

The State of New Zealand Sociology: an updated profile

Charles Crothers

Abstract

An update is provided of the progress of New Zealand Sociology in terms of knowledge outputs, staffing, organisational arrangements and resourcing over the last two decades since the 'State of New Zealand Sociology' was reviewed in the first article published in this journal. The inquiries into knowledge outputs cover material in *New Zealand Sociology* and also how this fits within the broader picture of sociological publications relevant to New Zealand, as well as reviewing a variety of other output formats. The situation in relation to staffing, organisational formats and resourcing is updated using a variety of sources and interpretations are offered about the extent to which the knowledge produced has been comprehensive and cumulative, and the ways in which it has been influenced by sources within and outside sociology.

Introduction

The first paper in the first issue of *New Zealand Sociology* (NZS) was a review of the 'State of New Zealand Sociology' (Crothers and Gribben, 1986) so it seems appropriate to update this and to review what the progress of New Zealand sociology (and particularly *New Zealand Sociology*) has been over the intervening two decades.

As in the earlier paper, I attempt to answer three general questions about New Zealand sociology over the last two decades:

- what is its current knowledge-base?
- what is its current person-power?
- what is its current share of research resources?

Again, as before, I retain a 'knowledge production system approach', although it might now be characterised as a 'Production of culture' perspective (Peterson and Anand, 2004). Thus 'the product' – contributions to the stock of social knowledge about New Zealand society – is seen as the output from a complex system of social research structures and resources, which are at least partially dedicated to this

purpose, and influenced by a wider environment. (For a broader treatment of national sociologies see Crothers, 2001.)

A second conceptualisation concerns the cross-over between Sociology produced by 'New Zealanders' and Sociology focused on New Zealand, which generates three types of sociological knowledge:

- material on New Zealand society produced by New Zealanders;
- material on New Zealand society produced by non-New Zealanders;
- non-New Zealand sociology produced by New Zealanders.

The fourth category of non-New Zealand sociology produced by non-New Zealanders is beyond the present scope. Both 'New Zealand' and 'New Zealander' are problematic terms although in most cases can be fairly common-sensically understood: for example, New Zealand sociologists are those domiciled in New Zealand at the time of writing.

¹While the focus of this paper is an investigation into the development of New Zealand-orientated Sociology over the last two decades. I do not necessarily put this forward as a goal that New Zealand-based sociologists should embrace or that this is necessarily a goal that should be pursued, although I would point out that if New Zealand sociologists do not produce a New Zealand sociology no one else will.

Over the last two decades some more historical work on the history of New Zealand sociology has accumulated and therefore can be drawn upon here: in particular Brickle's recent article on pre-sociological 'social analysis' (2007), McManus's (2006) study of social theory papers, Thorn's review (2003) and Spoonley (2003b) and my chapter in the Australian history of sociology collection (Crothers, 2004). (Some of the material in this paper is excerpted from others of my writings.) The latter in particular notes other available material, including some reminiscences in relation to New Zealand sociology's 'founding fathers' (Hancock et al., 1996) and Graham Fraser (Spoonley, 2003a). I also draw on data-collection which is part of a wider project (with Professor Jennifer Platt supported by a British Council grant) to developed detailed understanding to the development of several national sociologies with particular reference to the role of migrant sociologists.

¹ The term 'Sociology' is probably even more problematic: I refer to disciplinary Sociology with a capital *S* and more generic forms with a small *s*.

Compared to the mid-1980s, there seems to have been a shift in mood in commentaries on local sociology from the future-orientated ‘sociology of no sociology’ which was concerned to explain why sociology had yet to emerge, to a mixed circa-millennium combination of continuing hopes for sociology (as in the Beatson and Ojeili, 1999 symposium or Spoonley, 2003b) and backward-looking angst (as in so many other national sociologies) that it was on a downward slope.

Since the mid-1980s, the available information on academic disciplines has changed. Basic data on staff is still available through university calendars and also on websites, and research reporting (again on websites) is far better. The *New Zealand Official Yearbook* listing of important books has fallen away, but the advent of the *Performance-Based Research Fund (PBRF)* has provided a wealth of information about the demographics of staff and their outputs. Unfortunately, Sociology is embedded fairly invisibly within a much broader grouping that includes social work, social policy, gender studies and criminology.

I begin with the ‘output’ and then move on to the resources and organisational frameworks which have led to this production. Further data tables are posted on the *NZS* website (www.ipp.org.nz/NZSindex.html).

Knowledge Outputs

Outputs range across several different spheres: teaching, supervision of graduate students, consulting, social criticism, textbooks, books monographs and technical reports, conference papers and journal articles. Since journal articles are fully included in bibliographical data-bases they are more analysable, however other modes are also referred to.

Commentators agree that student numbers have fallen from the heady days of the 1970s when there was standing room only in first year classrooms, and some angst and several waves of redundancies have resulted. In considerable part this is related to competition from the various ‘studies’ but also to the increasing popularity of commercial subjects (which often incorporate sociological material). However, the undergraduate loss has been at least partly compensated by an increase in post-graduate numbers. The only source of information is the NZ Vice-Chancellors Committee’s survey of graduands, which does indeed show a

drop-off in Sociology graduands over the last few years (Table 1). (Earlier discipline-specific data is not readily available.)

Under this pressure and the influence of a changing society, teaching offerings have changed from the steady diet of a compulsory core of theory and research methods, followed by standard treatments of various specialties. More papers offered now are inclined to cultural studies or social policy studies (see Appendix 1: the AU offering is used as the example).

Table 1: Social and Behavioural Science Bachelor Graduands

Discipline	2003	1996
Anthropology	172	197
Communication Studies	358	66
Counselling	.	1
Development Studies	.	1
Defence/Strategic Studies	8	.
Education	631	1261
Geography	308	370
Labour Studies	4	1
Law (Professional)	709	742
Politics	335	307
Psychology	727	698
Social Policy/Social Work	176	135
Social Science Research	2	.
Sociology	118	185
Sports/Recreation	259	294
Teaching	702	.
Women's Studies	14	28
TOTALS	4523	4286

Source: NZVCC's Graduand surveys.

