Living Well with Others: Exploring Community-Engaged Scholarship in Canadian Higher Education

by

Tania Kajner

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Educational Administration and Leadership

Educational Policy Studies

University of Alberta

Abstract

Many Canadian scholars and institutions of higher education are embracing community-engaged scholarship (CES). However, the conceptual foundations and purposes informing CES remain ambiguous. As a result, CES is marked by confusion and contested practices, demonstrating the need to move to a more theoretical exploration of the field. At the time of this study, no pan-Canadian research has been done on Canadian scholars' conceptualization of CES. In this thesis I explore how Canadian scholars conceptualize their community-engagement work and partnerships.

Positioning the study within a hermeneutic framework and using a qualitative research design that included two semi-structured interviews with each of nine scholars occupying varying social, institutional, disciplinary and geographic locations within Canadian higher education, I examine three research questions:

(1) How do scholars in Canada conceptualize engaged scholarship?

(2) How do engaged scholars ontologically position themselves and Others in the engagement experience?

(3) How does the changing context of higher education interact with the growing interest in community-engaged scholarship in Canada?

In my analysis of findings I note the extent to which CES is problematically shaped by the neoliberalization of higher education. Study participants understand CES as a way to make scholarship meaningful by ensuring it is directly and immediately useful for community ends. CES was contrasted with what I have called *conventional scholarship*, which was problematized by study participants because it

was seen as a way of enjoying privilege and practicing scholarship that lacked accountability. Echoing the discourse of new public management, study participants emphasized the need for external accountability in scholars' work and saw CES as one way of achieving this.

I also point out that in making sense of their work, study participants depict the contradictory tensions of constructing community as an Other in a way that reflects the dominant European legacy of colonial relations while at the same time articulating forms of interaction that are decolonial. I suggest that decoloniality may offer a way forward for those scholars positioned in the Western neoliberal university, experiencing the discipline that comes with surveillance of ideas and scholarly outputs, the exclusions that support pragmatic approaches in the context of corporate time, and the sense of meaninglessness that is experienced when one's work does not appear to contribute to the social world in positive ways. The effects of decolonial CES might serve to disrupt the neoliberal university in unknown and unexpected ways. I suggest that decolonial CES is important and needs to be nurtured if Canadian scholars are going to relate to partners in truly reciprocal and equitable ways.

Preface

This thesis is an original work by Tania Kajner. The research project, of which this thesis is a part, received research ethics approval from the University of Alberta Research Ethics Board, Project Name: "LIVING WELL WITH OTHERS: EXPLORING COMMUNITY-ENGAGED SCHOLARSHIP IN HIGHER EDUCATION", PR00035144, NOV. 22, 2012.

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge the support of my thesis supervisor, Dr. Lynette Shultz, who is a constant source of inspiration for me. Her incredible openness and unwavering support was essential to the completion of this thesis. I'd also like to thank Dr. David Smith for his guidance and willingness to engage in deep conversations and Dr. Janice Wallace for sharing her knowledge and supporting this work at crucial points. Thanks also go out to Dr. Alison Taylor, Dr. Antonia Samek, and Dr. Carmel Borg for their thoughtful feedback on this thesis.

A special thank-you goes out to Dr. Donna Chovanec, my friend and mentor, for her constant encouragement and support.

I am grateful to my family, friends and colleagues for the many, many moments they kept me going in this work. In each of your different ways you helped me navigate the difficulties of graduate study, and sometimes the difficulties of life. My children, Cammi Manchur and Amos Kajner-Nonnekes, deserve a special mention. They are two of the most amazing, awe-inspiring people I have ever known and their love and support was essential to this work.

Finally, this thesis would not have been possible without the financial support of the Department of Educational Policy Studies, University of Alberta, Government of Alberta, Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, and the Killam Trust Scholarships.

Table of Contents

Introduction

This research study is driven by a question that has loomed large in much of my personal and academic life: "How can beings learn to live well with one another (with other humans, animals, plants, the planet itself)?" This is, primarily, a question about the possibilities for being, for existence. I approach this question not as a pragmatic one, looking for practices or specific behaviors that might lead beings to live well, but as an ontological question, as a way to enter into a more philosophical exploration of who we are in the world and what we might become together. My question emphasizes being in relation to the world and others. Since all relationships are imbued with power it is also a political question, at the micro level of relating to specific others in specific contexts and at the macro level of social, cultural, political, and economic structures and processes. Learning to live well with one another invites a consideration of inter-connectedness, understanding, compassion, equity, and difference, alongside objectification, violence, oppression, patriarchy, and colonization. The question presupposes a shared existence, though not necessarily a shared experience.

It was with an eye to living well with one another that community-engaged scholarship[1] (CES) caught my interest. Here scholars position their work within

[1] I use the terms scholarship of engagement, engagement, engaged scholarship, and community-engaged scholarship interchangeably throughout this paper. These terms capture scholar's work with communities and should be differentiated from scholarship *on* engagement: scholarly study of engagement or community engagement as a topic of academic interest.

relationships and ask questions about the ethics of collaborative knowledge creation. CES interested me because it is sometimes described as an emerging practice that has the potential to break down social and cultural barriers and transform both institutions of higher education and the wider social world. Additionally, the emphasis that some authors writing on CES place on shared discovery of Self and Other seemed well aligned with my own interests in the possibilities for living well with one another.

What was also curious to me is that scholars working on some very radical social change projects were beginning to use the language of CES. At the same time, engagement was being strongly supported by administrative leaders in higher education, leaders whose interests may differ from those of scholars seeking social and inter-personal transformation. I wondered about this strange alignment of interests emerging amongst actors in Canadian higher education and about the ways that CES might be useful for my own quest to understand the possibilities for being.

Background

A review of the literature on engagement revealed that CES as an academic field is not well understood, nor is it well theorized. CES explicitly calls for partnerships marked by reciprocity and mutual benefit and thus provides fertile ground to explore questions of identity, difference, power, and knowledge. However, the current literature on CES reflects a disproportionate interest in the pragmatics of engagement: developing guidebooks and strategies for engagement; examining the engagement relationship; and identifying best practices related to encouraging student engagement with community or within a particular discipline, for example. Additionally, the literature on engagement includes a

plethora of case studies that extract lessons learned from individual engagement partnerships.

Few scholars are studying how CES is conceptualized, asking questions about the purpose of engagement, or critically examining the assumptions embedded in this activity. The few conceptualizations of CES offered in the literature are contradictory and confusing. In my reading of the literature I identified three overlapping frames for CES. The first frame positions CES as an end in itself, the second as a means, and the third as a set of interconnected means and ends. Embedded within each of these frames are contested and contradictory understandings of what might be considered in any delineation of CES.

In addition to confusion and undertheorization, the literature on CES also demonstrated that studies seeking deeper understanding of CES as a field do not reflect the Canadian context. There are few Canadian scholars among those attempting to understand the field of engagement. At the time of this study, no national research had been done on Canadian scholars' conceptualization of CES.

Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study was to address gaps in the research in terms of Canadians scholars' conceptualization of CES. I sought to understand what CES might mean to scholars practicing engagement in Canada. Given my interest in developing a deep understanding and conceptualization of CES in Canada, I positioned this study within a Gadamerian hermeneutic framework. Gadamer's hermeneutics provides a good framework for this study because it focuses primarily on the creative interpretation of qualitative data. The purpose of hermeneutics, as Smith (2010) explained, is to reveal the original question

that called a text, event or phenomenon into being. By revealing the question, we can lift the burden that develops when a question is forgotten and the response therefore appears as alienating. When we recover the question, we can reconsider if the responses to it are currently relevant. Approaching CES within a Gadamerian frame enabled me to both understand and critique engagement in relation to the questions it was meant to address.

A provisional definition of CES

Understanding CES is an important foundational issue scholars are grappling with, and there is much disagreement about what constitutes engagement. To begin the study, I adopted a provisional understanding of CES as teaching, research, or service that engages faculty in academically relevant work and simultaneously meets community needs (National Review Board for the Scholarship of Engagement). In essence, it is a scholarly agenda that integrates community issues. With this provisional definition in mind I sought to complicate and deepen my understanding of CES.

