DISCUSSIONS AND APPLICATIONS OF ENGAGED SCHOLARSHIP, COLLABORATIVE ETHNOGRAPHY IN NORTH CAROLINA

Models of Engaged Scholarship

An Interdisciplinary Discussion

DOROTHY HOLLAND, *Department of Anthropology*
DANA E. POWELL, *Department of Anthropology*
EUGENIA ENG, *Department of Health Behavior and Health Education*
GEORGINA DREW, *Department of Anthropology*

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

> *Surely, scholarship means engaging in original research. But the work of the scholar also means stepping back from one's own investigation, looking for connections, building bridges between theory and practice, and communicating one's knowledge effectively. (Boyer 1990, 16)*

Ernest Boyer, an oft-cited early proponent of "engaged scholarship," called for a set of transformations to lower the walls between academic departments and disintegrate the insular behaviors between disciplines. To open up new space for redefining the full scope of academic work, Boyer explored interactions among five dimensions of scholarship: discovery, teaching, application, integration, and engagement. The final dimension, *engagement*, emphasizes how scholars might relate differently to their teaching, discovery, application, and integration activities by collaborating with people and organizations beyond campus and ultimately directing their work toward larger, more complex, and more humane ends (Boyer 1996).

Despite Boyer's catalytic definition, "engaged scholarship" is not fixed in its meaning. Rather it is an ongoing negotiation, being produced in different places through a range of university-based and community-based practices and the dialogues between the two. Meanings

of engaged scholarship remain up for grabs, interpreted through existing and emerging methodologies of collaboration, knowledge production, and experimental practice. At the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC) an interdisciplinary working group of scholars (and scholar-activists) met for a series of discussions to reflect on various models of engaged scholarship and to construct new ways of understanding engaged scholarship theories and practices. While valuing existing models, this group sought to "un-discipline" prevailing understandings of scholarship, revaluing the position of engaged scholarship in our respective fields and networks of association. In doing so we evaluated several existing models of engaged scholarship and explored possibilities for renovating and innovating engaged scholarship as a critical, collaborative mode of knowledge production and political practice. We view this work at UNC as part of a broader ongoing effort at many universities and other sites to construct new meanings and methods of engaged scholarship, an effort that has emerged partly in response to pressures from academic institutions to develop practices of engagement with communities beyond the university.

This essay foregrounds our working group experience at UNC as a case study of the process of negotiating new meanings and methods of engaged scholarship. The process is valuable in itself, as one node of practice in a broader network of researchers constructing engaged scholarship suited to specific locations and particular urgencies. Drawing upon a series of intensive discussions among twenty to thirty faculty and graduate student participants, the essay is the culmination of a collaborative effort and an ongoing discussion. Although co-authored by four of the participants (two faculty and two graduate students), it is informed by the reflections and analyses of all of the working group participants and in all the diverse fields they represent. At the same time, the interpretation of six models of engaged scholarship, the articulation of specific themes and problematics, and the provisional conclusions presented are the authors' findings and analyses.[1] Detailed later, these three areas map the terrain of one situated discussion in hopes of furthering the dialogue on fostering greater "epistemological equity" (Lassiter 2008) in research practices and relationships. In addition to this goal, we expect the descriptions and collective comparison of the six models to be useful for introducing one or more of the models to those unfamiliar with them and for critical reflection by those involved in defining engaged scholarship in other universities and venues.

Challenges and Potentialities at UNC

For the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill to become fully "engaged" in Boyer's sense is not without significant, systemic challenges.[2] For instance, UNC partnerships with government, business, and private organizations, which all provide funding to the university, and especially the professional schools, are already deeply integrated into our academic work. In contrast, our partnerships with civil rights and social justice organizations, which represent communities who suffer from economic and social inequities, are not always held in the same esteem. That is, while surrounding communities play an integral role in faculty research and student service-learning, the impetus tends to be unidirectional—from campus to communities—and thus such work does not qualify as engaged scholarship. Already a successful and highly ranked research institution, UNC has a strong investment in traditional modes of scholarship. With its large size, the university's tendency is to be compartmentalized and discipline oriented, making dialogue and change a slow process. Stumbling blocks for developing community engagement *as scholarship* have included: a lack of clarity for academic institutions and the local and trans-local communities where researchers work regarding the distinction between engaged scholarship and public service or service-learning; the preconditions necessary for engaged scholarship; the significance of the products of engaged scholarship for the development of academic theory; and the necessary infrastructure to initiate, sustain, recognize, and reward engaged scholarship within the existing academic rewards structure.

Nonetheless, engaged scholarship is a reenactment of many institutions' purported values and mandates. Most recently, for example, UNC's previous chancellor, James Moeser, defined the engaged public university as:

> Fully committed to direct, two-way interaction with communities and other external constituencies through the development, exchange, and application of knowledge, information, and expertise for mutual benefit. . . . Community engagement must be an integral part of a university's life, not something we practice if we have extra time or if the mood strikes us or if our schedule permits or if it happens to be convenient. We must consider it an obligation and a responsibil-

ity, something that we owe society. (quoted in UNC School of Public Health 2007, 4)

In this spirit Moeser assembled the Chancellor's Task Force on Engagement and charged it with developing a plan to mobilize the capacity of the university in mutual partnerships with communities for responding to North Carolina's needs in the areas of education, health, and the economy. He believed, as do we, that UNC and the people of North Carolina have the potential to inspire a powerful discourse on the fundamental, mutually beneficial interrelationship between rigorous scholarship and the common good.

Given this history and mandate for engaged scholarship at UNC as well as the urgency of social and environmental problems in the present conjuncture, we face the task of sharpening our understanding of engaged scholarship through practice and through rigorous reflection on existing models of engagement with local and trans-local communities. This task is particularly urgent given the increasingly neoliberal administrative trajectory of the university with its heavy reliance on contingent workers, its alliances with profit-oriented industries, and abandonment by the state to other revenue streams (Giroux 2002; Washburn 2005).[3] To this end two of the authors (Holland and Eng) collaborated to organize faculty from across the university to discuss models of engaged scholarship currently employed in their disciplines. The series of discussions had three primary goals:

1. Attract and build a critical mass of scholars at UNC with interests in debating models of engaged scholarship.
2. Identify and develop critical thinking about models of engaged scholarship from a range of disciplinary and interdisciplinary literatures.
3. Foster interdisciplinarity and broader discourse on directing the work of engaged scholarship at UNC toward larger, more complex, and more humane ends.

To meet these goals the interdisciplinary faculty group began with an in-depth exploration of six models of engaged scholarship often practiced in anthropology, public health, communications, and other social and behavioral sciences.[4] What follows is a brief summary of these six models, each of which represents a point of negotiation and ongoing discussion rather than a settled conclusion. We offer these six models as points of departure for examining existing practices and then improving upon those practices, theories, and the many relationships they imply.

Six Models of Engaged Scholarship

The synthesis of the faculty group's cumulative discussions is presented here as summaries of six models of engaged scholarship drawn from the literature: (1) Community-Based Participatory Research, (2) Public Anthropology and Sociology, (3) Critical Race Theory, (4) Public Dialogues, (5) Crisis Disciplines, and (6) Social Entrepreneurship. Several core themes and problematics emerged from the transcripts of the four discussions, which prompted discussion about next steps and needs for future research and practice.

MODEL ONE: COMMUNITY-BASED PARTICIPATORY RESEARCH

Community-Based Participatory Research (CBPR) is widespread across many disciplines but especially well developed in the field of public health. CBPR emerged within public health in response to a perceived need for a more ecological and holistic approach—one that went beyond analyzing the "individual" to understand the complex and intersecting societal arrangements that shape both health behavior and access to health resources. As a collaborative approach to research, CBPR was likewise responding to the conventional practices of "colonizing" communities for the sake of the researcher and research institutions. Researchers depended on communities to advance their own careers and projects, yet offered little in return.

Barbara Israel and colleagues identify intellectual and ethical commonalities that CBPR shares with "participatory research, participatory action research, action research, action science/inquiry, cooperative inquiry, feminist research, participatory evaluation, and empowerment evaluation" (Israel et al. 1998, 175). These approaches have an explicit commitment to "conducting research that will benefit the participants either through direct intervention or by using the results to inform action for change" (Israel et al. 1998, 175). Their interdisciplinary approaches draw on alternative epistemologies and methodologies within scientific research. Participatory Action Research (PAR), especially

the Latin American "emancipatory" tradition of PAR (Freire 1987; 2000 [1970]), informs CBPR theories and methods today (Israel et al. 2005; Minkler and Wallerstein 2008; Wallerstein and Duran 2004). In addition CBPR builds upon the alternative inquiry paradigms of critical theory and constructivism that emerged in social theory in the last three to four decades.