McManus (2006) reports a range of strategies for maintaining disciplinarity through social theory papers (often now 'de-cored'), pointing out that most leaven their offering with a concern with applicability to local issues.

Obtaining information on Theses/Dissertations is very difficult as they are poorly recorded, but the *NZ National Bibliographical system* lists nearly 500 theses which can broadly be classed as 'Sociological', although a considerable proportion were not completed within Sociology departments. As Table 1 indicates the number is steadily increasing over time, with the current decade already showing a very considerable crop.

Table 2: Sociology Theses

	Frequency	Percent
1950s	1	.2
1960s	11	2.2
1970s	85	17.3
1980s	85	17.3
1990s	127	25.9
2000s	172	35.1
Missing	9	2.0
Total	490	100.0

Over the last two decades, the book publishing possibilities for New Zealand sociologists have opened up (although perhaps become slightly more limited recently), and there has been a steady stream of sociology collections, although there remain few ‘proper books’ in New Zealand sociology. Thanks to the assiduousness of successive book review editors a large proportion of these have been reviewed in *NZS* (together with a steady stream of reviews of overseas sociology books.) Of the nearly 230 books reviewed (and 180 recorded in *Index NZ*: some 50 being ‘non-New Zealand’ books) a solid 60 or so (see further appendix on website) have been written by identifiable New Zealand sociologists (with almost all the rest produced by a wider range of New Zealand social scientists and writers). A wide range is included with texts, monographs, edited books and essays jostling alongside each other. Over one-third are edited compilations.

Technical reports, working papers and conference papers are chimerical. Up until the turn of the millennium, New Zealand departments of sociology produced a stream of working papers, but this has suddenly ceased. Instead, perhaps there is more recourse to reports put up on appropriate web-sites although this is only common on research project sites. A search of the *National Bibliographical System* yielded some 300 technical reports, occasional or working papers etc., with the main departments having contributed some 50-70 each and LU² and OU a

² University abbreviations are - AU: University of Auckland; AUT: Auckland University of Technology; WU: University of Waikato; MU: Massey University;

further two dozen between them. The annual conferences remain popular although often poorly attended by academic sociologists. Somewhat like a mushroom field, overnight a large numbers of participants gather and many dozens of papers are read, and appropriate rituals held before the crowd disperses with little residue in terms of publishable material (although CD-Rom or website publishing has enhanced the longevity of conference papers). Appendix 2 lists those conference proceedings which are available through the New Zealand library system. For all the effort that goes into this production of 'gray literature' its impact on ongoing New Zealand sociology seems negligible, although the social function surrounding its production may be considerable.

Journal Publishing

The previous review included a study of the articles published in *Australia and NZ Journal of Sociology (ANZJS)*, which is now updated and extended. Australian data are included to allow comparisons. The Australasian sociology journal scene has been relatively straightforward. *ANZJS* was published between 1965 and 1999 with *Journal of Sociology (JoS)* taking over from 2000 on whereas *NZS* has been published since 1986. Several special issues (see Appendix 3) have boosted article-provision. While there are other Australasian sociology or quasi-sociological journals (e.g. *Thesis 11*, *Social Alternatives*, *Sites*) these are not included here. The table produced here compares the three journals, but to some extent there are clearly period differences as well.

Up until the present some 1250 articles have been published in these journals: c1000 in the joint/Australian journals and some 250 in the New Zealand one. (Given the relative population sizes *NZS* has a higher production rate.)

In the *ANZJS* some 77% of authors are Australian (i.e. have an affiliation listed as Australia) with some 10% New Zealanders; but both *JOS* and *NZS* have hegemony rates of approximately 85%: perhaps ironic given the former's name. Few New Zealanders have published in *JOS*, but the Australian component of *NZS* is around 8%. There has been quite substantial publishing by UK-affiliated authors (especially publishing in

NZS) and by US-affiliated authors (with a tiny blip in *JOS* from Hong Kong based authors).

Table 3 reveals some interesting cross-Tasman differences. New Zealand sociology seems dominated by theoretical concerns and cultural sociology, but is deficit in terms of family and most surprisingly group interaction (including race relations).

In a second study, I expanded the scope from only examining the locally-based journals. I searched *Sociological Abstracts* for all articles which pertained sufficiently to New Zealand to be key-word coded. This provides a broad definition of Sociology as a wide range of journals are covered. In some of these articles (and perhaps this point needs closer attention) New Zealand is only passingly mentioned as one case in a multi-country study or as an example. I then coded affiliations to separate New Zealand-domiciled authors from overseas. The country of publication of Journals is available. There are some 2100 articles which fall into this search, stretching all the way back to the early 1950s (and even more interestingly with a few beyond). Of these 1/6th have been published in 'New Zealand' journals: half of these being in *NZS*. Nearly three-quarters of those in New Zealand journals were written by New Zealanders. Moving out to the broader picture, over half of the articles were written by New Zealanders so that the split (for New Zealand writers) is to publish just under one quarter of articles in New Zealand journals with the rest in overseas journals. As might be expected, attention to New Zealand is found most in journals published in Australia (6.4%), the UK (33%) and the US (26%).

Table 3: Subject-area by Journal

	ANZJS	JS	NZS
Methods	1.3%	1.3%	2.8%
History: theory	7.9%	5.3%	19.9%
Practise	2.7%	2.6%	2.8%
Policy etc	.6%	.7%	.5%
Radical	.6%		.5%
Soc. Psychology	2.8%	1.3%	.9%
Cultural	.9%	.7%	10.0%
Network		2.6%	.9%
Organisations	1.8%	.7%	.9%
Social Change	2.6%		.9%
Macro-sociology	.8%	3.3%	.9%
Mass Behaviour	1.3%	2.0%	2.4%
Opinions: communications	2.5%	2.6%	.9%
Leisure: sports	1.9%	2.0%	3.8%
Political	6.6%	6.6%	6.6%
Economic	11.5%	13.9%	3.8%
Military			
Group interactions	4.1%	9.9%	3.8%
Stratification	6.4%	2.6%	2.8%
Feminist: gender	4.1%	3.3%	3.3%
Rural	.8%		3.3%
Urban	4.8%		
Community: regional	.6%		
Environmental	.8%	2.0%	.5%
Language: arts	.6%		6.6%
Education	6.8%	2.6%	7.6%
Religion	1.1%	1.3%	2.4%
Social Control	4.8%	4.0%	2.8%
Violence		2.0%	
Knowledge	.4%		.9%
Science	.9%	3.3%	.9%
Demography: H Biology	4.1%	1.3%	1.9%
Family: socialisation	7.3%	13.9%	1.4%
Health: medicine	4.2%	6.6%	2.4%
Social problems: welfare	1.3%	1.3%	.5%
Poverty	.9%		
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Public Sociology in New Zealand