Research questions

In order to develop an understanding of CES, we need to understand what engagement is about, how it shapes partners and how it is affected by larger forces shaping higher education overall. Thus, three research questions guided this study:

1. How do scholars in Canada conceptualize engaged scholarship?
2. How do engaged scholars ontologically position themselves and Others in the engagement experience?
3. How does the changing context of higher education interact with the growing interest in engaged scholarship in Canada?

Methods

These three questions were explored through a qualitative research design that included two semi-structured interviews with each of nine scholars occupying varying social, institutional, disciplinary and geographic locations within Canadian higher education. Participants were selected for inclusion in the study through two forms of purposive sampling: intensity sampling, whereby participants are included in the study on the basis of having rich information and experiences that manifest the phenomena intensely (Creswell, 1998) and snowball sampling, a method of developing and expanding a sample by asking one participant to recommend others (Babbie, 1995).

The audiotapes from participant interviews were transcribed and, along with my notes and the literature, formed the basis of my interpretation.

Limitations and delimitations of the study

There are three major limitations to this study: partiality, transferability, and researcher bias. There are also two delimitations: geography and affiliation with higher education. Given the limits of time, my own perspective, and the hermeneutic recognition that understanding is always incomplete, it was impossible in this study to unpack all of the complexities of engaged scholarship. What I offer here is an interpretation and since all interpretations are partial, my study findings are also partial.

Because of this partiality and because interpretation is shaped by the researcher's interpretive horizon, the direct transferability of these research findings is limited. My interpretation is shaped by my own bias, both positive and negative in explicit and sometimes unseen ways.

The study is also delimited geographically and in terms of institutional affiliation. It only included people positioned in institutions of higher education in Canada. It does not include community members who may have very different understandings of CES, nor does it include those outside of Canada whose contexts would also be different.

1. Research Orientation: Gadamer's Hermeneutics

This inquiry into CES was shaped by Gadamer's hermeneutics. An important aspect of hermeneutic research, regardless of the specific topic under study, involves its "overall *interest* which is in the question of human meaning and of how we might makes sense of our lives in such a way that life can go on" (Smith, 1991, p. 200). This resonated well with the ontological interest that led me to seek out CES as an area of research for this dissertation.

The purpose of hermeneutics, as Smith (2010) explained, is to reveal the original question that called a text, event or phenomenon into being. When we recover the question, he noted, we can consider if the responses to it are currently relevant. In undertaking this kind of research, the researcher creatively interprets, creating meaning, not just reporting on it (Smith, 1991). Hermeneutic inquiry begins with a recognition that we are born into a pre-existing world, born into traditions and language systems within which we come to know others and ourselves. While at first this world might seem complete, we soon learn that the languages we inherit cannot fully articulate what we mean and that "reality is always reality for us, but it always opens out into a broader world which serves or can serve to enrich our understanding of who we are" (smith, 1991, p. 197). It is by seeking to understand the world we inhabit, and ourselves within it, that we interpret and create them.

Approaching CES within a Gadamerian frame enabled me to both understand and critique engagement in relation to the questions it addresses. In what follows I lay out four key concepts for hermeneutical research: Gadamer's logic of question and answer, the importance of creativity in interpretation, the interplay of whole-part-whole, and

intersubjectivity. I then turn more specifically to recommendations for undertaking hermeneutical research.

Gadamer's logic of question and answer

Gadamer's belief in the ongoing process of interpretation by a subject who is conditioned by historicity and tradition leads to an understanding of all knowledge as partial and incomplete (Hekman, 2003; Warnke, 1987). As Gadamer (1975) explained, the "noble task of hermeneutics (is): to make expressly conscious what separates us as well as what brings us together" (p. 315). Thus in encountering a new text, event or phenomenon, we enter into a conversation that involves a dialectical movement between our own provisional understanding and the text, a movement aimed not at pinning down meaning once and for all, but at developing a common understanding of each other (Smith, 2010). Central to Gadamerian hermeneutics is the idea that shared meaning and understanding can be generated through a "fusion of horizons" (Gadamer, 1988). In the fusion of horizons, the interpreter, who is conditioned by his/her horizon or tradition, approaches the material in an open manner hoping to be told something. This is not simply a matter of the text revealing itself, however, and the researcher documenting that revelation (Smith, 2010). Rather, the intentions of the text's author, as well as the text's own historicity, fuse with those of the interpreter to achieve an understanding. Hermeneutics, then, is relational.

Hermeneutics avoids the modernist tendency to absolutism and universal truth, while also avoiding the post-modern tendency to radical and irreconcilable difference that makes political and equity claims difficult (Hekman, 2003). As smith (2010) pointed out, Gadamer viewed metaphysics not as something to be overcome, as many other Western

philosophers since Kant have done, but as a phenomenon operating through language and thus open to interpretation. Gadamer argued that metaphysics could be seen as an attempt to solve certain problems, to resolve certain questions plaguing Western philosophical thought (Smith, 2010). In this way, he developed what Smith (2010) termed his "logic of question and answer" (p. 436). A text, event or phenomenon can be approached as the answer to a question that is as of yet unknown. The interpretive task is to recover the original question being answered and assess the responses to it to determine if they are relevant at this time. Smith (2010) describes this as an emancipatory task because if the question is not remembered and reassessed, the responses to it can become alienating and estranging. It is in uncovering the question that we are able to determine if the responses "sustain things in the present in such a way that allows human life to go on, creatively" (Smith, 2010, p. 432).

Importance of creativity in interpretation

According to Smith (2010), the basic assumption of hermeneutics is that there is a difference between what is said and what is meant. The former captures the surface level of language, the latter the more full range of possible meanings that are manifest in what is said. All expression in language, then, is subject to interpretation. This interpretation does not result in development of a fixed meaning because it is always the result of a subjective act of imagination and creativity.

In order to interpret something that appears new or strange, Smith (2010) noted, we need to be capable of creativity. He pointed to Schleiermacher's important contribution to hermeneutics: the insistence that interpretation is creative. In order to interpret we

need to imagine possible meanings. In this way, we bring our tradition to the interpretive act and through interaction with a text, event or phenomenon we creativity construct meaning.

Interplay of whole-part-whole in interpretation

In his most widely cited work, *Truth and Method,* Gadamer (1982) sought to overcome the positivist hubris that is evident in assuming that we can develop an objective knowledge of phenomena. He pointed to tradition, pre-judgment or prejudice, that provides the ground for interpretation. Tradition in the Gadamerian sense is not a fixed repository of meanings that persist through time, but the pre-condition for all interpretive acts. Tradition shapes our way of seeing the world, enabling something to appear new or strange, to provoke our curiosity or call from us a response. As an interpretive approach, Gadamer's hermeneutics emphasizes how we are always already immersed in particular interpretive traditions, assumptions, and histories, without which no understanding would be possible (Gallagher, 1992). As a result, we bring our history with us to the interpretive act where we meet the history and tradition of that, or those, we seek to understand.

According to Gadamer (1988), understanding is a matter of working out the interpreters' projections through the whole-part-whole movement. Because the interpreter comes to the text with openness to understanding, he/she "projects a meaning of the whole" (Gadamer, 1988, p. 71). The task of understanding, then, is one of working out the "proper, objectively appropriate projections" (Gadamer, 1988, p. 72). It is to struggle with the material to determine which projections of the whole are discovered in the parts and therefore come into being in a return to the whole, and which projections fall away. This

requires having and acknowledging projections, while also being prepared to learn something that challenges them; "whoever wants to understand will not rely on the fortuitousness of his own pre-opinions…Rather, the person who wants to understand a text is ready to be told something by it" (Gadamer, 1988, p. 72). Openness to being told something does not mean being neutral or removing ourselves from the process of critical interrogation. Instead, it is a matter of setting the text in relation to our projections and moving back and forth between the two.

Building on Heidegger, Gadamer (1988) explained that the hermeneutic interpreter approaches the text with a historical consciousness, with an awareness of historical projections and prejudices, as well as an awareness of the historicity of the text. Because we are born into a particular tradition, which is reflected in language, we are historical and traditional beings. When we are aware of this historicity, we are able to see and be open to the historicity of the text as well.