In these intersecting approaches, methodologies are shaped not to uncover universal truths but to attend to specific local conditions that profoundly affect people's lives and frequently interfere with the implementation or functioning of "universal" programs designed to improve health or some other aspect of life. Distinctive to CBPR, as compared with dominant research paradigms, is respect for local knowledge—that is, the intellectual contributions of community-based research participants. CBPR is called community-based participatory research because it assumes that effective public health research is possible only when the partners include all sections of a community, not just the health department or other recognized practitioners. The product of the research is an intervention with a community, which itself is conceptually informed and produces new knowledge.

Israel and co-workers identify eight key principles of CBPR, which are useful in painting a broad picture of this specific collaborative research approach. These principles are:

1. CBPR recognizes community as a unit of identity, and the identity of the community is strengthened through collective engagement.
2. CBPR builds on strengths and resources (e.g., individuals, networks, and institutional assets) within the community.
3. CBPR facilitates a collaborative process in all phases of the research.
4. CBPR integrates knowledge and action for mutual benefit of all partners.
5. CBPR promotes a co-learning and empowering process that attends to social inequalities and seeks a "reciprocal transfer of knowledge, skills, capacity, and power" (Israel et al. 1998, 179) between university and community participants.
6. CBPR involves a cyclical and iterative process (among communities and researchers in production, analysis, dissemination, and action).

7. CBPR addresses health from both positive and ecological perspectives. The positive model emphasizes physical, mental, and social well-being, while the ecological model stresses biomedical, social, economic, cultural, historical, and political factors.
8. CBPR disseminates findings and knowledge gained to all partners in language that is "understandable and respectful," and it recognizes the participants' rights to be consulted prior to submission of materials for publication and, where relevant, their rights to coauthorship.

There is a distinct history of CBPR in the Gillings School of Global Public Health at UNC. In the 1950s a small group of white South African physicians and researchers collaborated with black South African communities they served in conducting the first studies of the health effects of poverty and discrimination (Trostle 1986). As the constraints of apartheid intensified, the group dispersed to continue similar work in Kenya, Israel, and the United States. Four of these physicians eventually joined the UNC School of Public Health faculty. Examples of the legacy from their CBPR work at UNC include Dr. John Hatch's intervention research on the role of the black church in health promotion, Dr. Steve Wing's social epidemiology research on environmental justice, and the Action-oriented Community Diagnosis required by the Department of Health Behavior and Health Education.

An ongoing CBPR project at UNC is the Cancer Care and Racial Equity Study (CCARES), funded by the National Cancer Institute (NCI) to Eugenia Eng and Michael Yonas in the School of Public Health and their community partner, The Partnership Project. The study objective is to engage breast cancer survivors, health care providers, and hospital administrators in determining why disproportionately higher numbers of African American women treated for breast cancer die from the disease, when compared to white women (Yonas et al. 2006). CCARES integrated the principles of CBPR with those from the "Undoing Racism" training offered by the People's Institute for Survival and Beyond. Twenty-one community meetings were conducted over a seventeen-week period to identify the problem collectively, develop research questions, formulate a research plan, and submit the application to NCI for funding. CCARES was funded in September 2006, with a firm commitment from the local cancer center to sponsor future "Undoing Racism"

trainings, give full access to its cancer registry data, support interviews with breast cancer patients, and continue to engage with the community in understanding and intervening on how this specific health disparity is shaped by race, class, and gender.

As addressed by Israel and colleagues (1998), challenges, barriers, and tensions make CBPR a demanding undertaking. Participants discuss partnership-related concerns (e.g., lack of trust and respect, disagreement over who has the right to define the community); methodological issues (e.g., the difficulties of achieving a balance between research and action); and broader social, political, economic, institutional, and cultural questions. They provide best practices for responding to such difficulties. With regard to partnership-related concerns, for example, they recommend "identification of common goals and objectives" and "democratic leadership" (Israel et al. 1998, 186); for methodological challenges, "conduct[ing] educational forums and training opportunities" can ameliorate difficulties (190). A third set of challenges is more difficult, including the broader social, political, economic, institutional, and cultural issues (e.g., expectations and demands of academic and funding institutions, and political and social dynamics within the community). Successful CBPR poses challenges to rebuild society, yet CBPR's focus on community-level activities may be insufficient to effect changes necessary at the state and national levels. It also is at odds with traditional academic epistemologies and related practices of research and publication. Support and full legitimation for CBPR calls for sweeping change at multiple levels and among a diverse range of invested actors in the university and elsewhere. Finally, defining "community" can be problematic; as Israel and co-workers discuss in key principle three, CBPR may involve individuals and groups who offer a benefit to the project yet are not members of the "community of identity."

Various researchers working within the CBPR approach call for more in-depth and long-term case study evaluations of CBPR in action, its process, and its products. Many recognize that although CBPR projects will not undo structural inequalities (racism, poverty) on their own, the process of making such inequalities explicit in the research procedure, objectives, and findings may contribute to their alleviation. Other possibilities for future research and direction with this model include looking for ways in which CBPR efforts could be compiled across a variety of communities with health disparities along lines of race, class, and gender in order to promote systemic change (as seen in the Eng and Yonas breast cancer study).[5]

MODEL TWO: PUBLIC ANTHROPOLOGY AND SOCIOLOGY

Public anthropology and sociology (PA/PS) appeared in the late 1980s and early 1990s, following several waves of internal critique and reflection in the disciplines brought on by poststructuralism, feminism, critical race theory, and postcolonialism. What emerged has been termed "public anthropology" (Basch et al. 1999; Borofsky 2000; Lassiter 2005a; Peacock 1997), "public interest anthropology" (Sanday 1976), and "public sociology" (Burawoy 2005). These trends represented a new phrasing of disciplinary concerns about contemporary social problems as part of an ethical-political turn; the mandate of this new model was that anthropology and sociology should be reaching out to engage with different publics—not just to institutions and governments but to communities, the media, and especially to civil society organizations. James Peacock advocated for public anthropology during his presidency of the American Anthropological Association in the mid-1990s.[6] In his words, anthropology needed to shift its emphasis from "publish or perish" to "*public* or perish" (Peacock 1997), if the field was to remain relevant in an increasingly globalized, complex world. Responding to this charge, Lassiter argues on behalf of anthropology, stating that because of the discipline's methodological emphasis on cultural immersion and critique, "ethnographers are ideally situated . . . to write texts that are both responsive and relevant to the public with whom they work" (Lassiter 2005b, 6). This argument extends public anthropology's practice from a reconsideration of "fieldwork" practice to include a rethinking of the politics of textual production itself.

Michael Burawoy, Peacock's counterpart in sociology, was president of the American Sociological Association in the early 2000s. In his presidential address (2005), Burawoy identified distinctions among four types of sociological knowledge: professional, critical, policy, and public. This division of sociological labor, which developed in the last quarter of the twentieth century, has shaped expertise within the field and produced different, if overlapping, types of knowledge, each with a distinct audience and objective. The core questions that internally construct these distinctions are "knowledge for whom?" and "knowledge for what?"

The answers to these core questions make "public sociology" particularly urgent in the contemporary moment. Public sociology is situated relationally, reciprocally, and interdependently with the other three types but shares a reflective and contributory position most similar to critical sociology. "Critical sociology is the conscience of professional sociology just as public sociology is the conscience of policy sociology" (Burawoy 2005, 10). Burawoy's argument for public sociology, in a sense, takes sociology back to its epistemological and ethical beginnings as a defender of civil society—a task that is particularly urgent in today's world, with its increasing incorporation of neoliberal and neoconservative principles, and in contemporary graduate schools, where training "is organized to winnow away at the moral commitments that inspired the interest in sociology in the first place" (Burawoy 2005, 14). In sum, PA/PS may be seen as responding to a heightened questioning of just which segments of the population these disciplines aim to serve, as expressing an ethical commitment to a more equitable distribution of the benefits of knowledge, and as attempting to reconstruct the disciplines in ways that are more responsive and responsible to global challenges and perils.

There are multiple publics (including students as one public) to which PA/PS responds in a variety of ways; in short, there is no one model or theoretical framework informing public anthropology or public sociology. However, building upon others' work, we identify six crucial distinguishing elements of public anthropology and sociology (Burawoy 2005; Cushman 1999; Hale 2001; Peacock 1997). These entail: (1) a process of mutual education and dialogue between the researcher and the identified public(s); (2) attention to the positioning and standpoint of the individual sociologist and how this bears upon the public(s) in question; (3) an understanding that all disciplines, including sociology and anthropology, are themselves fields of power involving hierarchical and antagonistic knowledges; (4) a strong emphasis on reflexivity; that is, the recognition of the researchers' and the disciplines' roles in shaping the objects of the research; (5) a shift that seeks to transform the academy and be carried beyond the academy; and (6) a dedication to researching and acting on social problems from the standpoint of civil society—admittedly a contested terrain, but perhaps "the best possible terrain for the defense of humanity" (Burawoy 2005, 25). And, we would add, the defense of nonhumans and the environment as well.