New Zealand Sociology has not been noted for its public involvement: in the recent book on New Zealand intellectuals (Simmons, 2006) sociologists fail to be mentioned (even though the editor gave a plenary address, by invitation, to the AUT-based SAANZ conference in 2003!). Indeed, whereas a couple of decades ago there was some concern and debate about sociological interventions this seems to have faded since. Sociologists are regularly called on as commentators on media issues, but remain peripheral in influencing public views. There has been no New Zealand equivalent to investigative journalists such as John Pilger, although some social issues journalists (e.g. Simon Collins from the *NZ Herald* and Gordon Campbell from the *NZ Listener*) have written interesting material. There are 5 ways in which New Zealand sociologists have become involved outside the narrower bounds of academic modes, although these are wider than those activities thought of as 'public sociology' in a narrow sense.

(1) Civic sociology: Public Sociology was built into the foundation of New Zealand sociology, albeit through piecemeal efforts which were not particularly evidence-based. Jim Robb (VUW) was a major advocate for homosexual law reform, while Richard Thompson (CU) wrote and advocated on transport and civic issues, race relations and also church related issues. Bill Wilmott (CU) was involved with China-NZ friendship links and expressed wider social concerns (e.g. concerning unemployment). Rosemary Seymour (WU) was prominent on feminist issues, with her mantle later taken up Rosemary DuPlessis (CU). Peter Davis's book editing efforts took a partially-academic path that brought attention to health and Pacific issues. More recently Paul Spoonley has been a prominent spokesperson on ethnic/migrant issues and an active contributor in debates on being a New Zealander.

(2) Government-orientated Sociology: In the early 1980s a cluster of applied sociologists working in government (in departments including Statistics, Works and Development, Internal Affairs, Scientific and Industrial Research) were sufficiently vocal that their mode was seen as a distinguishing characteristic of New Zealand sociology. Perhaps the high point was the Royal Commission on Social Policy in the late 1980s where a large team of feminist sociologists wrote interpretive essays, while other sociologists

provided advice in relation to policy areas and the commission's survey of New Zealander's values. Some in the group of government sociologists later became consultants, while others moved into academia.

More recently there has been infiltration from sociologists into the public sphere at higher levels and from outside academia: notably Steve Maharey (recent Minister of Social Development, Education), Paul Spoonley, Geoff Fougere (through the Public Health Committee), Peter Davis, Christine Cheyne, Phil Harington (Lotteries Board). This has been a broad move broadly supported by a sociologically-sympathetic post-1999 Labour-led government. Several conference themes in the early 2000s featured the relation of sociology to policy. Within Universities there is a large trend, too, for more than their fair share of sociologists to be sucked up into academic bureaucracies. While this trend could provide a major opportunity for sociology to have a positive effect, there are no obvious signs of these effects, and indeed it is at least as likely that these links have been distracting to disciplinary progress.

(3) Deep Left Sociology: Although many New Zealand sociologists flirted with Marxist approaches in the 1970s it never became a strong feature of mainstream sociology. David Bedggood has nevertheless been a persistent voice from this orientation with a few others, together with support from outside sociology: Bruce Jesson, Jane Kelsey, Brian Roper, and Rob Stephens. However, this local thread of public sociology seems limited theoretically and empirically, presumably partly because there is not much room for such a tradition to work in New Zealand.

(4) Issue related/driven sociology: Of its own volition mainstream sociology often takes aboard an agenda which includes dealing with key issues of the day and it endeavours to give voice to suppressed concerns. Its alertness to social hurt is (hopefully) in advance of the slower mobilising of government research and eventually policy responses. Examples of this approach were notable during the hard times of the late '80s early '90s when several sociologists launched small-scale poverty studies, which were followed up later in the decade by large-scale government studies. There has also been a slew of sociologists involved in supporting particular issues e.g. Peter Beatson on the disabled. Issue-driven sociology has often been advanced by sociologists who have been particularly linked to social work/social policy traditions.

(5) 'High Social Theory': An Auckland group (Laurie Simmons and Heather Worth) had some success in the late 1990s and early 2000s in inviting leading social theorists to visit Auckland: Derrida, Zizek and Baudrillard. Amazingly, the Auckland Town Hall was filled for their talks and books of local commentaries were published after their visits.

Areas of New Zealand Specialisation

In 1974 Baldock and Lally suggested that New Zealand (and Australian) sociology had been dominated by studies in the following areas (and Baldock, 1994, repeats this listing in her 1994 treatment): demography and family-related studies, studies of ethnic minorities, areal and community studies, social stratification, sociology of education, study of political behaviour. On the other hand, Crothers and Gribben (1986) show that New Zealand sociology topics sprawl across the full range of topic areas. Since, different areas of study have had mixed fortunes, and the same mixed overall picture remains. For example, whereas the absence of rural sociology was earlier lamented there has been much catch-up this area (especially from LU and OU).

Drawing on an earlier attempt (in Beatson and Ojeili, 1999) the following areas are where there has been some sociological research in-depth: women's/gender studies, Polynesian/Maori/immigrant studies, cultural studies, social impact analysis (and program evaluation), recreation/leisure/physical education (PE) studies, social policy, social reporting/monitoring, health research, demography, poverty studies, political economy, political sociology, educational sociology. Some of these areas can be fragile, for example in political sociology with Jack Vowles departure for Exeter (partly because of lack of continuing funding for his electoral survey programme) reducing the capacity in this area. Spoonley (2003b) develops an important argument that New Zealand sociology (albeit developed more by people outside the mainstream) has significant Maori aspects. This potential has yet to be realised, although recent developments augur well.