The text is not the same as our own expression or understanding, but it is familiar enough that we can begin to make sense of it. So the task of hermeneutics is also based on a "polarity of familiarity and strangeness" (Gadamer, 1988, p. 76). This polarity is the between of "between historically meant distanced objectivism and belonging to a tradition". It is in the middle of an objective distance from our own traditions and an unaware emersion in these traditions. In the *between* is the true place of Hermeneutics because it is the place where we can maintain our own traditions and embrace the traditions of the text, we can be aware of our traditions while also participating in them.

Temporal distance involves a constant enlargement, which is productive for understanding. It allows prejudices that catch only a part of the work to die off, while allowing those which make possible a true understanding to emerge (Gadamer, 1988, p. 77).

This back and forth movement does not end in a mastery of all that can ever be known about the text, because the understanding achieved is based on one's starting point. Gadamer draws off Heidegger's argument that "understanding of the text remains permanently determined by the anticipatory movement of the pre-understanding" (Gadamer, 1988, p. 74). Heidegger asserts the impossibility of complete understanding and the inexhaustibly alien components of the text, which Gadamer sees as a process of "concretizing the historical consciousness" (1988, p. 74). The process is one of ensuring awareness of our own historical projections (prejudices) in a way that ensures we don't simply come away with the same historical projection we started with, nor with a new and fully complete understanding. There is always more to the text than we bring to it and there is always something different in the text than we anticipate.

The interpreter presupposes that the text has coherent and complete meaning within it, but also that it transcends his/her current understanding. Gadamer (1988) gave an example of receiving a letter. We approach the letter through our own projections and in reading it begin to see things through the eyes of the writer, which is another way of saying that we take what the writer is saying to be true. Further, we see the letter writer as having some authority over their description of events, since they were the one experiencing them. However, we do not naively accept everything the letter has to say. We place the author's claims within our own understanding, identifying inconsistencies, silences, and ruptures.

When approaching a text, we are open to the possibility that the text communicates something beyond our own projections and prejudice. We are guided by a "transcendent expectation of meaning" (Gadamer, 1988, p. 74), an expectation that the meaning of the text transcends the projections and prejudice we bring to it. In a back and forth, whole-part-whole movement, the interpreter seeks to expand, in concentric circles, the unity of understood meaning (Gadamer, 1988). Knowledge emerges in the interplay of universal and particular, an interplay that forms the "hermeneutic circle" (Smith, 1991, p. 190).

Ontological considerations are key to Gadamer's hermeneutic circle. While previous hermeneutic thinkers emphasized the hermeneutic circle as merely the interdependence between the parts and the whole in any interpretation, Gadamer draws from Heidegger's transformation of the hermeneutic circle as one that expresses how "all understanding is 'always already' given over to that which is to be understood" (Malpas, 2014, ¶9). Thus it is not just that we need to attend to the particular and the universal, the part and the whole and how they relate in our interpretations. Rather, the hermeneutic circle in Gadamer's hermeneutics points to the way that all understanding is based in some way on a prior ontological understanding (Malpas, 2014, ¶9). Any attempt to understand phenomena depends on our recognizing it as something to be understood, and thus depends on a fore-structure, a situatedness in the world. In coming to understand, we come to expose this fore-structure that we are already familiar with, since is has been with us as a fore-structure in our attempt to understand. It is both familiar and strange. It is important to note, however, that the fore-structure or our prejudice shapes any understanding, even our attempt to understand understanding. Thus there is no method in terms of a set of rules

that might be followed that can unearth understanding; understanding is necessarily dialogical and situated.

Intersubjectivity

In light of the hermeneutic circle, making a clear distinction between the self as subject and the topic under study as object is nonsensical; our subjectivity is developed in relation to the world taken as the object (Smith, 1991). Gadermerian hermeneutics, with its insistence that we find ourselves in our world and in each other, resists the colonization of difference (Code, 2003) and supports researchers in working through the complexities of subjugated and constructed identities (Warnke, 2003).

How then does Gadamer's view of intersubjectivity interact with concerns about power, inequality, and gender? Here Wallace's (2000) conceptual framework might be helpful. Wallace positions her work within the critical approach to subjectivity that is embraced by many post-structuralists, an approach that deconstructs the self/other dialectic. Wallace draws a connection between individual consciousness of prejudice on the one hand, and a collective consciousness of those of larger social groups on the other. To this she adds corresponding policy responses. Wallace's framework is important in that it demonstrates the links between the personal and social, while also recognizing unequal access to power, in this case organizational power.

Wallace identifies the three levels of consciousness that generate different modes of discourse and play out in the power relations of everyday practices. In the first, *I* approaches the Other as a means for achieving goals and understands the Other universally. In the second, *I* approaches the Other through reflection as a particular Other.

Here *I* is claiming to be master. In the third level, *I* knows the Other through authentic openness, which lets something be said. In this level *I* wants to hear and learn from the Other rather than achieve mastery over them. Gadamer refers to this last orientation as "dialectical ethics" (Gadamer as cited in Wallace, 2000). Hermeneutics is thus based on an understanding of the "deeply intersubjective nature of human knowing" (Smith, 2002, p. 197); we come to know through relation.

Hermeneutical research

At this point we might ask, "How does hermeneutical research proceed?" The research approach is not to be found in a standardized process that might be applied to a research endeavor, but in a philosophical approach that seeks to explore the process of understanding (Chang, 2010; Kincheloe, 2003). As Bernstein (1986) pointed out, Gadamer saw hermeneutics as distorted by questions of method, when this is understood as a process of gathering sanctioned knowledge by subjecting texts to a pre-determined investigative approach. Instead, hermeneutics is more concerned with expressing the distinctive type of knowledge that emerges when one authentically understands. As a method of inquiry, Gadamer's hermeneutics does not necessarily lay out how researchers should operationalize this philosophy. Rather, research carried out from a Gadamerian hermeneutical perspective aims for deep understanding of phenomenon (Fleming, Gaidys, & Robb, 2003). We can, therefore, look to hermeneutic scholars for some guidance that will assist with research study design.

According to Smith (1991), there are four requirements that the hermeneutic researcher should incorporate in their study:

1. A deep attentiveness to language that includes gaining a sense of what drives our language: its presuppositions, the etymological origin of words, and the ways in which these words are used.
2. An orientation to the basic interpretability of life. The hermeneutic researcher meaningfully deconstructs what is going on and proposes creative alternatives. The hermeneutic researcher struggles to continuously extend their understanding of what is at work by drawing off multiple narratives, including the suffocated narratives of spirituality, feminism, north-south relations, etc.
3. An understanding that hermeneutical research isn't concerned with hermeneutics itself but with how we might make sense of our lives. The hermeneutical imagination makes the familiar strange. This strangeness has the effect of showing how an area of study relates to the grander scheme of things. Hermeneutics is about finding ourselves, which is paradoxically about losing ourselves, by constantly engaging in the practice of interpretation. It draws from ideas across a variety of traditions in order to deepen our understanding of what it is we are investigating both vertically, reaching deep into a variety of traditions of understanding, and horizontally, positioning a phenomenon in its current context and in relation to the lifeworld.
4. Hermeneutical research is creative. It does not simply report meanings, but creates them. The task is to make proposals about the shared world with the aim of deepening our collective understanding of it. This does not remove the researcher's subjectivity from the act of interpretation; rather, a good

> hermeneutic interpretation is a creative act that shows how our lives are suppressed under the weight of dominant fundamentalisms.

With these points in mind, we can also look to Ellis (1998) who offered a useful image for imagining the unfolding of a hermeneutical research project. She depicted the process as a spiral with multiple loops to conceptualize the hermeneutic circle. Each loop represents engagement with various aspects of the phenomenon under study. The common thread of interpretation links the dialectical movements between part and whole.

The initial loop for this study began with my own experience of being addressed by the topic of engagement. In response, I began reading and conversing with community-engaged scholars, community members, and others, leading me to posit a program of study for my PhD program. I entered the second loop of the hermeneutic spiral when I conduced a concerted review of the literature on community-engaged scholarship, which is detailed in the next chapter.