Anthropologists tend to merge "public" and "critical" anthropology to a greater degree than does sociology as conceptualized by Burawoy. Public anthropology is described as "activist anthropology" or "critically engaged activist research" by particular anthropologists (Hale 2001; Speed 2004). Hale, for example, compares the quality of critical anthropological research to that of more positivist paradigms. He claims that "activist anthropology" may produce better results from its engaged, more horizontal methodologies, because people tend to provide better quality information when they feel a sense of active participation in the research process, and because collective participation of "subjects" in the research process—from data collection to interpretation—enriches and validates the research findings (Hale 2001, 15). Speed makes a similar claim, that activist research yields knowledge that is "empirically grounded, theoretically valuable, and ethically viable" (Speed 2006). Finally, PA/PS not only produces research and strategies of action but also explicitly addresses the processes and politics of knowledge production. This applies particularly for the "activist research" strands within PA/PS, especially those working with publics who are in subaltern or otherwise marginalized positions. Critical and public anthropology and sociology see knowledge as situated, historically particular, always partial, and intimately linked to questions of representation.

One example of public anthropology is the Center for Integrating Research and Action (CIRA), founded in 2003, a working group of faculty and graduate students at UNC and community leaders across the state of North Carolina and beyond. CIRA's identity lies somewhere between what Burawoy calls "public and critical" and what Charles Hale calls "activist anthropology." The working group, which has expanded from its roots in the anthropology department to include faculty and students from a variety of departments and professional schools, focuses on developing a process model for bridging divides between research and action and between university-based researchers and community-based activists and researchers. Through projects focusing on food and justice, alternative economies and energy, collective action, and cultural heritage, CIRA brings together university and grassroots leaders to produce and exchange knowledge for the purposes of addressing specific social and environmental problems in regions ranging from rural northeastern North Carolina to Maya communities on the Yucatán Peninsula.[7] CIRA is presently associated with a diverse set of ongoing collaborations addressing this range of issues.

Building upon the insights gained from ongoing interviews and meetings with community partners, CIRA launched its first participatory collaboration in North Carolina: the NC Sustainable Development and Poverty Reduction Project in 2005. The project brings together UNC-based researchers with community-based organizations located in the northeast, southeast, and northwest regions of North Carolina. Although each region has its own distinct geographies, histories, and cultures, each includes counties deemed areas of persistent and near persistent poverty. In addition each of the regions is anchored by a community-based nonprofit, with involvement from local leaders, activists, and university-based researchers. Members of CIRA facilitate communication among these partners and participate in research/action projects centered on regional needs. The collaboration has decided to focus its ongoing efforts on relocalizing food production and distribution in North Carolina.

There are dilemmas or concerns within PA/PS that resonate with challenges to CBPR discussed earlier. For example, there is always the risk that research findings will not be commensurate with a community's interpretation and experience of an issue. This constitutes a slippery position for the publicly engaged researcher—being an advocate, engaged with a particular public, and then finding that the research results do not support (and perhaps even contradict) the community's aims and visions for itself. This may, however, be partially a question of methodology and the extent to which quantitative "proof" is relevant to a particular engaged research project. In other words, even if the quantitative data do not bear out as expected (or desired), there could still be a wide range of interesting and significant qualitative questions to be explored with the community about their expectations, experiences, and interpretations.

Similar to this risk of a mismatch between research findings and community knowledge, another challenge is negotiating the role of the researcher-activist as interventionist. Speed explores the potential problem of how her intervention in helping a community construct its identity in a particular way (as indigenous, for making claims to land rights) could be seen as unwarranted "meddling" that altered the politics and future of a particular community (Speed 2006). In overtly interventionist research there are always unintentional effects that must be accounted for. There is never a guarantee that "good intentions" yield "good effects," in the immediate or long-term sense. In struggles over rights, particularly in the legal terrain, a contradiction can arise when the researcher is called in as an "expert" on a particular issue (e.g., a cultural identity or practice) in a way that reinforces a privileging of certain forms of knowledge, while at the same time the researcher has been attempting to work against these historical hierarchies through a more symmetrical, horizontal approach to knowledge production.

For future discussions, we might consider models in addition to CIRA in which public anthropology and sociology have been institutionalized (such as the activist anthropology program at the University of Texas at Austin and the public anthropology projects at the University of California–Berkeley and Duke University) to identify the advantages that other arrangements offer. In addition further research is needed to understand better if institutionalizing public anthropology/sociology adequately answers Burawoy's call to advance these models and practices as movements beyond the academy. Additional consideration on the "practical effectivities" and outcomes of public anthropology and sociology might also prove fruitful. For instance, in CBPR work in public health, community partners and funding agencies frequently want to see concrete, measurable results and outcomes soon into the project, and not just in terms of academic publications; how does PA/PS respond to such demands and desires? Speed argues that an overt focus on measurable outcomes is incommensurate with the time-to-success realities of political action and movements, in which new infrastructure must be built for change to happen, a process that may take long periods of time.

MODEL THREE: CRITICAL RACE THEORY

Critical race theory (CRT) is an interdisciplinary approach developed in the 1970s in response to what was been identified as a mainstream Eurocentric paradigm and epistemology. Like feminism, it was an outgrowth of a social movement as well as an intellectual turn in the academy; its direct roots are in legal scholarship (known as critical legal studies) and struggles for racial reform in the United States. Some CRT scholars also trace its roots more broadly to early twentieth-century work seeking different—for example, non-Eurocentric—epistemologies and experiences that existed and often resisted the dominant paradigm (Delgado and Stefancic 2000; Ladson-Billings 2000).

As a contemporary model of cultural critique and engaged scholarship, CRT responds to the racialized discourses and practices of U.S. society. By bringing attention to the historical legacies and contemporary influences of racism, it has pioneered the concept of "intersectionality" to explain the confluence of race, class, gender, and sexual orientation and the hidden contributions of policies and politics to the maintenance of interconnecting forms of social oppression. Intersectionality has opened spaces for the employment of CRT in areas such as critical race feminism and studies of multiracial conflicts. Some refer to this broader approach as "critical identity theory."

There are four key tenets of CRT. First, CRT offers the notion that racism is not anomalous in U.S. society but a "normal," regular feature of social life. The second tenet is methodological: CRT employs storytelling and narratives as modes of analysis important for understanding the lived experiences of people of color and other minorities. Third, CRT offers a critique of liberalism, including some movements that have continued to make (legal) claims within a system that is fundamentally structured to limit social and legal transformations. Finally, CRT argues that it is not people of color but instead whites who have benefited primarily from civil rights legislation (see Ladson-Billings 2000 for a more detailed discussion). For this reason, CRT scholars and practitioners argue that it is necessary to move beyond the language of civil-rights law and "traditional" civil-rights tools to inform critical attempts to challenge racist and oppressive practices (Su and Yamamoto 2000, 387).

In an example of critical coalition building among sweatshop workers and their allies, Su and Yamamoto argue that engaged CRT supports social change work by using race-theory insights to illuminate and aid coalition building across social divisions. Their analysis of coalitional litigation efforts between Latina and Thai workers in the Los Angeles garment industry shows how valuable CRT can be in such a case, where despite a common enemy and a common purpose, the two groups had difficulty seeing each other as allies. Rather than trying to avoid internal coalitional tensions in the interest of presenting a unified political front, CRT urges critical investigations into the disruptive effects of intergroup grievances on coalition formation. While moving beyond "common ground" to form progressive coalitions can be fraught with tension, difficulty, and internal and external conflict, they caution that not addressing differences and intergroup challenges risks approaching issues superficially, narrowly, and defensively. It also risks missing important opportunities for collective action and building communities of justice that do not replicate oppressive social and economic structures (Su and Yamamoto 2000, 386–88). Their case suggests possibilities for collaboration among race scholars, engaged lawyers, social workers, community organizers, and community members. They note, however, the challenges of representation that critical coalitions face when trying to convey their efforts and struggles in high profile venues such as the media, where the perpetuation of race disputes can take precedence over stories of intergroup collaborations attempting to overcome discrimination, injustice, and racism.

A dilemma of CRT, as the example indicates, is that in refusing to overlook race and culture-based conflicts, it can bring to the fore tensions among groups that are trying—or have the potential—to work together. This can extend processes of dialogue and problem solving. These extended processes, nonetheless, have the benefit of enhancing the long-term potential for favorable outcomes. Potentials for the expansion of CRT can continue to move beyond the black-white race-relations paradigm to explore how diverse communities of color can coalesce over cultural, legal, and political issues. Additional possibilities for CRT include its application to community-based participatory research projects. The collaborative project with Moses Cone Hospital in Greensboro, North Carolina, and its link with a series of Undoing Racism workshops, for instance, sparked faculty speculation on the potentialities for a more frequent and explicit use of CRT in projects with a public health focus.