Have New Zealand sociologists contributed to world sociology, or has New Zealand as a research-site been the focus for studies which have earned widespread renown? Neither have come about. At best New Zealand sociologists have contributed a few textbooks or other texts

which have received reasonably widespread attention. While New Zealand appears as a bit-player in some international cross-national analyses (it would appear in more, were New Zealand statistical authorities to make more data internationally available – a deficit that needs attention) it has been central in none, with the partial exception of a publishing flurry focusing on the Accident Compensation Corporation (ACC) scheme and its value implications (e.g. Vosburgh and Kronick, 1980) Neither our radical form of neo-liberalism nor our return to ‘social democracy’ have led to much sociological interest, in marked contrast to the period around the previous turn of the century when there was sufficient interest that ‘New Zealandisation’ (i.e. emulating New Zealand social policy) was widely discussed amongst progressive circles in North America (Coleman, 1987).

University Sociology Programme Arrangements

In 1994 Blalock summarised the general situation as follows:

There are currently seven universities within New Zealand. Of these, five have departments of sociology: VUW in Wellington, CU in Christchurch, Auckland University, Waikato University and Massey University. The five departments vary in size from 6 to 14 tenured staff, and they employ in all approximately 60 full-time staff and about the same number of part-time and ‘junior’ staff, teaching undergraduate, honours, and postgraduate courses. There is one professor in each department. These departments have been in operation as separate entities for at least 30 years. Other departments- for example, education at Massey University and medicine at Auckland – also employ sociologists. At Otago University, which has no separate sociology department, there are around 9 people in areas such as anthropology, community studies, education and medicine who are strongly interested in sociology. At Lincoln, the newest New Zealand university, 4 staff members apply sociological perspectives to their work in the teaching of leisure and tourism studies. There are courses in sociology in teacher’s colleges, and even some in secondary schools.

The structural arrangements of stand-alone departments of sociology remained up until the turn of the millennium with substantial departments at AU, WU, MU, VUW and CU: with the VUW department the only one formally linked to Social Policy/Social Work. Sociology is now taught in the School of Social Sciences at (ex-polytechnic) AUT, as well as all

three Massey campuses (Palmerston North, Albany and Wellington), within the Otago University anthropology offerings (making it the southernmost Sociology programme in the world), and is part of the curriculum in many polytechnics and Wananga (McManus, 2006). However, other than in AU, Sociology as a discipline has been absorbed into broader 'schools', although it may continue to enjoy some autonomy as a 'programme' within the School: namely Social and Cultural Studies at MU Albany and VUW; Sociology, Social Policy and Social Work School, MU Palmerston North; Social Science, Tourism and Recreation Group in the Environment, Society and Design Division, LU; Sociology & Sociology Policy at WU. The one professor per Department rule has now been breached in both directions, with some Sociology programmes remaining 'chairless' for extended periods (UW, MU at Palmerston North) while others have sprouted several (University of Auckland now with 3 professors, and with another 3 Sociology professors in other Auckland universities).

Within the New Zealand context, the fortunes of departments have waxed and waned. VUW and CU were the two earlier established and larger programmes. But VUW failed to grow, contributed little in the academic leadership stakes, and fell from national prominence. Later, Auckland and Canterbury have been the two larger, and perhaps somewhat conservative, departments, as opposed to the equally large but more energetic MU department which sponsored both *NZS* as well as a multi-disciplinary cultural studies journal *Sites* which was established after an earlier series of working group papers, but which more recently has shrunk.

Staffing Arrangements

The number of academic teaching staff formally affiliated with Sociology (55-60) has been static over the period, although its composition has changed from time to time. There is a small top-up to these numbers from sociologists in research or administrative positions, and of course a wider range accommodated amongst other teaching units. All but 3 of the staff located through University websites have doctorates. The gender balance is even (see Table 4), although women hold lower ranked positions (partly because they entered sociology more recently). In two

programmes (WU and VUW) multiple affiliations are listed and it is found that only a few sociologists do not also hold other involvements (usually social policy). Compared to the previous study, the discipline has now ‘matured’ demographically. Indeed, the cohort of first-appointed professors has now long-retired and the large cohort employed in the boom period of the late 1960s and 1970s has begun to retire. It is more difficult to keep track of the extent to which New Zealand positions have been held by non-New Zealanders (almost entirely from the UK). Certainly, the return to UK of Professors Smart and McLelland after sojourns in NZ during the 1990s have been noticed. On the other hand, New Zealand has exported many sociologists (some of whom retain important links with New Zealand).

Table 4: Academic Sociology Staff Characteristics

		Count	Col %
University	AU	14	24.6%
	AUT	3	5.3%
	WU	7	12.3%
	MU	10	17.5%
	VUW	7	12.3%
	CU	11	19.3%
	LU	2	3.5%
	OU	3	5.3%
Rank	Professor	5	8.8%
	As. Prof.	6	10.5%
	Senior Lecturer	33	57.9%
	Lecturer	12	21.1%
	Other	1	1.8%
Gender	Male	29	50.9%
	Female	28	49.1%

Infrastructural Support Arrangements

Besides its academic departments, a national sociology can flourish only if supported by other organisations. New Zealand has very limited publishing outlets: and in particular a very limited ‘quality’ media, that

might (for example) carry social criticism. There have been some attempts to establish critical sociology outlets but these were not long-sustained (*Race, Gender, Class; Red Papers....*). Some institution-building has been propelled by the Social Sciences Committee of the Royal Society of New Zealand (RSNZ) such as the new New Zealand social sciences on-line journal (*Kotuitui*) and this has already attracted some sociological attention. Earlier in the period arrangements for a monograph series began but this was abandoned after a few books were published.