2. Conceptualizing Community-Engaged Scholarship: The Literature

The purpose of this literature review is not simply to present an organized summary of pre-articulated knowledge about engaged scholarship, but, more central to a hermeneutic approach, to provoke thinking. What I discovered is that, for the most part, the literature on engagement demonstrates a disproportionate interest in the pragmatics of engagement, with very few scholars grappling with questions of "why?" "why now?" or "for whom?" Yet these seem to me to be the most interesting and the most important questions. If education must support living well with Others, as I believe it should, how does engaged scholarship help or hinder this project? This question cannot be answered unless we have a clear sense of what we're talking about when we say *engaged scholarship* and a clear sense of what we hope to achieve when we promote it.

There is much to think about here. My review begins with a brief summary of the work of Ernest Boyer, who coined the phrase *scholarship of engagement*, which has been picked up by scholars in a variety of ways. I touch briefly on themes that emerge in the literature on pragmatics of engagement before turning my attention to literature that tries to understand and articulate community-engaged scholarship. I summarize three dominant conceptualizations of engagement developed from my reflection on the literature and informed by my own emerging understanding of engagement. This deepened understanding forms the springboard from which I leap into the next loop of the study.

Roots of engagement: Ernst Boyer

The term *scholarship of engagement* was first introduced by Ernest Boyer in the mid nineteen nineties. Citing the "decline in public confidence in America's colleges and

universities" (1996, p. 18) as a key driver of the need to re-conceptualize scholarship, he argued that American universities were facing a crisis of relevancy and legitimacy. Universities, he asserted, are no longer seen as being at the "vital centre" (Boyer, 1996, p. 18) of the nations work, but as somehow separate from the problems and concerns of communities. Boyer (1990, 1996) traced the history of higher learning in America, pointing out the historical interconnectedness of the academy and society. He argued that the connection between society and institutions of higher education has seriously declined, resulting in universities being seen as a place where "students get credentialed and professors get tenured" (Boyer, 1996, p. 23).

In order to understand this crisis of relevancy, it is important to know a bit about land-grant universities in the United States. Originally established through the Morrill Act of 1862, land-grant universities were established as non-elite colleagues that could enable members of the working classes to obtain a practical education (Alperovitz, Dubb & Howard, 2009). Two key element of the land-grant model were: (1) extension services, which disseminated research, in particular to farmers who could use it and (2) the agricultural experiment station, which generated this research. The agricultural focus of land-grant universities is well documented, as is the important fact that at the heart of the land grant mission was a commitment to offering a training ground for democratic life and civic practice. Thus the social contract of land-grant universities was one of being a people's university. It is this social contract that was broken, leading to the crisis of relevancy Boyer cites as an impetus for change.

While recognizing that universities must protect their independence, both politically and intellectually, Boyer (1996) challenged institutions of higher education to broaden the

scope of scholarship by moving beyond the insular engagement of academics with other academics, to rediscover their higher purpose of scholarship of engagement. This rediscovery requires a new paradigm of scholarship whereby research, while still valued, does not dominate scholarly activity. Boyer's model of scholarship is comprised of four interrelated and interlocking functions: discovery, integration, sharing and application.

The first function of the scholar, the scholarship of discovery, includes an insistence that university research continue to push the boundaries of human knowledge. Scholarship of discovery comes closest to what is traditionally defined as research, which Boyer understood as a disciplined, investigative effort central to the work of higher learning. Universities are uniquely placed to expand knowledge as a result of their political and intellectual independence. Scholarly investigation is at the "heart of academic life and the pursuit of knowledge must be assiduously cultivated and defended" (Boyer, 1990, p. 18). This might seem to be support for a traditional model of research, as we will see it must be viewed through engagement. Engaged research does not stand on its own, but must be integrated, shared, and based on community concerns.

The second function, the scholarship of integration, involves placing research discoveries in a larger context and linking them to interdisciplinary conversations (Boyer, 1996). The complex questions facing communities do not divide themselves neatly into academic disciplines; they include components that may be addressed by a variety of disciplines. Scholarship of integration breaks down disciplinary boundaries, but also involves integration of knowledge created by scholars with that of non-specialists and with the "ethos" of the larger context (Boyer, 1990, p. 18). The key question driving the scholarship of integration is "what do the findings mean?" (Boyer, 1990, p. 21).

The third function, scholarship of sharing, evolves out of Boyer's earlier thinking on what he termed the scholarship of teaching whereby teaching is defined as scholarship because it "both educates and entices future scholars" (Boyer, 1990, p. 23). Teaching also builds bridges between the teacher's understanding and the student's learning and stimulates active students capable of critical thinking and lifelong learning. Sharing goes beyond teaching, however, to include the necessity of communication with a variety of interested parties, including those positioned within communities (Boyer, 1996). Scholarship is a communal act and, therefore, scholars must disseminate their work and communicate their ideas beyond their academic peer group.

The fourth and final function is the scholarship of application, which moves outward, towards engagement. The scholarship of application asks how knowledge can be used or applied towards consequential problems faced by individuals, institutions, and communities (Boyer, 1990). It also asks how the scholarly agenda can be shaped and informed by those problems. Application is not the same as volunteerism, rather, it is a dynamic process whereby "theory and practice vitally interact, and one renews the other" (Boyer, 1990, p. 23). Understanding how to apply knowledge, how to use it to inform concrete actions for change, is not simply a community concern. Because application informs and is informed by knowledge, it is also a scholarly concern. Boyer described this scholarly activity as that of becoming a "reflective practitioner" (Boyer, 1996, p. 27) and pointed to the blurred distinctions between knowledge and its uses; distinctions that disappear when knowledge is directed towards humane ends.

Boyer concluded his delineation of the four functions of the engaged scholar by asserting that "scholarship of engagement means creating a special climate in which the

academic and civic cultures communicate more continuously and more creatively with each other" (Boyer, 1996, p. 33). While Boyer's work states much of what was already known about university scholarship, his reframing of what is valued as scholarly work came at a "propitious moment" (Rice, 2002, p. 7). Boyer articulated concerns already visible in higher education under the challenge of redefining scholarship. Rice (2002) framed Boyer's *Scholarship Reconsidered* as a tipping point phenomenon. Similarly, Ward (2003) cast Boyer's work as both a culmination of and a catalyst for thinking about scholarship and its meaning. Zlotkowski (2005) also saw Boyer's work as a catalyst; providing the "intellectual scaffolding" needed for the creation of new ties between the university and the community (p. 148).

The growth of engaged scholarship

As a result of the ideas expressed in Boyer's *Scholarship Reconsidered* (1990), as well as a conviction that the United States state and land-grant institutions were facing deep and significant structural changes, the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NAULGC), with funding from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, developed a multi-year national commission to examine the future of public higher education in the United States. With representation from over 25 senior university administrators and academics, the NAULGC was well placed to comment on the state of land-grant universities. From 1996-2000, the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities (Kellogg Commission) produced six reports. The first five focused on the student experience (1997), student access (1998), the engaged institution (1999a), a learning society (1999b), and campus culture (2000a). The sixth report (2000b) called for

a “renewal of the covenant”, a renewal of the close partnership between the public and the public’s universities. Reiterating some of Boyer’s concerns, the Kellogg Commission (2000b) noted that institutions of higher education are perceived to be out of touch, out of date, and not structured in such a way as to bring their considerable resources and expertise to bear coherently on community problems.

The Kellogg Commission clearly articulated the perceptions that had been a growing concern for several decades among some higher education leaders (Vogelgesang, Denson & Jayakumar, 2010). The Kellogg Commission (2000b) called for an engagement with communities that spread the resources and scholarship of the university out, while also taking in the concerns and knowledge of the community. While much of the thinking on engagement at the time assumed the effect of engagement would influence both the scholar and the community, and indeed saw this mutual effect as a key factor distinguishing engagement from outreach or service, the Kellogg commission helped to further the conceptualization of the scholarship of engagement by clearly stating this effect (McDowell, 2003, p. 32).

