Public sociology is a dialogue between social scientists and society about how to understand the present and how to shape the future. This article seeks to contribute in three ways to recent initiatives promoting public sociology. First, by developing a broader concept of engaged social science that includes public sociology and policy or applied sociology, which solves specific social problems. Second, by suggesting ways to move toward greater engagement. Projects centered on creating new theory, the core work of professional sociology, can incorporate elements of engaged work. Policy-oriented projects can grow to include the larger dialogues of public sociology. Third, by suggesting ways to manage tensions and create synergies between professional and engaged social science. These ideas are based on a project on community organizing that includes professional research and partnerships centered on policy and public sociology. The article concludes that the movement for more engaged social science should connect with similar initiatives outside the discipline if it is to be effective at individual and institutional levels.
To help build a body of practical knowledge, I will suggest ways in which sociologists in academia can do more engaged work. I will draw from my project that started as research on community organizing and grew to include policy partnerships and public sociology. Based on this project and those of others doing similar work, I will propose some ways in which we can manage tensions and create synergies among the different forms of sociology.

My focus will be on the work of individual scholars, but I will look briefly at institutional issues. Outside the discipline of sociology, there have been important initiatives to encourage engaged scholarship. These provide ideas and support to individual scholars. They also look to change the culture and reward structure of academia. In addition to broadening itself into a movement for more engaged sociology, the public sociology movement must connect with these larger initiatives. Although the discussion focuses on sociology, much of it applies to other social sciences.

METHODS AND DATA
In 1995 I began studying community organizing in Cleveland, Ohio. In the early 1990s, the Gamaliel Foundation had created two Cleveland affiliates. Gamaliel is one of four national networks that coordinate and provide training for local affiliates that practice congregation-based community organizing (CBCO). This model of organizing was developed by the Industrial Areas Foundation (IAF) in the 1970s, after the death of Saul Alinsky, the IAF’s founder and director (Hart, 2001; Rogers, 1990; Warren, 2001; Wood, 2002). In this model, local affiliates consist of organizations, primarily religious congregations. Organizers (paid staff) train ‘leaders’ (persons within member organizations who choose to become active participants) to identify, analyze, and solve community problems. Local affiliates seek to become power organizations that change public policies and the practices of major private institutions. Although they avoid labels, the major CBCO networks pursue progressive policies. They focus on economic issues and avoid social issues that might divide their base, which is diverse in terms of class, race, gender, and religious affiliation.

I began my research as traditional participant-observation. I observed meetings of one of the local affiliates, CATCH (Congregations Acting Together for Community and Hope). I interviewed organizers, leaders, and observers. I have continued to act as a participant-observer as I have added policy and public sociology projects to this research program. Field notes and interview transcripts have been my main sources of data throughout this process.

Over time, my role changed in two ways. I began to incorporate policy and public sociology into the project. In a separate development, I became a leader within the local affiliate, once my congregation joined. These changes raised two issues of participant-observation. First, some argue that active participation compromises research by influencing the object of study more than necessary. This is a valid concern to which I have two responses. First, CBCO is a large national movement that will not be greatly affected by my participant as a local leader. Second, I do hope to influence its practice in community partners.
a deliberate fashion, through critical dialogues with organizers and leaders about the work of organizing. This is a form of public sociology.

Second, some argue that participation compromises objectivity. Others however, contend that even full participants can maintain a critical intellectual distance from the group or culture they study (Adler and Adler, 1987). I have worked to maintain this distance when studying and writing about organizing.

While fuller participation creates challenges to accuracy, it can also increase it. As a participant, I have had access to a greater range of data than as an observer. I have participated in a great number and a variety of events and conversations. More important has been gaining a different perspective. While I continue to approach organizing critically, participating has given me a greater appreciation for the difficulty of the work.

There are similar tensions around the motivation to be accurate. Participation can lead to cooptation. One may develop loyalties to persons and organizations that discourage dispassionate critique. On the other hand, a greater stake in an organization can increase one’s motivation to produce accurate descriptions and meaningful critiques. Effective critiques serve the shared principles and values of the community partner and the engaged scholar, even if they challenge specific persons, organizations, and practices.