In the latter half of the period covered there has been a major advance in the availability of statistical data. After a period when Statistics New Zealand was subject to an austere cost-recovery regime, in more recent years a wide range of data-collections have been launched and sustained and extensive efforts made to make appropriate data available to the social science community and also the public. The vogue of evidence-based policy has meant that a wide array of government ministries have arranged for appropriate survey data to be collected, with the subsequent reports (and even sometimes the data) being made publicly available. Alongside the government efforts has been more effective involvement from the New Zealand social science community with international operations with New Zealand legs of international survey efforts such as the *International Social Sciences Program (ISSP)*, the *World Values Survey (WVS)* etc. There are some local survey programmes too: e.g. the New Zealand Election Survey and those built around several longitudinal research programmes. Unfortunately, though, while there is some attempt to pull-together a formal government survey research program, social science efforts in this area are less well supported and some are faltering through lack of sustained support: for example, an academic survey data archive has only just been established. A listing of surveys in New Zealand which shows a remarkable level of activity is provided in Crothers (2008b). However, academic use of the available survey data seems very limited (e.g. searches in *Index NZ* using the names of survey data-sets yield only occasional academic articles, although it is possible that data from these sources is used in articles which are published overseas). There has also been some methodological development activity

from which sociologists might benefit: such as the NZSEI scale developed by Peter Davis.

From its early beginnings, Sociology in New Zealand has been flanked by supporting associational structures. The *Sociological Association of Australia and New Zealand (SAANZ)* was set up in the early 1960s, with a New Zealand branch formed in the early 1970s, which seized its autonomy in the late 1980s. (Some of the issues concerning the split have been aired in Crothers, 2004). There has been an unbroken stream of annual conferences since, following a vague geographical schedule of circulation amongst centres. SAANZ has remained minimalist: only providing its members a relatively informal newsletter and annual conference in return for a low cost flat annual fee. Although *NZS* has more recently become affiliated with the professional body, it has been separate for most of its history. Separate representation on the International Sociological Association (ISA) has been long held although little advantage taken of the international leverage (within sociology) this allows. A code of ethics had been formulated although it then lapsed into disuse as university ethics committees became active.

Another major trend has been something of a detachment from applied sociologists working for the government or consultancies which had been seen as a marked features of New Zealand sociology earlier on. While many applied sociologists retain a broad sense of disciplinary loyalty, they are often more closely attached to other professional bodies more appropriate to their work environments.

A major structural shift has been the flowing of considerably more research funding towards the social sciences (cf. Gidlow and Spoonley, 1993; Thorns, 2003) through a range of mechanisms including the Marsden Fund and James Cook Fellowships (administered by Royal Society of New Zealand), the public health research funding from Health Research Council, the CORE funding from TEC, and particularly, successive social research funding components of FORST (eg. 'Building an Inclusive Society'). In addition, several Ministries have been able to fund research programmes and in some cases this has involved support sociological research. This is funding on a scale far in advance of the picture of puny funding reported two decades ago. Unfortunately, the social sciences have not been successful in several rounds of CORE

funding but most of this money has not been directed in a disciplinary-specific way so that its effects on Sociology as such cannot be immediately identified. As a preliminary accounting I will merely indicate the FORST social research budget (see Table 5), indicate some of the major projects which seem to be particularly related to sociology and describe some of the sociologically-related research units that have been set-up based on these funding flows. The effect of this very considerable flow of funds on New Zealand sociology has yet to be adequately investigated.

Table 5: FORST funding: Social Research Output Class

Year	\$Million
2006	8.5
2005	6.8
2004	6.7
2003	6.23
2002	4.34
2001	4.30
2000	4.20
1999	7.65
1998	7.23
1997	6.98
1996	5.94
1995	4.23

Although it would not be difficult to develop a roster of the projects funded, it would be more difficult to assign these in terms of relation to sociology. A ready-to-hand list of sociologically-relevant projects affiliated to the several themes BRCSS 2008 platform (<http://www.brcss.net/images/research%20platform%20feb%2008.doc>) might serve to sketch in the picture (the numbers refer to sociologically-relevant projects in relation to the subtotal for the theme):

- New Wealth Creation and Distribution Systems in a Globalised Context: 2/11
- Social Justice and Development: 2/14

- Transmission of Wealth/Knowledge in a Context of Demographic Change: 4/18
- Sustainability of Diverse Households, Communities : 3/11
- Building E-research Networks in the Social Sciences: 3/3.

Some of the more or less institutionalised research groups or centres which have been established can be described as follows:

(1) *Social Statistics Research Group*

(<http://www.nzssn.org.nz/pages/index.php>): a group housed in Sociology at AU, which covers the following projects:

- *Family Whanau and Wellbeing Project (FWWP)* which is developing ways to monitor the social and economic determinants of family and whanau wellbeing and how these have changed over the 1981 to 2006 period;
- *Modelling Social Change in New Zealand (MSC)* applying computer-based simulation techniques to Census data on cohabitation to test a model of New Zealand's social structure in the rapidly changing demographic and economic conditions of the period 1981-2006 with the central research question being whether the social structure— as reflected in the distribution of matching socio economic and ethnic - choices of co-habitation partner across households —became more highly stratified and segregated over this period;
- *Primary care in an ageing society: a modelling approach (PCASO)* establishing a working computer-based model of the primary care system in New Zealand in its social context and to test propositions about its functioning and development under different scenarios of demographic ageing;
- *Changing Pacific household composition and wellbeing, 1981 to 2006;*
- *Developing a hub for e-Social Science in NZ: Linking the GRID with emergent social data technologies and networks.*

(2) *Local Partnership and Governance (AU): Strengthening Communities through Local Partnerships* – another AU project (since completed) that aimed to examine and document the overall range, scope and effectiveness of local partnerships:

<http://www.arts.auckland.ac.nz/lpg/index.cfm>

(3) *The Labour Market Dynamics research programme (MU)* <http://lmd.massey.ac.nz/publications.htm> seeks to contribute to a more detailed understanding of the various dynamics and mechanisms in labour markets in New Zealand, and particularly their impact on households and communities.

(4) *New Settlers Programme (MU/WU)*

<http://newsettlers.massey.ac.nz/> updates and significantly expands earlier New Zealand research on migrant economic incorporation

with the aim of identifying pathways that overcome barriers to successful integration, and new policy interventions for enhancing outcomes for both the new residents and the host society.