Since the Kellogg Commission reports, community-engaged scholarship has become a focus of many land grant institutions in the United States. Many of these institutions’ legitimacy and resulting public support depend on demonstrating that their resources are employed in service to the nation. Community-engaged scholarship provides a means by which this can be accomplished. As a result, the past two decades have seen enormous growth in the practices of engagement and in analysis of the structures needed to support this work in universities in the United States (e.g., American Association of State Colleges and Universities Task Force on Public Engagement, 2002; Holland, 2000, 2005; Holland &

Gelmon, 1998; Shulman, 2004; Stanton, 2008). Many authors of the early works on the scholarship of engagement were organizational leaders substantiating the need for higher education institutions' engagement with the communities of which they are a part (Ramaley 1997; Votruba as cited in Sandmann, 2008). Thus in the United States, engagement was initially shaped by the voices of senior administrators whose discourse revolved around questions of organizational reform (Fear, Rosaen, Bawden & Foster-Fishman 2006).

In Canada there is a similar growing societal expectation for universities to become more engaged with the needs of their communities (McLean, Thompson & Jonker, 2006). The ideas expressed by Boyer and the Kellogg Commission have aligned most strongly with university continuing education (UCE) departments and faculties who also struggle with issues of relevance and a recognition that their relationship with the broader community is no longer what it could and should be. Given UCE pressures related to funding, cost-recovery models, institutional restructuring, and the neoliberalization of higher education overall, it is no surprise that UCE leaders and practitioners are interested in thinking critically about their future role in the larger society. Some UCE practitioners point to the opportunity engaged scholarship might present to revive the activities such as social activism, community development, and justice education, which are no longer a primary focus of UCE in the contemporary period (McLean, Thompson & Jonker, 2006).

The interest in engagement is not limited to UCE departments, however, and is influencing the wider culture of higher education. For example, Kiely, Sandmann, and Bracken (2006) described engaged scholarship as a social movement in higher education that presents an opportunity for adult educators, who typically position their work within a

social justice orientation, to overcome the marginalization of their field. Engaged scholarship may reinvigorate aspects of adult education that have eroded in the past two decades. Hall (2011) argued that engaged scholarship is an important support for the global knowledge movement, which is centered on the lived experiences of those seeking justice and (2009) explored its potential in virtue of the extensive experience of Canadian adult educators. CES may offer a common identifier within which disparate practices of scholarship, such as community-based participatory research, social justice scholarship, service learning, etc., might mutually reinforce and strengthen each other. Advocates of community-university engagement have been building momentum across Canada, at the same time as a number of institutions of higher education are positioning civic education and community service closer to the centre of their purpose (Jackson, 2010).

Federal government support for CES in Canada, while limited, is provided by at least two granting councils—the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council and Canadian Institutes of Health Research (Jackson, 2010). Additionally, a number of national and regional working groups, conferences, and symposia have emerged in Canada including: the biannual Community-University Expo conference, the Community-Based Research Canada network, the Canadian Alliance for Community Service-Learning, and a new, broader-based vehicle known as the Knowledge Commons Initiative. Canadian institutions are beginning to develop international partnerships around engagement, with the University of Alberta becoming the first organization outside of the United States to obtain membership in the Engagement Scholarship Consortium. The Consortium is a non-profit educational organization, composed of state-public and private institutions of higher education whose goal is to work collaboratively to build strong university-community

partnerships anchored in the rigor of scholarship, and designed to help build community capacity (Engaged Scholarship Consortium, 2012). They are responsible for hosting the premier North American conference on outreach and engagement, and function as a hub for CES in the United States.

That engaged scholarship is a growing phenomenon in Canada is further evidenced by growing interest in community service learning (CSL) and establishment of offices to support CSL in Universities across the country; community engagement leadership positions created at universities and university colleges; and Presidential task forces to understanding engagement and recommend implementation strategies. In addition, conferences, working sessions, and journals focused on community-engaged scholarship in Canada either exist now or are in the planning stages. There is no denying that engaged scholarship has become an important part of the Canadian higher education landscape.

Issues, debates, and emerging directions

In the time since Boyer introduced the term scholarship of engagement, activities identified as an enactment of CES have expanded enormously. These activities include: engaged teaching and learning (Badley, 2003), community service learning (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996), action-oriented research (Small & Uttal, 2005), engaged research (Van de Ven, 2007), community-based research (Strand, Marullo, Cutforth, Stoecker & Donohue, 2003), community-engaged scholarship (Calleson, Jordan & Seifer, 2005), public scholarship (Colbeck & Michael, 2006), community-university partnerships (Buys & Bursnall, 2007), and service scholarship (O'Meara, 2000), to name a few.

How scholars understand these practices, their purpose and methodology, is subject to debate, informed by the existing traditions of theorizing and critical scholarship within these activity domains. Scholar's social and institutional positioning also affects how their engagement is viewed (Kasworm & Abdrahim, 2014). While the list of practices here is not exhaustive, it helps to draw a picture of what divergent approaches to CES hold in common: an orientation to community interests, as well a way of interacting with communities that goes beyond the one-way dissemination of knowledge. That this understanding is very general can be attributed to the fact that there is very little scholarship on CES, very little reflective scholarship on CES as a field of practice. As a result, the field is marked by confusion and contested practices, demonstrating the need to move to a more philosophical and theoretical engagement with engagement (Sandmann, 2008) as well as "unclear goals and historical fragmentation" (Shaffer, 2013, p. 127). That being said, as more scholars study engaged scholarship overall there is a corresponding increase in critical evaluation and attempts to achieve conceptual clarity. Sandmann (2007) captured some of the changes in how engagement is conceptualized in her ten-year review of articles published in one engagement journal. She describes four punctuations in the evolution of engaged scholarship: describing engagement, engagement as teaching and research, engagement as a scholarly expression, and institutionalizing engagement. As we will see in the section that follows, the field continues to be dominated by these sorts of concerns, while also being marked by a lack of clarity about what engaged scholarship means. This is problematic, for without clarity a broad range of people and practices can be understood as engaged, resulting in a movement that stands for everything and nothing at the same time (Saltmarsh, Hartley & Clayton, 2009).

While the conceptualization of engaged scholarship is an important foundational issue scholars are grappling with, and one that we will look at in some depth later in this literature review, most of the literature on engagement is marked by more pragmatic concerns. Theses concerns centre on the mechanics of engagement including: development of guidebooks and strategies for engagement; understanding what motivates engaged scholarship and what the barriers to engaging might be; how to document, measure, and reward engagement; and how to institutionalize engagement.

A number of authors have published articles categorizing program activities and developing guidebooks and strategies for engagement (i.e., Bringle, Hatcher, Hamilton & Young, 2001; Noel, 2011; Van de Ven, 2007;). Others have produced more focused explorations, looking at such things as nurturing the engagement relationship (i.e., Bringle & Hatcher, 2002; Fogel & Cook, 2006), best practices related to encouraging student engagement with community (i.e., Avila-Linn, Rice & Akin, 2012), or engagement within a particular context, for example, health (i.e., Seifer, 2000, 2006). These guides are supplemented by a plethora of case studies that extract lessons learned from individual engagement partnerships.

Introductions to engaged scholarship are important but not enough to ensure engagement. Understanding faculty and institutional motivation to engage is an important part of building momentum for engaged scholarship. A number of articles examine motivation, as well barriers, to engagement (i.e., Colbeck & Weaver, 2008; Holland, 1999; Weerts & Sandmann, 2008). These articles lead quite quickly to issues of promotion and tenure. For example, Finkelstein (2001) pointed out that the undervaluing of community engagement within higher education culture, and the uncertainties regarding how to

evaluate, assess, and document engagement, act as barriers to embracing this practice. As long as engagement is seen as less scholarly than traditional teaching and research activities, and therefore rewarded accordingly, it will be difficult to encourage scholars to adopt this practice. Further, the misunderstanding that engaged scholarship is the equivalent of service, which holds relatively little weight in the academic reward structure, presents a significant barrier to the practice of this activity (Vogelgesang, Denson & Jayakumar, 2010).

Given the predominance of scholar's tenure and promotion concerns in studies of barriers to engagement, it is not surprising that a good deal of literature on engaged scholarship examines strategies to document, measure, and reward engagement. As faculty become more actively involved with their communities, the issues that continually arise are those related to faculty rewards, promotion, and tenure (Sandmann, Foster-Fishman, Lloyd, Rauhe & Rosaen, 2000). Institutions of higher education in general, and research-intensive universities in particular, do not appropriately reward faculty involvement in community work (Diamond, 2006, 2009; Diamond & Adam, 1993, 1995; Vogelgesang, Denson & Jayakumar, 2010). Untenured faculty members are more likely to receive promotion for publishing articles in peer-reviewed journals than for demonstrating an active commitment to addressing community problems. Engaged scholarship is professionally risky and, for this reason, much attention has been paid to promotion and tenure guidelines.