As in the other models discussed, a core value of CRT is that it allows for theory building, shaped in practice, in support of social change work. As such it provides openings for future work and collaborations among diverse groups that can inform and be informed by CRT. A measure of the quality of CRT, therefore, is the extent to which it demonstrates to marginalized groups the role it can play in supporting their struggles for justice and the degree to which it can produce and provoke in-depth exchanges in the academy.

MODEL FOUR: PUBLIC DIALOGUES

The mission of this model of engaged scholarship is to promote public dialogue and improve the quality of public communications. It is based

on "practical theory" and its possibilities for social change. Practitioners such as Pearce and Pearce (Pearce and Pearce 2000; Pearce 2000) argue against the perceived abstraction of theory as timeless and general; they attempt to engage an alternate vision of theory as the malleable product of a process that is always unfinished. The authors note that they experience challenges from both sides: from theorists who refuse to accept the validity of practical theory and from participants in public dialogues who do not always credit the value of theory in the communication process. The authors have employed public dialogue models in middle and high school settings to improve communication among and between students, teachers, staff, and school administrators. They seek to treat the conversations of all parties as equal, avoiding privileging one over another.

One of the main principles driving the public dialogue model is that theory matters because it informs action. In practical theory, theorists are committed to a continuing engagement in multiple conversations among/between the participants (e.g., students), practitioners (e.g., teachers, administrators), and theorists; the interests of the participants in any given project are considered to be as important as those of the practitioners and the theorists; and the goal of projects undertaken is to enable the participants, practitioners, and theorists to act effectively in collective situations (Cronen 1995a).

Such a model speaks to questions such as "What is going on here?" and "What should I do now?" Practical theory commits the theorist to a participant's rather than a spectator's perspective on that which is being conceptualized. In other words, it enmeshes the theorist in the structure of conversational episodes that are embedded in multiple contextualizing stories that extend in time through patterns of reciprocity. In these relationships the theorists' position shift from what Martin Buber (Buber 1958 [1937]) described as an "I-It" to an "I-Thou" relationship. This shift from spectator to participant is common to all models of engaged scholarship.

Pearce and Pearce attribute the tenets of practical theory to "a certain theoretical temperament: a commitment to a participant's perspective within pluralistic social worlds in which our ambition is the continuing exercise of curiosity" (Pearce and Pearce 2001, 121). The "coordinated management of meaning" also informs this approach (Cronen 1995a, 1995b; Pearce and Pearce 2000). The public dialogue approach

seeks to model the process rather than dictating the content. Inspired by Bakhtin's dialogism (Bakhtin 1981), such approaches honor spaces in which diverse voices are in conversation. The Public Dialogue Consortium (PDC) provides another example of a public dialogue project. Working in schools, PDC teaches facilitation skills to students. The process of training students to become group conversation facilitators develops their ability to remain curious, respect difference, listen for understanding, ask good questions, and deal with difficult issues in sophisticated ways. The process of leading groups in which peers and even elders participate also enhances self-regard and social effectiveness. In so doing it provides students, teachers, staff, and administrators with experiences that help them deal with controversial and sensitive issues.

Pearce and Pearce (2001) find the SHEDD exercise helpful in such processes (SHEDD stands for getting started; hearing all the voices; enriching the conversation; deliberating the options; and deciding). A five-phase, ten-step dialogue process, SHEDD is an example of the contributions of practical theorists. The authors find that the SHEDD model helps organize what has been learned in the course of a public dialogue as it also helps to describe, make differentiations, and "act effectively in enhancing school climate and developing citizenship skills" (Pearce and Pearce 2001, 121). From using such models, school administrators have noted that students employ their public dialogue skills for improved outcomes in peer-to-peer conflict. There have also been opportunities for students and teachers to explore their different understandings of respect and trust in the classroom.

One set of concerns associated with the public dialogues approach involves the goal of giving equal privilege to all conversations occurring between and among groups of participants, practitioners, and theorists: to what extent can equal valuations be achieved? If the social world is in a state of continuous creation "in part due to the work of theorists themselves," what issues of reflexivity need to be addressed in directing change based on actions taken with the "hope of doing good in the world" (Pearce and Pearce 2001, 109)? These questions aside, the public dialogue approach does offer many possibilities. For instance, it opens spaces of praxis where new theories can be created while old ones are invigorated. An additional benefit of the public dialogue approach is that it grounds practical theory in curiosity and wonder. By

requiring critical analysis of what is occurring along with critical reflection on how to act, it acknowledges that there are no fixed answers. In so doing it keeps conversations open and continues the evolution of vocabularies of analysis/action. Its resonance with a practice theory vision of change in public life recently proposed by Spinoza, Flores, and Dreyfus is intriguing (Spinosa et al. 1997).

As a tool, SHEDD has many useful applications, as does its strategy of relying on participant inertia and pursuing their interests and aspirations rather than on teaching participants to understand experts' theories of problems and how to solve them. In allowing people to be heard, public dialogues reinforce public democracy. Pearce and Pearce observe: "Taking seriously the organizational development maxim that people support what they make, the dialogue process includes the whole group in the formation and deliberation of the issue, not bringing in the public to ratify decisions already made by the elites" (2001, 120). Additional benefits come from the value of practical theory that is demonstrated to participants in public dialogues.

MODEL FIVE: CRISIS DISCIPLINES

Mission-oriented or "crisis disciplines" emerge out of conditions of urgency. Given the contemporary worldwide threat of environmental crises, these disciplines are presently exemplified by the field of conservation biology with its attention to ecological collapse and mass extinction (Soule 1985; 1986). In addition to conservation biology, related scholarship is coming from diverse fields that engage environmental issues, including but not limited to anthropology and environmental studies (Drew and Henne 2006). This is to be expected since crisis disciplines are focused on responding to the crisis without regard for disciplinary boundaries. They tend to have an "eclectic multidisciplinary structure" that takes questions, techniques, or methods from a broad range or fields (Soule 1985, 727).

Robbie Cox, a faculty member of the UNC Department of Communications Studies and third time president of the Sierra Club, asserts that there is a need for the field of environmental communications to act as a crisis discipline with ethical norms and duties. He writes that the field of environmental communications is emerging at a moment of conjunctural crisis defined in significant ways by human-caused threats to both biological systems and human communities and by the

continuing failure of societal institutions to engage these threats adequately (Cox 2007, 2). The call to engagement is urgent given that communications about the environment are a mode by which residents, politicians, and other actors socially construct and know the material world. These communications and especially the dominant discourses for representing the "environment" influence societal deliberation and response to environmental signals, including signs of the deterioration of human health, climate, and ecological systems (Cox 2007, 8). The field of environmental communications has the position and the obligation to influence the diverse interactions with the "environment" that operate in U.S. society.

The concern of scholars such as Cox is the misuse of the power of communications about the environment to further agendas that sacrifice environmental and public health. He reminds us, for example, that interpretations of research on climate change, regulation of mercury in aging power plants, or permits for draining wetlands tend to favor private material and economic interests. Their dominance in the public sphere reflects and reinforces social, political, and symbolic processes driven by "interested" orientations and ideologies. To counter this threat, Cox argues that environmental communications should go beyond the documentation of failure, distortion, or corruption in human communications. More than being satisfied with critique and deconstruction, he calls for scholars to recommend alternatives that enable decision makers, communities, and educators to respond to the signals of environmental stress in a way that promotes human and biological well-being. One of the dilemmas of such action is the need to make decisions or recommendations with imperfect knowledge. Soule (1985; 1986) indicates a way out of this predicament by arguing that "provisional validity," or selecting the best working hypothesis, is sometimes acceptable. This is especially prudent, such arguments proceed, when the risks of non-action may be greater than the risks of inappropriate action (Soule 1986, 6).

Given the need to develop actions enhancing responses to environmental indicators, Cox proposes four normative tenets for environmental communications. With a brief review, we can reflect on other potential crisis disciplines and ask how these also might be able to incorporate analogous propositions to other issues of concern. Cox's first normative tenet is that environmental communications, both the

field and communications about the environment in general, should strengthen the ability of society to respond "appropriately" to environmental signals. Second, representations of the "environment"—including governmental information, scientific advisory systems, and decision-making processes—should be transparent and accessible to members of the public. This principle of democratic access to information extends the range of parties who can participate in such debates. Those affected by environmental quality deserve to participate in decisions affecting their individual and/or communities' health and well-being. The third normative tenet urges the nurturing of individual and societal opportunities and capacities to study, interact with, and share experiences of the natural world. Finally, the last point holds that researchers have an ethical duty to speak publicly when the results of their studies point to danger. This tenet asserts, moreover, that scholars, teachers, and practitioners also have a duty to educate, question, critically evaluate, and speak out when social/symbolic representations of "environment," knowledge claims, or other communication practices are constrained or suborned for the sake of harmful or unsustainable policies toward human communities and the natural world (Cox 2007, 9–10).