(5) *Social Sciences Research Centre* (SSRC: CU)

<http://www.ssrc.canterbury.ac.nz/index.shtml> is a multi-disciplinary centre set up to facilitate a more collaborative approach to social science research within the University of Canterbury and the broader Canterbury region with current projects including Care in New Zealand; Constructive Conversations/ Kōrero Whakaaetanga; e-Social Science; Reframing the debates: Analysis of Welfare States in an Age of Globalisation; Research Programme in Human Settlement and The Role of Virtual Technologies in Creating New Forms of Knowledge

(6) *Taylor Baines Associates* (<http://www.tba.co.nz/projects/>) a Christchurch (Kaiapoi) independent research provider and consulting firm founded in 1989 which works mainly in the areas of: Social & natural resource research assessment, policy & management and Participatory processes in strategic planning and evaluation. Their FRST projects have included studies of Multiple Job Holding; Integrated planning and managing of natural areas for tourism-related development; Institutions for Sustainable Development; Resource Community Formation and Change; and Host Communities - Siting and Effects of Facilities.

(7) *The Centre for Research Evaluation and Social Assessment* (CRESA) <http://www.cresa.co.nz/> is a Wellington based firm has been undertaking social research and evaluation for almost a decade, with research focuses on encouraging community development and sustainable communities with a listing of major projects which include: Integrated Planning of Natural Areas for Tourism Related Development; Developing Special Interest Tourism for Local Economies; Sustainable Housing in Disadvantaged Communities; Building Attachment in Families and Communities; Local Government and the Treaty of Waitangi; and Rural Tourism for Sustainable Rural Economic Development.

There are a few other research groups with a sociological orientation and other consultants. Alongside this there has been minimal think tank activity in New Zealand although the Maxim Institute has patrolled morally conservative issues and the I New Zealand NZS has developed some economics studies with social implications. But many extra-university attempts at developing think tanks have been ephemeral, with a short-lived *Social Research Institute* born from the motherly embrace of

the former *Department of Scientific and Industrial Research (DSIR)* crashing within a short period.

Again, it is not clear what effects these research-funding-fueled operations have had. Certainly, material from these large-scale projects seems to have not yet penetrated into the undergraduate curriculum or texts (see Crothers, 2004).

Conclusions

Two themes which permeate this discussion are the changing disciplinarity of Sociology in New Zealand and its shifting New Zealand-centeredness. After discussing these two points, I will provide a sociological perspective on the recent development of sociology in New Zealand. This perspective must necessarily draw on part on the global political economic and cultural contexts, trends in the social sciences internationally, what else has been happening in New Zealand society, and transformations at different levels and in different ways in New Zealand institutions.

Although both McManus (2006) and Austrin and Farnsworth (2007) seem ambivalent on this point, I think it is clear that disciplinary sociology in New Zealand has become diluted, perhaps more so than in many other national contexts. This is because sociologists across many sites of their practise need to constantly negotiate with social scientists from a range of disciplinary backgrounds: not only in extra-academic activities or research but in teaching or at least university administration. In this most recent period Sociology has increasingly to fight against a closing-in horde of speciality interest-subjects (women's/gender studies, criminology, critical management theory, cultural/communication studies, Maori studies etc.). A somewhat common foundation of social theory and of social research methods also underpins a much wider cross-disciplinary consensus, and in New Zealand a shared 'sociological' (note: small 's') discourse has emerged which variously covers sociology, social anthropology, social geography, social psychology, social history, political sociology, areas of public health, educational studies, demography, labour or institutional economics and other areas of study. It is often difficult to recognise (apart from minor terminological quirks)

the disciplinary backgrounds of academics or post-graduate students across this range of studies. In turn, resistance to 'de-coring' has clearly lessened, especially as indicated in teaching structures.

Paradoxically, I think that New Zealand sociology has become both more New Zealand-centred and less so. The pressures from PBRF and the much-widening opportunities for international publishing (because of the proliferation of journal titles) are important contexts. The advent of internet communication and the cheaper costs of travel to overseas conferences and more readily available institutional support for such travel has considerably widened the operating horizons of New Zealand sociologists, although I do not think we yet have hard evidence on the extent of close working international links which have been forged or whether this is different than in previous eras. On the other hand, New Zealand has become a more legitimate research-site, and the local funding sources, institutional supports (including policy-making interest) and flood of data, provide opportunities for local study. But interests in non-New Zealand topics continue: one pattern is for many of those New Zealanders who obtain overseas post-graduate degrees to focus on a non-New Zealand topic during their studies and some retain such an interest. Correlatively, some of those migrating to New Zealand take up new topics here while others retain earlier interests.

These two questions converge in the further question of to what extent is there a recognisable 'New Zealand national Sociology'? But, beyond the brute fact of its existence, there is no evidence of the construction of any traditions that might constitute 'New Zealand sociology' (cf. Perry, 1991).

Globally, we have experienced the potentialities of the 'knowledge society' and its huge flows of signals and noise over the last two decades, and a cycle of radical neo-liberalism followed by a partial recovery towards a 'centre of the spectrum' politics. Both clusters of political economic trends, and perhaps particularly their consequences, have animated much sociological reflection and even some research! However, unravelling the complexities of changing social life has only been a minor item on the New Zealand sociological research agenda.

This period has seen major changes within global Sociology itself, which have strongly shaped New Zealand Sociology: albeit after a lag

period. A sequence of theoretical drives have impacted on sociology including feminism, ethnic-concerns and finally post-structuralism and post-modernism. One theoretical influence which has taken some local sociological root has been actor-network theory, although it is difficult to detect too much other influence (some theories that have gained some purchase in New Zealand over the last two decades include regulation theory, labour process theory, and identity theory). While it may be difficult to see particular influences there may well have been a more generic effect with many New Zealand sociologists turning their hand to theoretical work. Indeed, while it is clearly a speculative interpretation it might be argued that New Zealand sociology has increasingly bifurcated into a data-free theoretically orientated academic wing and theoretically-poor but fact-rich applied and research wings.