PUBLIC SOCIOLOGY AND ENGAGED SCHOLARSHIP

Burawoy (2004b) identifies four types of sociology: professional, critical, public, and policy. He builds this typology on two dimensions, intended audience, and type of knowledge produced. Each dimension can take on two values, as shown in Table 1. Audiences can be inside or outside academia. Knowledge can be instrumental or reflexive. Instrumental knowledge helps solve specific problems. Reflexive knowledge focuses on ends rather than means. It creates debates about underlying values and goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Audience</th>
<th>Extra-Academic Audience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instrumental Knowledge</strong></td>
<td>PROFESSIONAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reflexive Knowledge</strong></td>
<td>CRITICAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. From Burawoy 2004b: 106. b. Instrumental knowledge looks to solve problems and focuses on means. Reflexive knowledge questions underlying assumptions and focuses on values and ultimate goals.

Professional and critical sociology address academic audiences. Professional sociology produces social theory. Critical sociology questions and poses alternatives to the assumptions, theories, and methods of mainstream professional sociology. Policy and public sociology address an audience outside academia. They are forms of what is more generally called engaged scholarship (Boyer, 1990; 1996) that connects academia with the larger society. Burawoy’s typology makes an important distinction between these two forms of engagement. Policy sociology produces instrumental knowledge designed to
solve social problems. Public sociology produces reflexive knowledge, enriching our dialogue about social values and visions of the future.

Burawoy argues that engagement has been central to sociology from its beginning. He claims that the growth of academic sociology has meant a retreat into isolation and abstract theorizing (Burawoy, 2004b). In advocating re-engagement, Burawoy promotes public sociology. However, as mentioned, he dismisses policy sociology as a “servant of power” (Burawoy, 2004b: 105). This is unfortunate for two reasons. First, there are longstanding traditions of policy sociology in which sociologists work with and attempt to empower non-elites. Second, policy sociology can overlap with and contribute to public sociology.

Fortunately, Burawoy’s discussion of public sociology suggests a way to revise his typology to incorporate this kind of community-based policy sociology. Burawoy distinguishes two main forms of public sociology. ‘Elite’ or ‘traditional’ public sociology addresses broad, diffuse publics, typically through the mass media. ‘Organic’ or ‘grassroots’ public sociology involves “carrying sociology into the trenches of civil society, where publics are more visible, thick, active, and local . . .” (Burawoy, 2004b: 104). It creates a dialogue between sociologists and other members of the community, rather than a one-way conversation.

In practice, there is a wide range of public sociologies involving a great variety of audiences or partners. Projects may combine elements of both traditional and grassroots public sociology. Ultimately, the goal of these public sociologies is to “. . . nurture or shift people's perspectives, by helping them grasp the context within which they operate, galvanizing their dispersed and shattered wills into collective actors inspired by insights into the conditions of their existence” (Burawoy, 2004c: 129).

Although specific projects may blur the distinctions between elite and grassroots public sociology, it is useful to maintain the two categories as ideal-types. A similar distinction between elite and grassroots forms of policy sociology will improve the typology. These forms of policy sociology differ in three ways. First, policy partners vary from powerful organizations made up of elites or serving their interests to grassroots groups composed of non-elites or serving their interests. Second, power relations between sociologists and community partners vary. In working with powerful partners, sociologists may have more or less autonomy in designing and conducting projects. In working with less powerful partners, sociologists may dominate the partnership or they may try to empower their partners. Third, projects have different effects on the larger power relationships within society. Some may reinforce existing inequalities, while others may challenge or reduce them. Policy sociology, therefore, is not just work for hire serving the interests of dominant groups. This is not just an abstract argument. Sociologists and other social scientists have created several clusters of practices that can be viewed as grassroots policy social science. Among these traditions are ‘participatory research,’ (Park et al, 1991; Park, 1992; Ansley and Gaventa, 1997) ‘action research,’ (Argyris, Putnam, and Smith, 1985) ‘participatory action research,’ (Whyte, 1991), and ‘community-based research’ (Strand et al, 2003). The movement for public sociology should embrace these traditions as part of a larger movement toward engaged scholarship.
Grassroots policy sociology is inherently important. It also creates opportunities for public sociology in at least two ways. First, in working to solve specific problems, sociologists may develop relationships of trust and mutual understanding with community partners. These relationships can encourage and support the more challenging dialogues around values and visions that form the core of public sociology. Second, policy partnerships can give sociologists more of a voice in public policy debates. Burawoy claims that policy sociology is not effective partly because the mainstream of sociology is far to the left of the mainstream of policy debates. Brady (2004) points to some policy areas where progressive sociologists have not been so marginalized. In those areas where they have, however, partnering with grassroots groups enables scholars to enter policy debates not as isolated voices, but as members of a broader and less marginalized movement.

