northwestern University, or the University of Wisconsin participated in the 2005 meetings. In 1968, a few senior faculty members from these institutions did so. Moreover, most, if not all the participants from the Universities of Minnesota, Illinois, and Indiana in 2005 were students. Most faculty participants were from state colleges and universities.

A caution about this observation is important. The reference to the missing institutions is not presented as a comment about relative status. Rather,

our framework invites discussion about university organizations and knowledge. Do the changes in presenters at the MSS meetings reflect changes in university specialization? Have the hopes of the Carnegie Commission of the 1960s and 1970s come to fruition? Proposals made then sought to establish research and teaching universities.

Finally, we have focused on the Midwest. Broad social, political, and economic forces drive us toward regional homogenization. Yet regional differences remain, and many similarities haunt different regions (see Ender and Huang 1999). We think this framework should be of use to sociologists who wish to establish cooperative research efforts within and, perhaps, across regions. Michael Hill's (2005) historical and bibliographic work provides an especially good place for Midwesterners and others to begin.

CONCLUSIONS

The authors have proposed a framework for analyzing the relationship between universities as organizations and the kinds of knowledge sociologists produce. We have emphasized the importance of financial controls and privatization and their implications for internal and external university environments. In addition, we have illustrated a way to bridge these conceptual concerns with empirical data. Our concern from the outset was to adumbrate a framework for thought, research, and analysis, and to illustrate the framework with empirical evidence. Our hope is that the framework will be elaborated and refined by others.

Such a framework seems especially important in an era where sociologists face many powerful forces including those that want them to bend to the aims of corporate universities. But sociologists, and not only famous ones, must produce knowledge of the social order in which they live. This may mean multiple bases for research. Professional associations offer one possibility. Advocacy organizations may be another, though they too face pressures that may help or hinder sociological knowledge.

In his deeply reflective personal work *The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology*, Alvin Gouldner warned, "Under the banner of sympathy for the underdog, the liberal technologists of sociology have become the market researchers of the Welfare State" (1970:500-501). For a generation unfamiliar with Gouldner, this remark was very much the opposite of a defense of conservatism. He worried that sociologists whose universities were deeply incorporated into the Welfare State would lose their capacity for critical analysis

and reflection. For Gouldner, that fate *was* the coming crisis in Western sociology.

He appealed to sociologists to be aware of the danger, and to develop "a new and heightened self-awareness . . . which would lead them to ask the same kinds of questions about themselves as they do taxicab drivers or doctors." Above all," he added, " [W]e must acquire the ingrained habit of viewing our own beliefs as we would those held by others" (Gouldner 1970:25).

We have set out a framework to assist in developing the kind of critical reflection Gouldner sought. Universities have changed enormously: how do they shape our sociological knowledge? The diverse kinds of universities and colleges of the Midwest offer rich potential for diverse analyses, in urban and rural settings, in states large and small, and in states with different economic and political ideologies. Studies large and small and in between can be gathered in this framework.

REFERENCES

- AAUP. 2015. "Background Facts on Contingent Faculty." Downloaded at <https://www.aaup.org/issues/contingency/background-facts>
- Berger, Bennett. 2004. "Geezer Talk: An Emeritus Professor Looks Back." *The American Sociologist* 35(3):64-70.
- Bramson, Leon. 1961. *The Political Context of Sociology*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Calhoun, Craig (ed). 2007. *Sociology in America: A History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Cole Stephen. 2001. *What's Wrong with Sociology?* New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Collini, Stefan. "Sold Out." *The London Review of Books*. October 24, 2013:3.
- Dugger, Ronnie. 1974. *Our Invaded Universities: Form, Reform, and New Starts: A Play for Five Stages*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Edmonds, Dan. 2015. "More Than Half of College Faculty Are Adjuncts: Should You Care?" *Forbes* March 28. Retrieved from <http://www.forbes.com/sites/noodleeducation>.
- Ender, Morten G. and Shihiluang Huang. 1999. "Revisiting Regional Traditions: An Emerging Sociology of the Great Plains." *The American Sociologist* 30(1):37-53.