In terms of research methodologies a small-scale qualitative approach (albeit more usually deploying interviewing than ethnography) has become hegemonic and has been embedded in some of the wider theoretical approaches common in New Zealand sociology. Another 'ideology' which has some play has been the 'policy-relevant' phase in the early 2000s.

The reformulation of academic structures towards a tighter degree of monitoring and oversight of (both research and teaching) performances has also been virulent, although their effects are unclear, especially when placed against the (at least partially) countervailing effects of increased research funding. Clearly, there is more pressure to publish and to publish in more 'worthy' output types (although it is not clear if these should be articles or books) and for overseas audiences, but it is not yet clear to what extent New Zealand sociologists have responded to these pressures and the available research moneys can feed both international and local outputs.

Focusing on particular areas of interest would make much sense in such a small country with so few sociologists, but this has not really happened. Moreover, we tend not to build much on what has gone before. Thus Gribben and Crothers (1986) indicated some concern with the cumulative quality of New Zealand sociology production, and their observations about the limitations in the consolidating of New Zealand's sociology literature are still appropriate 20 years later.

What 'progress' has New Zealand sociology achieved over the two decades? Certainly, there are few signs that it is other than in reasonable heart: the flows of students, conference-papers and research continue, and some coherence and continuity have been maintained in the face of shifting organisational contexts. But if a higher standard of judgement is to be employed, New Zealand sociology is no further ahead of itself than it has ever been. There are few signs of cumulation, of laying down traditions, of getting any further ahead in tackling key issues in the research agenda or even groping towards some sense of shared research agenda. It is not clear we know no more than we did about the changing social realities of New Zealand, and sociologists are only occasionally seriously involved in policy debates. The requisite level of self-consciousness, leadership and organisation to tackle such an agenda of tasks just does not seem to exist.

References

- Austrin, Terry and Farnsworth, John (2007) Assembling sociologies: following disciplinary formations in and across the social sciences *New Zealand Sociology*, 22(1):45-68
- Baldock, Cora (1994) Australian and New Zealand Sociology in *International Handbook of Contemporary Developments in Sociology* edited by Raj P. Mohan & Arthur S. Wilke. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press.
- Beatson and Ojeili, (eds.) (1999) The State of New Zealand Sociology: a symposium *New Zealand Sociology* 14(2): 201-265.
- Brickell, Chris (2007) Those 'Other Sociologists': social analysis before sociology *New Zealand Sociology*, 22(2): 195-218.
- Coleman, Peter J. (1987) *Progressivism and the world of reform: New Zealand and the origins of the American welfare state*. Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas.
- Crothers, Charles with Chris Gribben (1986) "The State of Sociology in New Zealand: some preliminary observations" *New Zealand Sociology* 1(1): 1-17.
- Crothers, Charles (1994) "Introduction: Review Symposium of Recent Works on Political Economy" *New Zealand Sociology* 1994 9(2): 380-390.
- Crothers, Charles (2001) "National Traditions in the Social Sciences" in Neil Smelser (ed.) *International Encyclopaedia of Social and Behavioral Sciences* Elsevier Science 15: 10323-8.
- Crothers, Charles (2004) History of Sociology in New Zealand in John Gemov et al (eds.) *History of Australian Sociology* Melbourne University Press
- Crothers, Charles (2006a) Mapping the Social Sciences by exploring Performance-Based Research Fund data: Characteristics of New Zealand academic Social Sciences research outputs. in L. Bakker, J. Boston, L. Campbell & R. Smyth (Eds.). *Evaluating the Performance-Based Research Fund: Framing the Debate* (pp. 185-209). Wellington: Institute of Policy Studies: Victoria University of Wellington.

- Crothers, Charles (2006b) *Mapping the Social Sciences: Characteristics of New Zealand academic research outputs*. Building Research Capacity in the Social Sciences (BRCSS), Occasional Paper Series No. 3. Auckland: 2006, 22 pp.
- Crothers, Charles (2007) Race and Ethnic Studies in New Zealand *Race and Ethnic Studies* 30(1): 165-170
- Crothers, Charles (2007b) "Public Sociology in New Zealand: Plenary Panel Session". Australian Sociological Association (TASA) & the Sociological Association of Aotearoa New Zealand (SAANZ) Joint Conference: Public Sociologies: Lessons and Trans-Tasman Comparisons, University of Auckland, Auckland.
- Crothers, Charles (2008a) New Zealand Sociology Textbooks *Current Sociology* 2008 56(2):221-234.
- Crothers, Charles (2008b) Surveys in New Zealand 1995-2007: A findings list www.nzssds.org.nz/book/export/html/17
- Gidlow, Bob and Paul Spoonley (1993) "Symposium on the funding of social science research in New Zealand" *New Zealand Sociology* 8(2)
- Hancock, Merv; Jim Robb and Richard Thompson (1996) "The Establishment of sociology in New Zealand: a founders' retrospect" *New Zealand Sociology* 11(2): 317-333.
- McManus, Ruth (2006) Shifting practices in New Zealand sociology *New Zealand Sociology*, 2006 21(2) 270-288
- Perry, Nick (1991) "Book Review of *New Zealand Society*" *Australia and New Zealand Journal of Sociology* 27(3): 396-402.
- Peterson, Richard A. and N. Anand (2004) The Production of Culture Perspective *Annual Review of Sociology*, 30: 311-334,
- Simmons, Laurence (ed.) (2006) *Speaking Truth to Power: public intellectuals in New Zealand* Auckland University Press.
- Spoonley, Paul (ed.) (2003a) Special Issue: Graeme Fraser and New Zealand Sociology *New Zealand Sociology* 18
- Spoonley, Paul (2003b) Island imaginings: the possibilities of post-colonial sociology in Aotearoa *New Zealand Sociology* 18: 55-66.
- Thorns, David (2003) The Challenge of Doing Sociology in a Global World: The case of Aotearoa/New Zealand *Current Sociology*. 51(6): 689-708
- Vosburgh M., and J Kronick (1980) The Family Policy Implications of a New Social Program - The New Zealand Accident Compensation Scheme *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 42(3): 683-693.