INTEGRATING ENGAGED AND PROFESSIONAL SOCIOLOGY

In studying community organizing, I gradually integrated engaged work into a professional sociology project. I will describe this process and try to distill some practical lesson about increasing engagement.

The Culture of Organizing and Keys to Engagement

I began my research by attending meetings of CATCH and by interviewing its organizer and key leaders. Soon after I started this research, CATCH’s organizer encouraged me to participate in Gamaliel’s “weeklong” (six-day) leadership training course. She thought this experience would be the best way for me to learn about the culture and practices of faith-based community organizing. She suggested that I participate as a leader without disclosing my researcher role until after the training. Taking the role of leader, she said, would make the experience more authentic and would avoid calling attention to myself as an outsider.

I went to the training, participating alongside about 150 leaders from affiliates around the county. Gamaliel’s national staff and experienced local organizers conducted daily sessions on the fundamentals of organizing. Topics included how to run effective meetings, raise money, conduct a power analysis of a local community, create and win an issue campaign, and build a local affiliate into a powerful force in the community.

There were also several sessions surprising to those more familiar with issue-driven or ideologically based social activism. CBCO is sometimes called relational organizing. As practiced by Gamaliel and the other networks, this form of organizing starts with building interpersonal relationships of trust and understanding among community members. From these relationships emerge conversations about values and about deep-seated angers over social injustices as experienced in our lives. From these conversations emerge issues upon which people are willing to act. Weeklong training included sessions on relational organizing skills.

Organizers have developed specific techniques for building relationships and for agitation, challenging others to live up to their aspirations and potentials. The basic relationship-building technique is a one-on-one meeting. Leaders are trained to spend 20 to 30 minutes interviewing another person. They ask probing questions about the
person’s goals, motivations, and values as they relate to their public life as members of the congregation, organizing group, or community. Skilled interviewers learn much about the other person’s life story. More importantly, from the organizers’ perspective they build a more trusting relationship with the person being interviewed by showing interest and empathy.

Agitation builds upon these relationships. In an agitational conversation, a person challenges another to live up to his or her potential and to values and aspirations revealed in their one-on-ones. Agitations are supposed to be specific. They can include an offer to help the other person achieve a particular goal. If done skillfully, agitation helps create mutual accountability. When done out of genuine concern for the other person’s development, it deepens trust.

Although relationship building and agitation are central to organizing, they also are important practices for engaged scholarship. Grassroots policy and public social science also rely on relationships of mutual understanding and trust. As with organizing, agitation can create better outcomes by pushing both parties toward better performance and mutual accountability. Grassroots public sociology with community partners is itself a form of agitation. Sociologists use our theories and research to challenge our partners to examine critically their basic assumptions and practices. For this to be a real dialogue, we have to be willing to have our partners agitate us and not just about our ideas, but also about our roles and practices.

It is important for engaged scholars to recognize the centrality of relationship building and agitation to our work. For those studying and working with community organizers or other community members whose organizations value and promote these practices, there are two additional implications. First, we can learn from them by observing how relationship-building and agitation take place and how they affect their work. Second, our partnerships can be enriched by their commitment to these practices. We can build on their strengths.

One-on-ones and agitation are emotionally laden techniques. Organizers believe their job is to agitate people to develop not just specific skills, but also emotional maturity and personal qualities of courage, accountability, and perseverance. Organizers push leaders to identify and overcome fears and habits that prevent them from becoming powerful actors. For members of marginalized groups, these may be habits of deference to authority. For middle-class professionals, they may be elitism or a tendency to be too easily co-opted by those with real power. While academic culture is intellectual, the culture of many community partners is more emotional. It helps our professional and engaged work to understand this and to learn to accept and even participate in these cultures.