There are changes on the horizon, however. In their study of campuses that received Carnegie classification for curricular engagement, outreach, and partnerships, Saltmarsh, Giles, Ward and Buglione (2009) found that engaged scholarship reward policies are in

transition. Institutions are developing more expansive understandings of scholarship and attempting to reward them accordingly. This is only a first step, however. Once institutions expand their definition of scholarship to include engagement, the problem of how to evaluate this work arises (Finkelstein, 2001). Hierarchies of knowledge in institutions of higher education interfere with valuing community as peers and obscure recognition of multiple forms of scholarship. Knowledge is produced, but because it is produced by alternative methods of knowing, researching, disseminating, or in partnership with those who are not themselves scholars following academic protocols, it is either invisible or not respected by academic communities (Holland, Powell, Eng & Drew, 2010). The key challenge, then, is to demonstrate engagement's scholarly value.

To aid in dealing with this issue, a number of scholars and institutions of higher education, particularly in the USA, have developed definitions of engaged scholarship, expanded promotion and tenure standards, and implemented measures to more fully include engaged scholarship in the promotion and tenure process (Braxton & Del Favero, 2002; Calleson et al., 2005; Church, Zimmerman, Bargerstock, & Kenney, 2003; Franz, 2011; Jordon, 2007). Frameworks and recommendation have also been put forward to assist scholars in documentation (i.e., Driscoll & Lynton, 1999; Franz, 2011; Lynton, 1995; Moore & Ward, 2008; Seifer, 2003) and evaluation (i.e. Colbeck, 2002; Diamond & Adam, 1995; Glassick, Huber & Maeroff, 1997; O'Neill, 2008; Vernon & Ward, 1999) of engaged scholarship.

For example, Glassick et al. (1997) proposed a model that evaluates scholars' work as scholarship on the basis of the extent to which it includes clear goals, is adequately prepared, uses appropriate methods, has significant results, creates an effective

presentation of the work, and reflects critical activity. Diamond and Adam (1993) suggested a model that defines scholarship as work that requires in-depth level disciplinary expertise, is innovative, can be documented, peer-reviewed, replicated, and has a significant impact. While models and advice differ, there are some consistencies in approaches to recognizing engaged scholarship. In her review of literature relating to re-conceptualizing the tenure and promotion process, Oliphant (2009) identified 7 suggestions that continually arise: begin with the institutional mission; include faculty in re-conceptualizing evaluation processes; be explicit in defining scholarship and provide clear guidelines for how it will be assessed; re-examine workload expectations; assess the impact of work and involve community partners in peer review; recognize multiple forms of outputs; and adopt multiple forms of teaching assessment.

Higher education leaders seeking to establish community engagement as a core institutional value need to understand how to embed the values of engagement in institutional reward policies (O'Meara, 2000, 2005; Saltmarsh, Giles, O'Meara & Sandmann, 2009; Saltmarsh, Giles, Ward & Buglione, 2009; Ward, 2003). While tenure and promotion policies are fundamental to institutional change, implementing these changes requires approaching change from multiple leverage points, including institutional culture (Calleson, Jordan & Seifer, 2005).

The complexities of university supports and barriers to institutionalizing engagement, as well as strategies for moving forward, are well documented (e.g., Checkoway, 2000; Cox, 2000; Fogal & Cook, 2006; Holland, 1997; Rubin, 2000; Sandmann & Weerts, 2008). Despite these resources, as Saltmarsh, Hartley, and Clayton (2009) pointed out, engagement is currently not the defining characteristic of higher education's

mission, nor is it embraced across disciplines. Few institutions have made the systemic changes necessary to create the academic culture needed to value community engagement as a core function. This may be, in part, because engagement is positioned directly against the disciplinary nature of most universities (Holland et al., 2010; Saltmarsh, Hartley & Clayton, 2009). Nonetheless, changing policies, practices, and the culture of higher education remain central concerns in the efforts to institutionalize engagement.

Conceptualizing engagement: Three approaches

While organizations and higher education institutional working groups have encouraged and promoted engaged scholarship, some also have acknowledged the lack of a consistent understanding of what it is they are promoting (Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions, 2005). The Research Universities and Civic Engagement Network, at their UCLA gathering in 2007, recognized this problem and called on their colleagues to embrace engagement, engaged scholarship, and community-engaged scholarship while acknowledging the need for "a much sharper, nuanced conceptualization of engaged research than currently exists" (Stanton, 2007, p. 8). Attempting to establish what constitutes community engagement is a central challenge (Mullins, 2011).

Engagement scholars have taken up this challenge, developing and importing typologies, conceptual frameworks, and other mechanisms to help bring clarity to the field. Few in number, these articles are important reflections *on* engaged scholarship. In the section that follows I analyze those publications explicitly seeking to define, understand, explain, or delineate engaged scholarship as an overall field of practice. My analysis reveals three overlapping conceptual frames. Though presented discretely, these three

conceptualizations are, in fact, mutually informing trends in the literature, differentiated by the extent to which they emphasize a particular framing of engagement.

The first conceptual frame envisions engagement very broadly, as a valuable end-in-itself, an end of linking community with higher education. The second frame positions engagement as a means to an ill-defined end, often as a means to democratic renewal and support, though without advocating for any particular understanding of democracy. The third frame envisions engagement as a philosophical orientation embedded within practice, one that disrupts the dominant epistemology and culture of the academy in order to achieve equality and emancipation in knowledge production.

Frame 1: Engaged scholarship as an end-in-itself

The first, most broad conceptualization envisions engagement as linking scholarship, understood as the action of scholars and/or institutions of higher education, to community, broadly defined as those outside the traditional academic audience of peers. Many, though not all, of these publications are found in the grey literature: in reports from working groups, organizations, and institutions of higher education. Here authors recognize the civic obligation of higher education, but frame engagement as a desirable end-in-itself.

While a critical scholar might speculate about the unexpressed ends that these conceptualizations point to, in this frame there is little critical scholarship. In some ways this is not surprising since there is a lack of criticality in engagement endeavors over all (Fear et al., 2006; Saltmarsh, Hartley & Clayton, 2009). In this frame, engagement is assumed to be a principal good. Questions about the deeper purpose of engagement do not typically arise; the purpose *is* engagement. Likewise, questions about what is included and

excluded in engagement, and discussions of the appropriate methods with which to engage, are not picked up in any depth. This frame of engagement does not lead to a critical reconsideration of existing activities in the academy, rather, it recognizes the many levels or gradations of engagement: "engagement occurs under a large tent featuring a wide range of activities, stakeholders, and even 'dialects' to describe these initiatives" (Sandmann & Weerts, 2006, p. 5).

For example, the National Review Board for the Scholarship of Engagement (n.d.) considered engaged scholarship to include scholarship in the areas of teaching, research, and/or service that engages faculty in academically relevant work that simultaneously meets campus mission and goals as well as community needs. In essence, it is a scholarly agenda that integrates community issues. Holland (2005) suggested that community engagement could be understood as the intentional collaboration between higher education institutions and their larger communities for mutual beneficial exchanges of knowledge and resources in the context of reciprocity and partnership. The National Centre for Outreach Scholarship at Michigan State University views outreach and engagement as scholarship that cuts across teaching, research, and service in a manner that involves generating, transmitting, applying, and preserving knowledge for the direct benefit of external audiences in ways that are consistent with university and unit missions (Glass, Doberneck, & Schweitzer, 2010). Similarly, the Kellogg Commission (1999a) envisioned engagement broadly, as reciprocal and mutually beneficial partnerships: two-way streets defined by mutual respect for what each brings to the table.

In their review of literature and practice in Australia, Sunderland, Muirhead, Parsons, & Holtom (2004) shared findings that support this first frame, describing a

conceptualization of engagement that views community engagement as an irreducible and unavoidable element of existing university activities. Here it is assumed that all research and teaching ultimately involves engagement with the community and the aims of community engagement do not differ from the traditional aims of higher education. Rather, pre-existing practices such as community consultation, community development, fundraising, and public relations have simply been re-branded as community engagement.