After outlining these normative tenets, Cox writes: "We may not yet, self-consciously, align our work with the ethical premises that define a crisis discipline, but perhaps we should" (Cox 2007, 11). While Cox was referring to environmental communications, we asked the faculty working group, "What other fields could be considered 'crisis disciplines'? And what might be gained in doing so?" Some argued that anthropology, sociology, and epidemiology could fall within that category, depending on the kind of engagement being practiced. Upon reflection, we also asked ourselves to think about the possibilities for "crisis *inter*disciplines." Likewise, crisis itself—its implications and the rupture it implies—must be thought through critically as both an analytic and a call to action (Redfield 2005). These are important areas for further reflection.

MODEL SIX: SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP

The final model we considered was social entrepreneurship, a topic especially pertinent at UNC. In the last several years, UNC, with the support of a large grant from the Kauffman Foundation, has fostered faculty and student projects and undergraduate curricular opportunities

for social entrepreneurism. Is social entrepreneurship, we asked ourselves, a model of engaged scholarship or is it something else altogether? We explored two readings on social entrepreneurism bearing this broad question in mind.

One reading came from possibly the best-known writer on social entrepreneurism in the academy, Greg Dees of the Fuqua School of Business at Duke University. Social entrepreneurism, Dees argues, is not a new concept (Dees 1998). It is, however, a term used with growing popularity that represents a blurring of sector boundaries. Social entrepreneurs, in his conceptualization, work with, and in response to, the market. They often take up where the market leaves off or cannot enter: "Markets," Dees writes, "do not do a good job of valuing social improvements, public goods and harms, and benefits for people who cannot afford to pay," but social entrepreneurs can (Dees 1998, 3).

Theoretically, social entrepreneurship is based on the possibility of working with the market as an entrepreneur to "locate and exploit" opportunities for social change. Social entrepreneurs, following Dees, look for ways to serve social missions that are effective, long-term, and sustained. Social entrepreneurs work with the resources at hand and make the best possible use of existing systems. According to the argument, social entrepreneurs differ from workers in nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), not-for-profits, and for-profits in their ability to address social needs *flexibly*. Social entrepreneurs engage in processes of continuous innovation, adaptation, and learning that are reinforced by bold action building upon but not limited to the resources at hand. They are accountable not to their donors, boards, or the market but to their constituencies.

Richard Bornstein, from a different understanding and in a more popular account of social entrepreneurism than Dees's, describes a number of exemplary people associated with the Ashoka Foundation, a creation of William Drayton (Bornstein 2004). Drayton, who visited UNC's Carolina Seminar on social entrepreneurism in 2003, argued that neoliberal government reorganization has opened many doors for citizen social entrepreneurs to experiment and develop solutions to social problems. A chapter from Bornstein's book makes an example of a dedicated and driven individual in Brazil named Fabio Rosa. An agronomic engineer, Rosa began his social entrepreneurial career in the rural areas of Brazil's southernmost state. Noting that peasants needed but could not afford the expensive electricity sold by the govern-

ment, Rosa began projects of small-scale electrification using relatively inexpensive technology. His aim was to provide cheap irrigation and improve the life standards of rural Brazilians. Despite the successes of his solution, Rosa continued to run into roadblocks at various levels of power in the state, especially those serving business interests. Adapting to the needs of communities and opportunities made available—or unavailable—depending on the political climate, Rosa moved on to other schemes that involved harnessing solar energy to produce electric fencing for cattle farmers. Later, he began a nonprofit organization to implement his models in under-resourced areas where the for-profit model did not fit. Rosa's achievements stand out as a shining example of the creative work of a social entrepreneur. With this example, Bornstein demonstrates how a social entrepreneur may or may not use the market to make a solution sustainable. Instead, what makes Rosa a social entrepreneur is his persistence in trying to serve social needs by all sorts of means and maneuvers to bypass barriers and overcome obstacles.

Numerous questions emerged in the lively discussion on this final model: To what extent do examples such as Rosa demonstrate what we have been calling "engaged scholarship"? To some, such social entrepreneurial efforts seem more focused on creating change than on predicting or controlling it on the basis of scientific research. Another member of the faculty working group commented, "It appears that the social entrepreneurship approach is more focused on 'jiggling' parts and otherwise 'tinkering' with the system in order to achieve a specific improvement rather than trying to effect fundamental transformations." How effective can approaches such as the ones taken by people like Rosa be when they are working against one limitation after another and not trying to challenge overarching systems?

The group pondered the vision of such an approach and questioned whether the model of society and social change it rests upon are simply less explicit than those of the other models we considered. To what extent, others asked, does—or could—social entrepreneurship expand "traditional" research approaches? Does it instruct scholars, for instance, to start from the field instead of from the university? How might it encourage a shift in the position of the analyst and, in so doing, "disrupt the fetish of the referee (of scholarly work)," as one member of the group phrased it? Does it play a role in altering who gets to tell stories? Is it research with a small "r" instead of a big one? In a critical vein, faculty members expressed concern over the silence of social entrepreneurism with respect to gender and class issues. It was further posited that social entrepreneurism was not adequately reflexive about the technologies, strategies, and purchase it employs.

In light of these concerns, some pondered the possibilities for academics to engage with the positive features of social entrepreneurism. If social entrepreneurship is a model for social change, but not a model of engaged scholarship, some asked, could it become one? What, for example, could scholars bring to social entrepreneurship to make it more relevant to the mission of knowledge production within the academy, and how could it develop to meet the standards of reflexivity that have developed within social sciences over the last thirty to forty years? In what ways, it was asked, can academics be the providers of blueprints for what works where and why? Could scholarship aid social entrepreneurism through evaluation science, for example? Or could positive features of the social entrepreneurial model be put together with critical thinking to develop a new model of engaged scholarship?

Themes and Problematics

Over the course of our discussions about these six models of engaged scholarship, several central themes and problematics emerged. The themes are claims or arguments advanced by the faculty working group, while the problematics are provocations for further reflection and research. Some of these issues were particular to one or two of the six models and have been presented earlier. Other themes and problematics cross-cut all the models and spoke more broadly to scholarship, the purpose of knowledge production, and academic engagement with civil society. In what follows, we offer five of the broader themes and their related problematics that we think are particularly relevant and urgent for ongoing debates on engaged scholarship at UNC, other sites of practice, and in the broader literature.

HIERARCHIES OF KNOWLEDGE WITHIN THE ACADEMY OBSCURE RECOGNIZING MULTIPLE FORMS OF SCHOLARSHIP AND REASSESSING THEIR VALUE

The first theme involves recognizing multiple forms of scholarship and reassessing their value. Institutionalized measures of what constitutes "scholarship" tend to point away from practices of engagement. This is true despite Boyer's identification of five different forms of interde-

pendent scholarship within the university. Hierarchies of knowledge still common in the academy privilege the scholarship of discovery. At its greatest extreme, this privileging obscures the existence of other forms of scholarship; in its milder forms, it simply relegates other forms, especially the scholarship of engagement, to lower rungs. When this theme arose in faculty discussions, the stated concern was in moving beyond the limitations of such hierarchies to see their adverse effects on both the imagination and use of scholarship. The traditional knowledge hierarchy has constricted the development of engaged scholarship inside the academy and curtailed the perceived and actual relevance of much social science and humanities scholarship that could lie beyond academic networks of review.

Taking first the lower status and, thus, the more limited attention to engaged scholarship within the academy: Burawoy's analysis of distinctions within the discipline of sociology suggests why engaged scholarship has been ranked relatively low and has received few resources for development. Briefly, his familiar argument points out that knowledge is developed in relation to the institutions that depend on it for assistance and for legitimation of their actions. "Policy" sociology and "professional" sociology are frequently in the service of the state, of government, and of industry; providing what Burawoy calls "instrumental" knowledges. Critical sociology, public sociology, and the other models we discussed, excepting social entrepreneurship, emphasize and incorporate "reflective" knowledges into their research practice. These knowledges, in turn, speak back to the discipline itself, involving multiple publics in common issues of concern. However, critical reflection and these broader publics have less prestige and fewer resources than the partners of policy and professional sociology; thus, by association, critical and public sociologies convey less standing to the researchers affiliated with them. The engaged scholarship movement, to the extent that it serves marginalized publics, is a move toward the democratization of knowledge production and distribution.