In my case, immersion in this culture of relationships and agitation furthered professional and engaged work. It gave me a deeper understanding of faith-based organizing and greater credibility with organizers and leaders. Even after revealing my role as a researcher, I was taken more seriously because I had invested the time to learn about organizing. I was given greater access to local and national meetings and events, and more candid answers to my interview questions. These changes created the conditions for public and policy sociology partnerships.
Grassroots Public Sociology: Simple Forms

After attending weeklong training, I began conducting regular interviews with CATCH’s organizer. These started with a narrow focus on the work of the organization, but soon included reflections on the philosophy and practice of CBCO, its institutional structure, and its key practitioners. I began to think of these conversations as a small contribution to the work of organizing, with which I was increasingly sympathetic. Gamaliel and the other congregation-based networks encourage organizers and leaders to reflect on their work and their individual growth. I tried to provide the organizer with a regular opportunity to do so. I also provided her with transcripts of the interviews as a basis for further reflection.

For scholars studying activism, using our work to engage activists in critical reflection on their work is an important form of engaged sociology. It combines elements of policy sociology and public sociology, as activists address both specific social problems and broader social structures and processes. However, this kind of critical dialogue is often hard to establish. Some activists dismiss academia as irrelevant and insulated. Others fear airing dirty laundry to those not loyal to their movement or organization. Many believe that those who do not do the work cannot understand it well enough to criticize it. Some also believe that their model of activism does not require questioning and revising.

These concerns are understandable. They can be reinforced by academia’s culture and incentive structure, which typically discourage scholars from taking the time to build relationships with community partners and from writing in ways that are accessible to non-professionals (Ryan 2004). Policy sociology, however, can create the knowledge and trust necessary for these critical conversations.

Grassroots Policy Sociology

Traditional community organizing focuses on neighborhood and citywide issues, pressing local governments and business to address major social problems. With suburbanization, however, the urban core of central cities and older suburbs has lost population and wealth to newer, outer suburbs. The Gamaliel Foundation’s response to these trends was to start organizing on a metropolitan scale (Kleidman, 2004). Local organizations merged into regional structures. They began to work on ‘smart growth’ policies to limit or stop urban sprawl, and ‘regional equity’ policies to reduce socioeconomic disparities among communities in a region.

NOAH (Northeast Ohio Alliance for Hope), the regional organization into which CATCH had merged, began to work on a study of urban sprawl and socioeconomic polarization in Northeast Ohio. With some background in urban sociology, I offered to work on the study. Eventually I became a coauthor. To help publicize the study, I obtained funding from my university and local foundations for a series of community seminars in concert with NOAH. We then worked for almost a year to plan a major regional meeting of political, religious, business, labor, and other community leaders. The event was deemed a success by organizers who attended, including several from nearby local affiliates and senior members of the Gamaliel national staff. Having earned their
trust by working on their immediate goals, I was afterwards able to draw more of them into conversations about organizing.

Grassroots Public Sociology on a Larger Scale

Policy partnerships are important forms of engaged sociology. However, for scholars studying activists, grassroots public sociology is a more natural extension of professional sociology in terms of role, time, and product. For example, interviews serve as data for research and they can help activists reflect critically on their work. Accounts of activism serve social movement scholars as professional publications. If activists read and discuss them, these publications are a form of grassroots public sociology in which we influence actors whose goal is to affect society. One can make similar arguments about work with other kinds of community partners. Scholarly accounts of CBCO have served to stimulate deeper reflection by activists. Authors of major books on CBCO (Warren, 2001; Wood, 2002) have been invited by organizers and leaders to talk about these works and their implications for organizing. I have discussed my article on regional organizing (Kleidman, 2004) with organizers and leaders. Based on one critique made in this article, I have talked with organizers about creating a program to add more political education to leadership training. These publications were all based primarily on participant-observation and in-depth interviews, research methods that help create the conditions for critical conversations by building relationships between scholars and activists. In my case, policy partnerships deepened these relationships.

It is harder to gain professional credit for grassroots public sociology projects that do not follow from or lead to peer-reviewed publications. For example, in 1998 I co-organized a conference of community organizers and leaders, funders, and scholars to discuss collaborative work. I enlisted the help of Randy Stoecker, a sociologist experienced in community-based research, Jeannie Appleman, Executive Director of Interfaith Funders, and Spence Limbocker, Executive Director of Neighborhood Funders Group. Two days of discussion led to the realization that all parties were interested in developing partnerships that would go beyond the typical instrumental exchanges of money, expertise, legitimacy, and other resources (Stoecker and Kleidman, 1998). While valuable, the conference did not directly lead to professional publications for the participating scholars.