Given the breadth with which engaged scholarship is described by authors in this frame, it is not surprising that what counts as scholarship, for the most part, does not exclude an understanding of community engagement as infrastructure partnership, consultation, producing knowledgeable graduates, publishing books, and other traditional roles of scholars and universities. Thus engagement as an end-in-itself is easily embraced by institutions of higher education, and can become a rhetorical strategy to market existing activities. Without a clearly stated purpose beyond engagement itself, engaged scholarship can easily become nothing more than a public relations function on the part of university administration (Saltmarsh, Hartley & Clayton, 2009).

Frame 2: Engaged scholarship as a means to an ill-defined end

The second conceptualization of engagement frames it as a means to an ill-defined end, typically one of supporting civic education, civic renewal, and democracy, though sometimes also an end of stronger research findings, easier implementation, or greater research impact. This conceptualization remains very broad as it does not specify what the aim of engagement is, or ought to be. And, in fact, it is more concerned with viewing engagement as a set of practices than defining what those practices are supposed to achieve. Given the emphasis here on engaged scholarship as an overall field, I will not go

into the many writings on specific practices. It is worthy of note, however, that practice specific literatures, such as those addressing community service learning and community-based research, have explored models and typologies that can inform those practice domains in some depth.

Authors included in this conceptual frame seek to develop models and typologies of engagement overall. These authors often describe engaged scholarship as a civic responsibility of higher education. The civic aims of higher education are closely linked to the needs of the nation and particularly to democracy (Saltmarsh & Hartley, 2012). However, the links between civic education and global citizenship, also an area of emerging importance in higher education, are only beginning to be explored in any depth. The complexities of engaged scholarship are similar to those of global citizenship education, which Shultz (2007) pointed out is a site of contestation and confusion.

Engaged scholars are thought to share a concern about civic responsibility that is motivated by different factors (Ramaley, 2001). An institution that embraces its civic responsibility sets for itself the goal of playing a role in generating a renewal of democracy by linking learning and community life through engaged scholarship. Stanton (2008), for example, in his summary of discussions held with 23 scholars from research universities in the US, framed engaged scholarship as part of the civic engagement movement in higher education. His report does not clearly articulate how civic engagement is understood. Rather, each university needs to determine for itself how it will understand engaged scholarship and, by implication, how it will support and institutionalize this work. Like Ramaley, Stanton leaves room for diverse understandings of democracy in the work of engaged scholars.

The link between democracy and scholarship is also taken up by Barker (2004) in his examination of engaged scholarship. He pointed out that engagement is characterized by a distinctive set of practices used in conflicting, confusing and overlapping ways and developed a taxonomy of five forms of engaged scholarship which include: public scholarship, participatory research, community partnerships, public information networks, and civic literacy. Each form, he argued, is anchored in a different idea of democracy, emphasizes different methodologies, and seeks to address slightly different problems. Like Barker, Doberneck, Glass, and Schweitzer (2010), also developed a typology of engaged scholarship. Based on current practices of engaged faculty at a research-intensive land-grant institution in the US, they identified 14 different activity types within the four broad categories of: publicly engaged research and creative activities; publicly engaged instruction; publicly engaged service; and publicly engaged commercialized activities. Butin (2007) identified four distinctive typologies - technical, cultural, political, and anti-foundational - that serve as Weberian ideals to clarify community engagement and its diverse goals. Thompson (2008) put forward a generic typology of engagement centered on three elements of partnership: collaboration, complexity and contract. Like the others, Thompson saw the aims and means of engagement as linked to civic responsibility in diverse and multifaceted ways.

Models developed to guide engaged scholarship include those of Stephenson (2011), who suggested scholars and administrators conceptualize engagement as a form of adaptive leadership that encourages social learning and change and is undertaken in collaborative complex adaptive social networks; Van de Ven (2007), who developed a model for engaged research that positions engagement within a scientific paradigm;

Aronson and Webster (2006), who suggested a ladder model for engagement whereby State and Land-Grant Universities follow five steps to become more engaged with community; Martin (2010), who derived five strategies for engaged scholarship, each of which positions the participants, in this case envisioned as policy practitioners, with varying degrees of involvement and influence; Sandmann, Saltmarsh, and O'Meara (2008), who suggested a four-pronged, integrated model to advance scholarship of engagement; and Holland, Powell, Eng, and Drew (2010), who identified 6 models of engaged scholarship: community-based participatory research, public anthropology and sociology, critical race theory, public dialogues, crisis disciplines (such as environmental conservation biology) and social entrepreneurship (though this last one was much contested). In addition, innumerous authors have presented case studies and showcased individual projects by way of offering models of engaged scholarship as well, though for the most part these are not conceptually developed and as a result have not been included here.

While typologies and models may be useful for engaged scholars, without a careful articulation of the nature of the democratic or civic ends of engagement, goals as diverse as maintaining and supporting a liberal democracy to facilitating revolutionary social action can be justified as legitimate goals of engagement. Here we have the problematic situation of encouraging scholarship for ill-defined civic ends, resulting in an "apolitical 'civic' engagement" (Saltmarsh, Hartley & Clayton, 2009).

Some scholars suggest that the ends of engagement be left for communities to decide. Schaefer and Rivera (2013) cast the purpose of community-engaged scholarship as that of bringing about change in different levels of society, change that is shaped and determined by community needs. They view engaged scholarship as based in service, its

research questions derived from community issues, needs and questions. Thus engagement is a means to whatever end communities determine. Checkoway (2013) captures this focus on community when he writes that "any scholar, whether a philosopher or a physicist, can be an engaged scholar when he or she develops knowledge with the well-being of society in mind rather than for its own sake" (p. 8). CES is also seen as a form of scholarship that has meaningful impact on communities (Gelmon, Jordan & Seifer, 2013). That being said, *why* having a direct impact on community and meaningful/ valuable scholarship are equated is not explored in the literature on CES.

Thus, in this second conceptual frame, we are left with an understanding of engagement that positions it as a means by which to achieve an ill-defined end, inviting a practice-based understanding of engagement and a focus on pragmatics. While these are important, conceptualizing engagement as a means does little to clarify the purpose of engagement, or critique some of the fundamental assumptions and values embedded in the engagement discourse.

Frame 3: Engaged scholarship as a philosophical orientation

The third conceptualization of engagement is grounded in philosophical and theoretical considerations relating to the purpose of engaged scholarship. Of the three frames I have presented here, this frame offers the most precise understanding of engagement, one that enables exclusion of some community-university activities, while still encompassing a breadth of practices. This lens highlights engaged scholarship as a field that must be critical, aware of power, and make use of epistemological models that enable the co-creation of knowledge. Here engagement is cast as a critical and political knowledge

expansion activity that is linked to equality in knowledge production and resists the dominant epistemology within higher education.

In one of the most comprehensive explorations of engagement, Fear, Rosaen, Bawden and Foster-Fishman (2006) positioned engagement as a practice that can run counter to elitism with its corresponding focus on exclusion, domination, and the unilateral exercise of power. They argued the need for scholars to critically examine engagement such that it might realize this potential. Critical engagement, a mode of engaging that emerges out of their work, is "profoundly democratic, emancipative, and empowering – precisely what engagement in civil society needs to be" (p. 251). While Fear et al. positioned engagement as a moral obligation and critical engagement as a way to make democracy work, it is clear that they envisioned a kind of democratic functionality that is linked to equality and emancipation. Engagement is a change oriented, transformative, and emancipatory practice that scholars undertake with peers in the community. Fear et al. distinguished two forms of engagement, instrumental and critical, and argued in favour of the latter. Instrumental engagement is focused on getting things done. Critical engagement, while not wholly impractical, is focused on "helping individuals think intentionally and deeply about themselves, their work, and how they approach their practice" (p. 257). Critical engagement requires a kind of mindfulness to flows of power and helps people reinterpret the taken for granted, common ways of thinking in order to evaluate the truths presented by others, to see through hegemonic practices and dominant discourse, and to understand how perspectives can be shaped by those in power to further their own interests.