HIERARCHIES OF KNOWLEDGE WITHIN THE ACADEMY INTERFERE WITH THE VALUATION OF COMMUNITY AS PEERS AND OF COMMUNITY-PRODUCED KNOWLEDGE AS THEORY

The second and closely related theme addresses the untoward or unfavorable effects of hierarchies of knowledge on the valuation of community-produced knowledge. Beyond the disciplines, indeed beyond the university, knowledges are produced, but because they are not academic or because they are produced via alternative methods of knowing, researching, and disseminating, they are either invisible or are not highly valorized by most academic communities. This tenet builds upon arguments being made at the intersection of anthropology, cultural studies, and social movement studies (Casas-Cortés et al. 2008; Conway 2004; de Sousa Santos 2004; Escobar 1998, 2008; Holland and Lave 2001). This subjugation of knowledge production outside the academic circle tends to silence and unfairly limit the scope of experience these knowledges represent. Such subjugation limits the creation, invention, and application of theory to the multiple and complex problems we collectively face. Two aspects of the models reviewed seek to revise these exclusions. One move is to avoid predetermining and foreclosing on what counts as "theory." Faculty recognized that types of theoretical formulation, deliberate practice, and critical reflection are common to many sites of everyday and institutional life in addition to the university. Social movements are increasingly recognized, for example, as sources of knowledge production.

A second move to overcome the limitations of the "hierarchy of knowledge" is to expand our conception of "peers" in processes of knowledge production. This was exemplified in the CBPR project in Greensboro, North Carolina (Yonas et al. 2006). The inclusion of breast cancer patients, their families, and health care providers in the peer review process prior to any publication of findings in effect expanded the network of peers as well as the meaning of accountability in research. Importantly, this practice opens up spaces for participants in this larger network to share their own knowledges and experiences of the issue through a dialogic encounter with CBPR researchers. This speaks to the problematic that asks: How do we valorize the co-production of knowledge between university-based and community-based researchers and, at the same time, incorporate the conceptualizations that communities have produced on their own?

These last two points help to distinguish engaged scholarship from traditional "service learning," "outreach," and "community service," which are more informed by a notion of a one-way transfer or translation of knowledge from the university to the community (Ramaley 2007). In contrast, a symmetrical and reciprocal view of engaged scholarship seeks to broaden theory and practice through dialogic, two-way encounters.

ENGAGED SCHOLARSHIP WITH COMMUNITIES AND GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS CONTRIBUTES VALUE BEYOND THAT OF CONVENTIONAL RESEARCH PROJECTS

A recurring argument in the discussions was that engaged scholarship contributes value beyond that of conventional research projects. This third theme, in other words, addresses the perception that engaged scholarship has a limited range of value in the academy at both institutional and departmental levels. While it might be respected and even applauded as an "extra-curricular" activity, for instance, engaged scholarship is often not as valued as that judged solely by processes of peer review. Rather than marginalizing engaged scholarship to the peripheries of scholastic activity, faculty argued that it should be institutionally recognized as worthwhile and deserving of reward in considerations of promotion and tenure. Beyond career advancement, recognizing and valuing the "scholarship" of engagement would advance it to a more central place in discussions and reviews of academic production and practice. At the same time, we recognized that standards and procedures for review of engaged scholarship are now in their infancy.

This shift in value of the practices of scholarship also extends to a reevaluation and *revaluation* of the partners of engagement. For, as noted by several in our group, universities have had long histories of "engagement" with government and industry but, other than in fields of public health and social work, less engagement with the organizations of civil society, particularly those oriented to social, economic, and environmental justice. Therefore, part of the move toward a critically engaged scholarship entails a move toward supporting and collaborating with organizations, movements, individuals, and other community and regional groups that have historically been underrepresented in university-public engagements. As some have recently argued (Holland et al. 2007), civil society organizations have taken on responsibilities left to communities as a result of neoliberal reorganization of government. This reorganization has championed the reduction of government support, the privatization of services, and when that fails, the outsourcing of services to public-private partnerships. With this transformation comes a particularly urgent need for university-based researchers to engage with communities and civil society organizations—not only because there is a greater resource burden placed on them than before but because communities themselves are involved in reflective, generative, solution-oriented knowledge production about their particular situations and the political and social conditions that have contributed to the challenges they face. In short, the growing call for "engaged scholarship" is a qualitatively different project than the mode of engagement with private industry that sometimes calls, for example, for participating departments to abide by corporate strictures on knowledge distribution.

EMPHASIZING CROSS- OR TRANS-DISCIPLINARITY CAN HIGHLIGHT THE POTENTIAL FOR FUTURE THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL INNOVATIONS WITHIN AND ACROSS THE MODELS AS WELL AS IN THE PRODUCTION OF ENTIRELY NEW MODELS

Emerging as a central tenet of the group's discussions, the necessity of interdisciplinarity coalesced as a fourth theme in the group's work. In reviewing the literature and discussing the six models outlined, it was clear that several models are deployed across departments, disciplines, and fields, in similar and somewhat different forms. For instance, while CBPR has been used overtly and broadly in public health research, it is also a familiar approach in anthropology, sociology, education, social work, and other fields. The example of critical race theory–based coalition building also shows the value of interdisciplinarity as it demonstrates how race scholars, legal studies lawyers, and community organizers can work together to oppose injustices that stem from the institutionalization of racism. Emphasizing the cross- or trans-disciplinarity of these models highlights the potential for future theoretical and methodological innovations and cross-fertilizations within and across the models as well as the potential for the interdisciplinary production of entirely new models.

One of the limits to such innovation and creative leadership arises from the enduring compartmentalization of departments within the university. Strictly departmental, single discipline approaches are typically myopic. They restrict the creative capacities of researchers to integrate and build their work in broader, problem-oriented collaborations, both within and beyond the university, and stand in the way of broadening "scholarship" so that it is more relevant to the concerns of broader publics and audiences. Such a move does not forgo specialization or specific expertise but builds networks and alliances among differently located university-based researchers and community-based

researchers to transform the very concept and practice of "expertise" itself. Interdisciplinarity, briefly stated, calls for a shift away from the prowess of individual scholars and toward collective know-how and skills. Two questions or problematics this theme generated were: How might we transform (our own) disciplinary demands for advancement and recognition? And what possibilities exist—or could exist—for universities to organize themselves flexibly to include horizontal (inter- or trans-disciplinary), problem-oriented units instead of the overwhelmingly vertical (departmentally compartmentalized) institutions that now predominate in most institutions.

SEVERAL POTENTIAL "RISKS" OF ENGAGED SCHOLARSHIP WARRANT CAREFUL CONSIDERATION IN FUTURE DISCUSSIONS

Finally, recognizing that an emphasis on engaged scholarship is unlikely to be a new universal or "silver bullet" for change, the group reflected on several potential "risks" of engaged scholarship. Many of these risks are taken up in the literature, especially in articles and chapters on the models of community-based participatory research and public anthropology and sociology. Risks are also addressed in the broader literature on engagement and collaboration, where histories of uneven power relationships between researchers and communities (and indigenous communities, in particular) have shaped the field of action in significant ways (see, for instance, Lassiter 2005b; Daubenmier 2008). Bearing these risks in mind, we still ask: Can we develop models of engaged scholarship that allow us to develop truly dialogic processes with local communities (or, for that matter, regional, national, and transnational communities)? In such relationships, can we maintain our integrity as scholars with analytic skills and knowledge able to contribute to the skills and knowledge that community people and organizations bring to the solution of social problems? For instance, when partnering with a community in a process of collaboration and engagement, what if our research findings do not bear out what the community expects or desires? In other words, what if our data and results contradict the community's interpretation of its own experience or conditions? Second, "communities" are always in flux, unbounded, and historical; therefore, defining "the community" with whom one engages is itself often problematic terrain, particularly if rifts and tensions within multiple or overlapping communities become reified by the researcher's engagement with one set of actors and not another. Third, as many of the authors reviewed here and elsewhere (especially in the development studies literature) have argued, there are always unpredictable effects of any intervention or collaboration.[8] How can engaged scholars and researchers begin to mediate or anticipate possible effects (especially negative effects) of well-intentioned partnerships? We leave these questions open for the time being, hopeful that they will spark future discussions on models, theories, and practices of engaged scholarship.

Conclusions

Boyer's and Burawoy's respective claims about the interconnections between forms of knowledge also apply to the field of engaged scholarship. We notice several crucial points of articulation among the six models, themes, and problematics discussed. Burawoy argued that professional, critical, policy, and public sociology are interconnected and equally necessary if sociology is to be an ethical, intellectually vigorous, relevant, flourishing field. Analogously, the different models of engaged scholarship reviewed here are complementary, not more or less valuable or central in relation to one another. As already alluded to in the discussion of critical race theory, the models contribute different, yet complementary, analyses and tools for furthering the processes of linking research to action and action to research that lie at the heart of engaged scholarship, although these models are frameworks for theorizing and research, and are not methods per se.