Similarly, several of us from the conference later worked with Interfaith Funders to conduct a major study of CBCO. The resulting report (Warren and Wood, 2001) provides an excellent overview of the history and current state of the field. It presents a range of views from organizers and scholars of contemporary CBCO’s major challenges and opportunities. Again, however, it did not directly lead to professional publications for the report’s coauthors or the other sociologists who participated in the study.

In both cases, we scholars may have failed to think strategically about how to create more synergies between engaged and professional sociology. Fortunately, recent initiatives for engaged scholarship have produced a body of literature on how to do so. I will discuss these initiatives below, in the section on tensions and synergies.

LESSONS
Several lessons emerge from these experiences. First, engagement can be small-scale and “low-cost,” in terms of time away from professional work. Good interviews, for example, generate research data for scholars and opportunities for reflection by community partners.

Second, developing relationships of mutual trust and understanding with community partners is very important but time-consuming. It helps if scholars are willing to learn about community partners’ culture and interests. Trust also develops if we help them meet some of their immediate needs in policy projects. In doing so, we can bring not just professional skills but also institutional resources and legitimacy.

Third, engaging community partners in a critical conversation about their work is difficult but not impossible. In addition to the work I discussed on CBCO, there are groups of scholars who study and work with other movements, including the labor movement, producing professional sociology as the basis for public sociology (Derber, 2004). None of these scholars, however, has written about the process of creating engaged projects.

It is important to see critical conversations about the work of community partners as a dialogue. This dialogue works best when we use our sociological knowledge to enrich the conversation, but present our views as hypotheses and suggestions rather than final pronouncements. While we believe in the value of the sociological method and perspective, we need to recognize other forms of knowledge and other perspectives.

Fourth, it is important to find ways to manage tensions between professional and engaged work, ideally by creating synergies where time and product serve both kinds of work. In the next section, I will explore these tensions and possible synergies more fully. I will continue to focus on the role of the individual scholar, but also look at institutional issues.

PROFESSIONAL AND ENGAGED SOCIOLOGY: TENSIONS AND SYNERGIES

Burawoy sees the four types of sociology as compatible and interdependent, although he is concerned that professional sociology tends to dominate the others. He also observes that academic institutions fail to reward engaged work (Burawoy, 2004b). Derber, however, argues that “… Burawoy’s assumption of an essential complementarity among the four sociologies masks deep tensions among them” (2004: 119). I will discuss three key sets of tensions: roles, skills, and time. I will discuss the nature of these tensions, how they might be managed, and how sociologists might create synergies between and among the four sociologies.

Roles

As discussed in the methods and data section, there are tensions between the roles of participant and professional sociologist. This is true whether one becomes an active participant within the organization one studies, or becomes a partner in policy or professional sociology projects with that organization. The typical concern is whether this compromises the quality of research. Less well-explored is how this role conflict may inhibit effective participation.
The habits of critical distance essential to good research can prevent one from wholehearted participation. I found it difficult to feel fully a part of the team, even after becoming a leader. I held back from entering into relationships of mutual support and agitation necessary to sustain the work of organizing. Fortunately, organizers agitated me around this issue. I slowly learned how to suspend disbelief during the process of organizing.

On the other hand, as discussed, there are synergies created by combining professional and engaged work. Gamson (2004) and Ryan (2004) discuss how their work as strategic consultants to social movement groups has helped them produce better social movement theory. Conversely, social movement theory can help improve movement activism. For Gamson and Ryan, this has centered on using theory to help activists develop better media strategies.

Despite the increasing amount and quality of social movement theory in recent decades, however, few social movement theorists have done engaged work on a sustained basis with the groups they study. In part, this failure is due to the tensions inherent between professional and engaged work. But, as critical sociology might suggest, it may also have something to do with the abstract, ahistorical nature of much of social movement theory (Buechler, 2000; Flacks, 2004). Other fields of study may have similar issues that critical sociology can help analyze and perhaps overcome.

Skills

Professional sociology calls for skills that only partly overlap with those required for more engaged work. Professional sociology is often an individual intellectual enterprise. Engaged work is typically more relational and emotionally-expressive. Academic writing and speaking to academic audiences are different from public speaking and writing for wider audiences. These differences create tensions for professional sociologists who venture into more engaged work. As someone trained in professional sociology, I continue to struggle with working in a more relational and emotionally-expressive way, and with speaking and writing more clearly. On the other hand, there are synergies. Relational and agitational skills are important in aspects of academic life, including teaching. Clear speaking and writing should enhance professional communication. Conversely, strong professional research and analytic skills are essential to successful public and policy sociology projects.