- Fligstein, Neil. 1990. *The Transformation of Corporate Control*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gouldner, Alvin. 1970. *The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology*. New York: Basic Books.
- Halmos, Paul (ed.). 1970. *The Sociology of Sociology*. Keele, Staffordshire, UK: University of Keele Press.
- Hill, Michael R. (compiler). 2005. "Working Bibliography on the Institutional History of Midwestern Sociology." Washington, D.C.: The American Sociological Association, as condensed from *The Centennial Bibliography on the History of American Sociology*.
- Horowitz, Irving Louis. 1968. *Professing Sociology: Studies in the Life Cycle of Social Science*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Keith, Bruce. 2000. "Taking Stock of the Discipline: Some Reflections on the State of American Sociology." *The American Sociologist* 31(1):5-14.
- Keith, Bruce. 2004. "Disciplinary Culture and the Organizational Dissonance: The Regional Association in American Sociology." *Sociological Focus* 37(2):83-105.
- Kirp, David L. 2013. "Tech Mania Goes to College." *The Nation*, September 23:12-17.
- Krupp, Sherman. 1961. *Pattern in Organizational Analysis*. Philadelphia: Chilton Co.
- McKee, James. 2000. "Sociology and Race: A Perspective that Failed." Pp. 363-391 in Larry T. Reynolds (ed.). *Self-Analytical Sociology: Essays and Explorations in the Reflexive Mode*. Rockport, TX: Magner.
- Mills, C. W. 1958. *The Sociological Imagination*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- National Center for Education Statistics, *Digest of Education Statistics 2013*. *New York Times*. March 11, 2006.
- Nichols, Larry (ed.). 2007. *Public Sociology: The Contemporary Debate*. Edison, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Omaha World Herald*. 2014. "Part-Time College Professors Push for Higher Pay." April 15, p. D3.
- O'Neal, John. 2002. *Sociology as a Skin Trade: Essays Toward a Reflexive Sociology*. New York: Harper Torchbooks.
- Pladenhauer, Michaela. 2013. *The New Sociology of Knowledge: The Life and Work of Peter Berger*. Edison, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

- Reynolds, Larry T. and Janice Reynolds. 1970. *The Sociology of Sociology: Analysis and Criticism of The Thought, Research, and Ethical Folkways of Sociology and Its Practitioners*. New York: David McKay.
- Reynolds, Larry T. and Boyd Littrell. 2014. "A Brief Sociology of Midwest Sociology: The Essential Difficulties, Possible Solutions, and a Very Modest Suggestion for Improvement." Pp 137-154 in Larry T. Reynolds, et al. (eds.). *Twenty-Five Years of Excellence in Michigan Sociology: More from the Best of the Michigan Sociological Review*. Mt. Pleasant, MI: Central Michigan University Press.
- Schwendinger, Herman and Julia Schwendinger. 1974. *The Sociologist of the Chair: A Radical Analysis of the Formative Years of North American Sociology (1882–1922)*. New York: Basic Books.
- Sica, Allen and Stephan Turner. 2005. *The Disobedient Generation: Social Theorists in the Sixties*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Snow, C. P. 1961. *The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Stein, Maurice and Arthur Vidich (eds.). 1963. *Sociology on Trial*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Swidler, Ann and Jorge Ardití. 1994. "The New Sociology of Knowledge." *Annual Review of Sociology* 20:305-329.
- Thomas, W. I. 1923. *The Unadjusted Girl: With Cases and Standpoint for Behavior Analysis*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
- Tiryakian, Edward A (ed.). 1971. *The Phenomenon of Sociology*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions. 2102. *For Profit Higher Education: The Failure to Safeguard the Federal Investment and Ensure Student Success*. 112th Congress, 2nd Session. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. Retrieved November 18, 2015 (<http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/>).
- U.S. Congress. Joint Economic Committee (Senate Democratic staff). 2013. *The Causes and Consequences of Increasing Student Debt*, Pp:1-11. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. Retrieved November 1, 2015 (Google).
- U.S. Department of Commerce. Bureau of Economic Analysis. March 2015. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

- U.S. General Accounting Office. "Undercover Testing Finds Colleges Encouraged Fraud and Engaged in Deceptive and Questionable Marketing Practices 2010." See GAO-10-948T. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- University of Wisconsin-Madison. 2015. "Budget in Brief." Downloads from University of Wisconsin-Madison, p.4. Also found at: www.apir.wisc.edu/datadigest.htm.
- Weber, Max. 1968. *Economy and Society* (edited by Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich). Pp. 956-958. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Wilbert. Leonard M. II. 1975. "The Midwest Sociological Society Convention: Six Years of Meetings." *Kansas Journal of Sociology*. 11 (1):91-108.
- Wilbert. Leonard M. II. 1974. "Academic Representation and Substantive Concerns of Five Annual Meetings of the North Central Sociological Association." *Sociological Focus*. 7(1):101-112