Community-based participatory research, critical race theory, public dialogues, and public anthropology and sociology all consider their relationships with particular nonacademic (or not primarily academic) publics to be crucial and not just for the purpose of gaining entry to carry out research. We see this as a critical distinction from other forms of scholarship. These models of engaged scholarship share a dedication to the democratization of knowledge production and dissemination. All four consider themselves to be (1) ethically obligated to reciprocal engagement with underserved publics, especially when these publics are involved in the research; (2) dependent upon the local community for necessary knowledge of local, lived experience, history, and social dynamics; and (3) ill equipped, in the absence of a working relationship with the community, to produce usable research-derived knowledge.

Informed by these strong similarities, the four models nonetheless have complementary emphases: CBPR seeks community participation in all stages of the research; critical race theory attempts to dismantle racist structures both in projects and in the larger society; public dialogues promote dialogue among people in different social locations through forums in which no one conversation or group is privileged; and public anthropology and sociology defend and validate civil society—the sector presently most likely to articulate the interests and inputs of nonacademic and nonpowerful publics.

Crisis disciplines, with conservation biology and now environmental communications as prototypes, are addressed to constituencies with no voice or a limited one in debates relevant to their overall well-being. These two prototypes are concerned with abstract entities such as "the environment" and "democracy." While this fifth model out of the six seems not to share the themes emphasized by the four preceding models, it has a lot to offer the field of engaged scholarship. For instance, conceptualizing crisis discipline creates new roles and identities for scientists whose studies bear on impending catastrophes—situations in which it makes sense for researchers to advocate for particular responses no matter how politically charged the questions. All engaged scholars should find these debates vital for their own thinking about the timeliness of their work and the conditions under which they as researchers and scientists should take on unconventional roles.

Among our working group participants, the most debated model was social entrepreneurism and whether it constitutes a mode of engaged scholarship. The Kauffman Foundation has supported the integration of social entrepreneurism into the undergraduate curriculum at UNC and helped individual faculty plan entrepreneurial activities to promote intellectual and other sorts of products emerging from their research and creative work. The grant has also enabled several faculty members working on social projects to think through the lens of social entrepreneurism and incorporate business plans, ideas about revenue streams, and other tools and models from business. At this point research associated with social entrepreneurism is primarily oriented to issues of sustainability (especially projects that ensure their own financial continuation). So far the theoretical framework underlying social entrepreneurism is not well articulated and is therefore difficult to evaluate. A number of the faculty were skeptical that the potentially helpful aspects of social entrepreneurism could be imported into the mix of models of engaged scholarship without privileging capitalistic assumptions and goals that fit uneasily with anti-racism, pro–participatory democracy, amelioration of inequalities, prioritization of environmental protection, and other such goals of the other five models of engaged scholarship that we considered. The conversation raised issues requiring further debate.

Our review of models of engaged scholarship suggests emerging new visions in several disciplines about what constitutes outstanding scholarship. A number of fields have begun extensive theorization and development of tools and practices for engaging in locally as well as globally oriented research/action projects. These developments reflect growing recognition of the unavoidable (and productive) interconnections between researchers and those who are researched as well as altered views of the ethics of research. Recent research also addresses the increasing appreciation of knowledge production at sites other than the university. These theoretical shifts and empirical findings imply transformations in thinking about research such that the standing of engaged scholarship is likely to rise.

• • • • •

DOROTHY HOLLAND is Cary C. Boshamer Professor of Anthropology at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Former chair of department, former president of the national Society for Psychological Anthropology, and current co-director of the Center for Integrating Research and Action at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Holland has conducted anthropological research in several parts of the world, including the Caribbean, South Asia, and the South Pacific, with a primary focus on the United States. The National Science Foundation and other sources have funded her major research projects on school desegregation, gender tracking in college, social movements, local democracy, and currently (with Don Nonini), the Alternative Agrifoods Movement. Her latest book, the co-authored *Local Democracy under Siege* (NYU Press, 2007), is the 2007–2008 recipient of the SANA Prize for the Critical Study of North America.

DANA E. POWELL is a doctoral candidate in anthropology at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. She is currently completing a dissertation on the cultural politics of energy development in the Navajo Nation, considering how emerging energy technologies are shaping the politics of knowledge, identity, and environmentalism. Dana has also done ethnographic and collaborative research in Chiapas, Mexico, and in North Carolina on environmental justice and indigenous movements. The National Science Foundation, Wenner-Gren Foundation, and the Graduate School and Royster Society of Fellows at UNC have funded her work.

EUGENIA ENG is a professor of health behavior and health education and director of the Kellogg Health Scholars Postdoctoral Program at the Gillings School of Global Public Health, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Dr. Eng's body of work examines the lay health advisor intervention model, the concepts of community competence and natural helping, and the community assessment procedure called Action-oriented Community Diagnosis. She has more than twenty-five years of community-based participatory research (CBPR) experience, including field studies conducted with rural communities of the U.S. South, West Africa, and Southeast Asia, to address socially stigmatizing health problems such as pesticide poisoning, breast and prostate cancer, and STDs. With funding from AHRQ she was the co-scientific director for an evidence-based review of CBPR quality. She is co-editor for *Methods in Community-Based Participatory Research for Health*.

GEORGINA DREW is a doctoral candidate in anthropology at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Her research examines resource conflict and community organization around water in South Asia and elsewhere. She received Fulbright Hays and National Science Foundation funding for work with social movements that address resource management challenges along the Himalayan stretch of the Ganges River. Georgina is a former coordinator of the social movements working group at UNC and is involved in several initiatives to promote culturally sensitive water policy.

Notes

1. The six models of engaged scholarship discussed in this article were decided upon by the working group and by no means exhaust the wide range of possible models we could have discussed. The summaries of these models are drawn from sets of core readings on each model as well as the relevant discussion sessions of the working group. The group met four times to discuss particular models and their strengths and weaknesses. Our analysis of the themes and problematics of the discussion sessions was based on notes taken and on transcripts.

2. The challenges listed here are noted in the 2007 strategic plan of UNC's Gillings School of Public Health for becoming an engaged institution for eliminating racial and ethnic health disparities.

3. Giroux argues, among other things, that the new corporate university values profit, control, efficacy, and the production of neoliberal subjects/employees. Higher education, he continues, is now leverage for a better job and does not entail the academic rigor and social engagement it once signified. Instead, he argues, higher education should be a democratic space where students learn to be "engaged citizens."

4. The models included are not to be considered a definitive or comprehensive review of models of engaged scholarship at UNC or in the broader literature. Nor is this intended as a definitive word on what is "right" or "wrong" with these models. Rather, participants of the interdisciplinary faculty group selected these six models as particularly salient to their present work and to questions now facing communities and the university.

5. As intimated, CBPR has spread into other professional fields. Robinson-Pant, for example, a literacy and development specialist, describes "participatory development design" (Robinson-Pant 2000). Whereas the older approaches listened primarily to providers and practitioners, participatory development design, which emerged in the mid-1990s as a major new direction, listens to the recipients' perspectives at every step from the plan to the project.

6. Relevant to the discussions, Peacock, a member of the UNC anthropology faculty at Chapel Hill, was also a participant in the working group. Peacock's public anthropology activities have included work with the Muhammadiya of Indonesia (1970–present); work with the North Carolina Legislature as chair of the Faculty Council of UNC (1991–94); creation of the Human Rights Commission and Ethics Code for the American Anthropological Association during tenure as AAA president (1993–95); serving as director of the University Center for International Studies at UNC and in creation of the FedEx Global Education Center and its various programs (1996–2003); and current work as the co-director of the Duke-UNC Rotary Center for Peace and Conflict Resolution, director of Carolina Seminars, and chair of Worldview, an international program for educators at UNC.

7. The Maya project is a public archaeology project organized by archaeologist Dr. Patricia McAnany at UNC. For a full listing and description of CIRA-affiliated projects, see www.cira-unc.org.

8. For examples, see work in critical development studies by Arturo Escobar, James Ferguson, and Carmen Medeiros (Escobar 1995; Ferguson 1994; Medeiros 2000).

References

Bakhtin, Mikhail. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Translated by C. E. a. M. Holquist. Edited by M. Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Basch, Linda G., Lucie Wood Saunders, Jagna Wojcicka Sharff, and James Peacock, eds. 1999. *Transforming Academia: Challenges and Opportunities for an Engaged Anthropology*. Arlington, VA: American Anthropological Association.

Bornstein, David. 2004. *How to Change the World: Social Entrepreneurs and the Power of New Ideas*. York: Oxford University Press.

Borofsky, Rob. 2000. "Public Anthropology: Where To? What Next?" *Anthropology News* 41 (5): 9–10.