Time

The most intractable tensions involve time. For sociologists in most academic settings, faculty roles and rewards center on professional sociology. Policy and public sociology are seen primarily as community service. Sociologists are discouraged from spending much time on them. This problem is particularly acute for those who wish to develop strong relationships with community partners, a process that usually requires a substantial investment of time. Collaborations, especially when more than one partner is involved, may pay off only slowly or not at all in terms of publications (Ryan, 2004).
Brady (2004) supports the public sociology movement, but he fears it may fail partly because there has been little discussion of creating professional incentives for engaged work. However, neither he nor Burawoy mention major initiatives from outside sociology that focus on precisely this issue. The most important of these has been from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Ernest Boyer, its President, led a task force to examine the relationship of academia to society. In *Scholarship Reconsidered* (Boyer, 1990), he reported that the task force found institutions of higher education to be far too removed from the rest of society. To redress this problem, he called for an expanded notion of scholarship. In addition to the traditional scholarship of discovery, we should recognize and reward the scholarships of integration, teaching, and what he later called engagement (Boyer, 1996). Since the book’s publication, Carnegie and other organizations have sponsored conferences, workshops, publications, and other means to promote engaged work ranging from service learning to community-based research.

An important spin-off of these efforts was the Forum on Faculty Roles and Rewards of the now-defunct American Association of Higher Educations (AAHE). In a series of annual conferences in the 1990s, the Forum encouraged more engaged work in two ways. Individual scholars shared ideas about treating engaged work as scholarship and about using it to generate peer-reviewed publications. Faculty and administrators discussed ways to modify the institutional cultures and reward structures of institutions of higher learning. Several important publications have emerged from these conversations (Lynton, 1995; Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff, 1997; Rice, 1996; Driscoll and Lynton, 1999).

At the institutional level, engaged scholars can also seek ways to create sustained opportunities for engaged work. Within colleges and universities, for example, there are institutes that bring scholars and community partners together in regular projects and conversations. Creating more such institutes would be an important step forward, especially if they provide fellowships enabling community partners to take the time to discuss and write about their work.

Until and unless academic culture changes, however, sociologists employed in academic settings must focus on how to manage tensions between professional and engaged work as individual scholars. Those of us who work in engaged projects with the same community partners we study professionally have a clear opportunity. One can act as a participant-observer while working on engaged projects, gathering data about the partners as one works with them. Provided one is open and honest about this dual role, it can help reduce the tensions between professional and engaged work. While this may not be the most efficient way to gather data, working collaboratively allows one to see new things and to see them from different angles. It also can create trust that eventually pays off in richer interviews and more opportunities for dialogue.

**CONCLUSIONS**

This article has focused on three related goals. The first is to further the theoretical understanding of engaged sociology and its relationship to academic sociology. Two revisions of Burawoy’s typology move us in the direction. One is to include the concept of grassroots policy sociology as a form of engaged scholarship. The second is to see a
more dynamic relationship among the forms of sociology. These relationships include tensions and the possibilities for synergies.

The second goal is to increase our understanding of these tensions and how to manage them. Three specific tensions were discussed: role, skills, and time. Specific suggestions were presented for managing tensions and creating synergies. These suggestions are intended to enrich the existing literature on engaged scholarship. Although this literature is growing, the movement for engaged scholarship should encourage more deliberate reflection and writing about the process of engagement.

The third goal is to add to our practical knowledge of how to do policy and public sociology. The suggestions made in this article are most relevant to two groups of social scientists. The first consists of scholars whose work centers on professional research and theory. This is the audience addressed by the public sociology movement. The other group includes those whose work centers on policy or applied social science. Because the public sociology movement tends to slight or ignore much of this work, it misses an opportunity to encourage its practitioners towards greater engagement with grassroots policy sociology and with public sociology. This is ironic, because many applied sociologists have developed the relationships needed for these deeper forms of engagement with community partners.

To be more inclusive and effective, the movement for public sociology should be reframed as a movement for engaged social science, policy, and public. It should connect with other initiatives toward engaged scholarship. The resulting movement toward greater engagement can encourage and assist individual scholars. It can also help make engaged work more central to the missions of our disciplines and institutions.
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