Appendix 1: Sociology Papers, 2008: University of Auckland

Nb: asterisk indicates not taught in 2008)

SOCIOL 100	Issues and Themes in Sociology
SOCIOL 101	Understanding Aotearoa New Zealand
SOCIOL 102	Becoming Modern
SOCIOL 103	Social Policy, Social Justice
SOCIOL 105	Cultural Studies and Society
SOCIOL 106	Sociology for Auckland
SOCIOL 200	Theory and Society
SOCIOL 201	Social Research
SOCIOL 208	Work and Leisure
SOCIOL 210	Colonisation, Globalisation and Development
SOCIOL 211	Sociology and Popular Culture
SOCIOL 212	Race, Gender and Class in Australia and New Zealand
SOCIOL 213	Ethnicity and Identity
SOCIOL 214*	Sociology of Gender
SOCIOL 215*	Law, Inequality and the State
SOCIOL 216	Sociology and Crime
SOCIOL 220	Last Call
SOCIOL 221*	Pakeha Identity
SOCIOL 222	Families, Labour and Love
SOCIOL 224	Issues in Migration
SOCIOL 303	Sociology of Religion
SOCIOL 307*	The Pacific in the World
SOCIOL 308*	Law and Identity
SOCIOL 310	Applied Social Research
SOCIOL 311*	Sociology, Science and Technology
SOCIOL 314*	Women/Deviance
SOCIOL 317	Sociology of the Welfare State
SOCIOL 318	Sociology of the Media
SOCIOL 320*	Qualitative Sociological Research
SOCIOL 321*	Quantitative Sociological Research
SOCIOL 323	Consuming Interests
SOCIOL 324*	Special Issues in Gender
SOCIOL 325	Sociology of Emotions
SOCIOL 326	Sociology of Violence
SOCIOL 331	Issues and Themes in Visual Culture
SOCIOL 333*	Sociology of Health and Medicine
SOCIOL 335*	Organization and Representation
SOCIOL 700	Advanced Problems in Sociological Theory
SOCIOL 701	Advanced Skills in Research
SOCIOL 704*	Researching Islam in the West
SOCIOL 708*	Complex Organisations
SOCIOL 712	Capitalism Today
SOCIOL 713	Sociology of Law
SOCIOL 718	Research Projects
SOCIOL 722*	Remaking Aotearoa New Zealand
SOCIOL 728*	Family, Women and the State
SOCIOL 729	Modernity and Consciousness
SOCIOL 730*	Globalisation and Market Governance
SOCIOL 732	Tourism and Heritage
SOCIOL 735	Current Debates in Gender and Sexuality
SOCIOL 740	Modern Times, Modern Crimes

Appendix 2: Conference Proceedings Lodged in New Zealand Libraries: NZ National Bibliographical Network

- TASA & SAANZ Joint Conference 2007 [electronic resource]: public sociologies: lessons and Trans-Tasman comparisons, 4-7 December 2007, Auckland.
- SAANZ Conference, 9-11 December 2003, Auckland University of Technology, Auckland: Sociological Association of Aotearoa/NZ 2003 Conference : resource file.
- Social diversity and the politics of exclusion: Sociological Association of Aotearoa (New Zealand) proceedings of conference 2001 editor, Catherine Brennan.
- Proceedings of Conference 2000, 17-19 November 2000: reinvigorating New Zealand sociology: practices, projects, politics and protests. University of Waikato
- Health-related papers from the Sociological Association of Aotearoa Annual Conference, Akaroa, December 1995 edited by Pauline Norris. Working paper University of Canterbury. Dept. of Sociology no. 16.
- Tourism and sustainability: unfolding local identities; shifting global challenges: papers presented in the Tourism Strand of the Sociological Association of Aotearoa-New Zealand Conference 1995 edited by Tracy Berno. Occasional paper Lincoln University, Dept. of Human and Leisure Sciences no. 11.
- Proceedings of the N.Z.S.A. Conference. Auckland: Dept. of Sociology, 1994
- Directions for New Zealand sociology: proceedings of the SAA (NZ) Annual Conference, 1993, Auckland College of Education, August 1993.
- Proceedings of the Rural Economy and Society Section of the Sociological Association of Aotearoa (N.Z.) 1991 edited by John R. Fairweather. Discussion paper Lincoln University Agribusiness and Economics Research Unit no. 129.
- Sociological Association of Aotearoa (N.Z.) 1990 conference proceedings, Lincoln University, Canterbury.
- Proceedings, New Zealand Sociological Association Conference, 2-4 December, 1987. Massey University.
- Proceedings of the Symposium on Research Agendas for Sociology in the 1990s: Massey University, Palmerston North, July 3, 1987 jointly sponsored by SSRFC, NZSA and the Massey Department of Sociology.
- N.Z. Sociological Association annual conference programme and papers, University of Canterbury, 1-3 December 1986.
- New Zealand Sociological Association Conference proceedings, 1985. University of Waikato
- Social Policy Conference, Nov. 30-Dec. 2, 1984: programme and abstracts. Association of Social Science Researchers, New Zealand Sociological Association.
- Proceedings of N.Z.S.A. Conference, May, 1983. University of Auckland

Appendix 3: Journal Special Issues

- 2007 22(1) Sociology of Work and Organisations
2006 21 (1) Cultural Politics of Museums

- 2004 19 (2) Rural Sociology
2003 18 (1) Graeme Fraser
2002 17 (1) Actor Network Theory
2001 16 (2) Cultural Studies in Aotearoa
2001 16 (1) Sociolinguists
1999 14 (2) The State of New Zealand Sociology
1996 11 (2) The Establishment of Sociology in New Zealand: A 'Founders' Retrospect
1995 10(1) Directions in NZ Sociology
1994 9(2) Recent Books on NZ Political Economy
1993 8(2) Organisation of NZ Social Science Research

Charles Crothers is Professor of Sociology at AUT University – a post he has held since returning to New Zealand from Durban in 2001. Besides working on sociology of knowledge perspective on national sociologies, Charles is working on New Zealand's changing social structure, the political economic and other causes shaping it, and its effects in terms of patterns of attitudes and behaviour.

Email: charles.crothers@aut.ac.nz