Boyer, Ernest L. 1990. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Princeton: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

———. 1996. "The Scholarship of Engagement." *Journal of Public Service and Outreach* 1 (1): 11–20.

Buber, Martin. 1958 [1937]. *I and Thou*. Translated by R. G. Smith. New York: Scribner.

Burawoy, Michael. 2005. "American Sociological Association Presidential address: For Public Sociology." *American Sociological Review* 70 (1): 4–28.

Casas-Cortés, Maribel, Michal Osterweil, and Dana Powell. 2008. "Blurring the Boundaries: Knowledge-Practices in Contemporary Social Movements." *Anthropological Quarterly* 81 (1): 17–58.

Conway, Janet. 2004. *Identity, Place, Knowledge: Social Movements Contesting Globalization*. Halifax, Nova Scotia: Fernwood.

Cox, Robert. 2007. "Nature's 'Crisis Disciplines': Does Environmental Communication Have an Ethical Duty?" *Environmental Communication: A Journal of Nature and Culture* 1 (1): 5–20.

Cronen, Vernon E. 1995a. "Coordinated Management of Meaning: The Consequentiality of Communication and the Recapturing of Experience." In *The Consequentiality of Communication*, edited by S. Sigman. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

———. 1995b. "Practical Theory and the Tasks Ahead for Social Approaches to Communication." In *Social Approaches to Communication*, edited by L. Leeds-Hurwitz. New York: Guilford Press.

Cushman, Ellen. 1999. "The Public Intellectual, Service Learning, and Activist Research." *College English* 61 (3): 328–36.

Daubenmier, Judith M. 2008. *The Meskwaki and Anthropologists: Action Anthropology Reconsidered*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

de Sousa Santos, Boaventura. 2004. "The World Social Forum: Toward a Counter-Hegemonic Globalisation," parts I and II. In *World Social Forum: Challenging Empires*, edited by A. A. Jai Sen, Arturo Escobar, and Peter Waterman. New Delhi: Viveka Foundation.

Dees, Gregory J. 1998. The Meaning of Social Entrepreneurship. Comments and suggestions contributed from the Social Entrepreneurship Funders Working Group. Fuqua School of Business, Dyke University.

Delgado, Richard, and Jean Stefancic, eds. 2000. *Critical Race Theory: The Cutting Edge*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Drew, Joshua A., and Adam P. Henne. 2006. "Conservation Biology and Traditional Ecological Knowledge: Integrating Academic Disciplines for Better Conservation Practice." *Ecology and Society* 11 (2): 34–40.

Escobar, Arturo. 1995. *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton Studies in Culture/Power/History. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

———. 1998. "Whose Knowledge, Whose Nature? Biodiversity, Conservation, and the Political Ecology of Social Movements." *Journal of Political Ecology* 5:53–82.

———. 2008. *Territories of Difference: Place, Movements, Life, Redes*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Ferguson, James. 1994. *The Anti-Politics Machine: "Development," Depoliticization, and Bureaucratic Power in Lesotho*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Freire, Paulo. 1987. *Education for Critical Consciousness*. New York: Continuum.

———. 2000 [1970]. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

Giroux, Henry. 2002. "Neoliberalism, Corporate Culture, and the Promise of Higher Education: The University as a Democratic Public Sphere." *Harvard Educational Review* 72 (4): 424–63.

Hale, Charles R. 2001. "What Is Activist Research?" *Items* (Social Science Research Council) 2 (1–2): 13–15.

Holland, Dorothy, and Jean Lave. 2001. "History in Person: An Introduction." In *History in Person: Enduring Struggles, Contentious Practice, Intimate Identities*, edited by D. Holland and J. Lave. Santa Fe: School of American Research.

Holland, Dorothy, Donald M. Nonini, Catherine Lutz, Lesley Bartlett, Marla Frederick-McGlathery, Thaddeus C. Guldbrandsen, and Enrique Murillo Jr. 2007. *Local Democracy under Siege: Activism, Public Interest, and Private Politics*. New York: New York University Press.

Israel, Barbara A., Eugenia Eng, Amy J. Schulz, and Edith A. Parker. 2005. *Methods in Community-Based Participatory Research for Health*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Israel, Barbara A., Amy J. Schulz, Edith A. Parker, and Adam B. Becker. 1998. "Review of Community Based Research: Assessing Partnership Approaches to Improve Public Health." *Annual Review of Public Health* 19:173–202.

Ladson-Billings, Gloria. 2000. "Racialized Discourses and Ethnic Epistemologies." In *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, edited by N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Lassiter, Luke Eric. 2005a. "Collaborative Anthropology and Public Anthropology." *Current Anthropology* 46 (1): 83–97.

———. 2005b. *The Chicago Guide to Collaborative Ethnography*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

———. 2008. "Editor's Introduction." *Collaborative Anthropologies* 1 (1): vii–xiii.

Medeiros, Carmen. 2000. "Civilizing the Popular? The Law of Popular Participation and the Design of a New Civil Society in 1990's Bolivia." *Critique of Anthropology* 21 (4): 401–25.

Minkler, Meredith, and Nina Wallerstein, eds. 2008. *Community-Based Participatory Research for Health: From Process to Outcomes*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Peacock, James. 1997. "The Future of Anthropology." *American Anthropologist* 99 (1): 9–17.

Pearce, Kimberly A. 2000. "Combining Passions and Abilities: Toward a Dialogic Virtuosity." *Southern Communication Journal* 65:161–75.

Pearce, Kimberly A., and W. Barnett Pearce. 2001. "The Public Dialogue Consortium's School-Wide Dialogue Process: A Communicative Approach to Develop Citizenship Skills and Enhance School Climate." *Communication Theory* 11 (1): 105–23.

Pearce, W. Barnett, and Kimberly A. Pearce. 2000. "Extending the Theory of the Coordinated Management of Meaning (CMM) through a Community Dialogue Process." *Communication Theory* 10 (4): 405–23.

Ramaley, Judith A. 2007. Community-Engaged Scholarship in Higher Education: Have We Reached a Tipping Point? Paper presented at Community-Engaged Scholarship for Health Collaborative Invitational Symposium, Washington, DC, February 21–22.

Redfield, Peter. 2005. "Doctors, Borders, and Life in Crisis." *Cultural Anthropology* 20 (3): 328–61.

Robinson-Pant, Anna. 2000. "Development as Discourse: What Relevance to Education?" *Compare: A Journal of Comparative Education* 31 (3): 311–28.

Sanday, Peggy Reeves, ed. 1976. *Anthropology and the Public Interest: Fieldwork and Theory*. New York: Academic Press.

Soule, Michael. 1985. "What Is Conservation Biology?" Theme issue: The Biological Diversity Crisis. *BioScience* 35 (11): 727–34.

Soule, Michael, ed. 1986. *Conservation Biology: The Science of Scarcity and Diversity*. Sunderland: Sinauer Associates.

Speed, Shannon. 2006. "At the Crossroads of Human Rights and Anthropology: Toward a Critically Engaged Activist Research." *American Anthropologist* 108 (1): 66–76.

Spinosa, Charles, Fernando Flores, and Hubert L. Dreyfus. 1997. *Disclosing New Worlds: Entrepreneurship, Democratic Action, and the Cultivation of Solidarity*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Su, Julie A., and Eric K. Yamamoto. 2000. "Critical Coalitions: Theory and Praxis." In *Crossroads, Directions and a New Critical Race Theory*, edited by F. Valdes, J. M. Culp, and A. P. Harris. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Trostle, J. 1986. "Anthropology and Epidemiology in the Twentieth Century: A Selective History of the Collaborative Projects and Theoretical Affinities, 1920–1970." In *Anthropology and Epidemiology: Interdisciplinary Approaches to the Study of Health and Diseases (Culture, Illness, and Healing)*, edited by C. R. Janes, R. Stall, and S. M. Gifford. Norwell, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

University of North Carolina (UNC) School of Public Health. 2007. "Engaged Institutions Initiative Strategic Plan: Becoming an Engaged Institution for Eliminating Racial and Ethnic Health Disparities." Chapel Hill: UNC School of Public Health.

Wallerstein, Nina, and Bonnie Duran. 2004. "Using Community-Based Participatory Research to Address Health Disparities." *Health Promotion Practice* 7 (3): 312–23.

Washburn, Jennifer. 2005. *University, Inc.: The Corporate Corruption of Higher Education*. New York: Basic Books.

Yonas, Michael A., Nora Jones, Eugenia Eng, Anissa I. Vines, Robert Aronson, Derek M. Griffith, Brandolyn White, and Melvin DuBose. 2006. "The Art and Science of Integrating Undoing Racism with CBPR: Challenges of Pursuing NIH Funding to Investigate Cancer Care and Racial Equity." *Journal of Urban Health* 83 (6): 1004–12.