Saltmarsh, Hartley & Clayton (2009) also argued for a critical approach to engaged scholarship. They pointed to distinctions between two forms of engagement: civic engagement and democratic engagement, and made a case for democratic engagement because it better captures the principles of reciprocity and bidirectionality embedded within engaged scholarship. Civic engagement, they pointed out, is often used as an umbrella term for activities that connect with or relate to something (issue, concern, organization, people) outside the campus and is thus easily adapted into the existing culture of higher education. This notion of civic engagement comes very close to the first conceptual frame I presented above. However, civic engagement is more narrow in that it links engagement activities with an epistemology that privileges the application of university-based expertise to community problems. Civic engagement is embedded with a positivist understanding of research and holds knowledge producers separate from knowledge users in the community.

Democratic engagement, on the other hand, focuses on process, which is reciprocal and respects difference, and purpose, which is seen as that of enhancing a public culture of democracy on and off campus and alleviating public problems through democratic means. Critically questioning the process and purpose of engagement reorients civic engagement to democratic engagement which is distinguished not by the kind of knowledge generated, but if that knowledge and its use is inclusive of other sources of knowledge. Democratic engagement calls for a substantial change in the prevalent culture of academic institutions. It includes a shift in discourse to reciprocity grounded in explicitly democratic values of sharing tasks and encouraging participation in ways that enhance and enable broader conversations. Reciprocity implies that multiple forms of knowledge are valued and

scholarly work is conducted with shared authority and power. Democratic engagement thus locates the university within "an ecosystem of knowledge production" (p. 10) whereby the multi-directional flow of knowledge is key.

Democratic engagement is critical and attends to relations of power, resulting in a different kind of knowledge production. Sandmann, Kliewer, Kim and Omerikwa (2010) emphasized the importance of attending to power and the underlying philosophical constructs in engagement when they conducted an analysis of power as it relates to two core values of engaged scholarship: reciprocity and mutuality. Using the theories of Freire, Foucault, and Rawls, the authors examined engagement and offered a "relational engagement framework" as a tool for thinking deeply about issues of power in engagement. Likewise, Mullins (2011) positioned engagement, at least the engagement of public anthropologists, as a critical and social justice activity. He saw a trend in engagement whereby scholars are increasingly insisting that "truly engaged" scholarship is distinguished from other forms by its intentional political impacts on the social world (p. 236). He cited as exemplars practicing public anthropologists who frame their work in terms of social justice and make claims about the necessity of ongoing scholarly involvement in social change activities once the magnitude of a social problem has been understood. Fear and Sandmann (2001/2002) argued that engagement challenges the dominant technical rationality and instrumental knowledge of the university and called for a critical, values-based engagement that includes taking a stand on issues of importance. This challenge to the value neutrality of the scholar asks questions about scholar's responsibility to the wider public, particularly underprivileged publics. Holland et al. (2010) echoed this sentiment: "the engaged scholarship movement, to the extent that it

serves marginalized publics, is a move towards the democratization of knowledge production and distribution" (p. 24). Collaborative knowledge production is a power sharing activity that positions all parties as knowledge holders and creators.

The challenge engagement might present to dominant knowledge paradigms in higher education is also taken up by Schön (1995) who argued that engaged scholarship requires a new epistemology, one that includes norms of practice that will conflict with the prevailing epistemology of technical rationality built into the research university. The epistemological distinction is important because it is too easy to take up engaged scholarship without challenging the hegemonic force of higher education's dominant paradigm, and in doing so remove much of the exciting impetus for transformational change in how knowledge is produced and understood (Fear & Sandmann, 2001/2002). Engaged scholarship calls for an epistemology that challenges traditional notions of scholarly expertise, knowledge as objective, and knowledge as decontextualized (Dragne, 2007; McDowell, 2003; Rice, 2002). As Pollock (2010) argued,

> If engaged scholarship is not and certainly should not be ''outreach'' or ''service'' (especially as degraded to sharing intellectual goods on a short tether), then it must return to the university as fundamentally changed paradigms of knowing and knowledge production, or what and how we know. (p. 465)

Engaged scholarship challenges dominant paradigms of knowledge. As Fear and Sandmann (2001/2002) suggested, critical interpretations of engagement are guided by questions about the purpose of engagement and point to an epistemological model that is based in an engagement ethos. Thus, engagement within this conceptual frame is a critical

activity attentive to power dynamics and oriented to the co-creation of knowledge in ways that disrupt the prevailing epistemology embedded in institutions of higher education.

Summary

Key issues in the literature on engagement reflect a disproportionate interest in the pragmatics of engagement, including how to engage, document, reward, and institutionalize this activity. While these are important considerations, the more fundamental question is one of understanding what it means for scholars to engage with community in the first place.

Engaged scholarship as a field is currently conceptualized in three predominant ways: as an end-in-itself; as a means to an ill-defined end; and as a philosophical perspective that is embodied through a commitment to critical knowledge expansion, equality in knowledge production, and resisting the dominant epistemology within higher education. While each of these conceptualizations offers something to our understanding of engagement, the first two frames do not have the same transformational impetus as the third, and are easily embraced by institutions of higher education without significant changes. When broadly defined, engaged scholarship can become little more than the new buzzword for existing activities. Without a clear sense of the purpose of engagement, and how that links to methodology, it is difficult to delineate an engaged and non-engaged approach. In a white paper report capturing the discussion of 33 academic leaders in the US, Saltmarsh, Hartley & Clayton (2009) reported participant's consensus that engagement is stalled by ambiguous goals, fragmented efforts, and the academy's dominant ideology.

Emerging Research Questions

Canadian conceptualizations of engaged scholarship

Many Canadian scholars are embracing engaged scholarship and working to open up higher education spaces to ensure this practice is a viable form of scholarship that is rewarded accordingly. However, the literature that conceptualizes engagement is small, and disproportionately American. This invites questions about how Canadian scholars understand engaged scholarship. What is it that they believe they are working towards? Or, to put it more directly: *How do scholars in Canada conceptualize engaged scholarship?*

Intersubjective relations in engagement

As the literature review demonstrated, some critical scholars are expanding and deepening their understanding of engagement and exploring the potential for engagement to disrupt traditional academic knowledge systems. However, development of an engagement specific epistemology is by itself not enough. Watson, Hollister, Stroud and Babcock (2011) asserted that engagement in higher education, as a global phenomenon, is very much marked by differences in North and South that call for attention to the interconnection of epistemic and social exclusions. Inclusion, then, must attend to efforts to understand how the subject is excluded as well as how his/her knowledge is excluded. Changes in epistemology and ontology are deeply inter-related.

Smith (1999) argued that reciprocity in education requires prioritizing ontology. In Gadamerian terms, we might say that reciprocity is necessarily inclusive of understanding, of the shared becoming that is manifest in understanding. Recall that Gadamer positions understanding ontologically: understanding is a mode of being in the world. It is through understanding that we come to be, to know our own being in relation to others and to the larger world of being. The traditions we are born into and the prejudices that shape our

horizons are brought forth in understanding, as are those of the person, event, text or phenomena we are hoping to understand. Both are changed as a result of the encounter. Both find themselves in relation to the Other, they are created anew through the relation.

It is the possibilities for being that I would like to explore in this second question, which I see as different from questions about how partners are positioned in engagement in virtue of legal and informal partnership agreements, roles and responsibilities, etc. The latter do not help to unearth what it means to "be" an engaged scholar nor what modes of existence might be possible in and through engagement. The following question is meant to unearth these possibilities: *How do engaged scholars ontologically position themselves and Others in the engagement experience?*

Drivers of engagement

What is ultimately at stake in any discussion of engaged scholarship is that social engagement is unavoidably political, though it may not be explicitly so (Bernardo, Butcher, and Howard, 2012; Gunn & Lucaite, 2010; Nyden, Hossfeld, & Nyden, 2012). The emergence of community engagement as a new movement in Canadian higher education is happening within the context of a changing understanding of higher education more broadly. The factors driving engagement and support for engagement in higher education are underexplored. This leads to me to ask: *How does the changing context of higher education interact with the growing interest in engaged scholarship in Canada?*

Conclusion

In the time since Boyer introduced the term scholarship of engagement, activities identified as an enactment of CES have expanded enormously. Yet, the literature on

engagement demonstrates a disproportionate interest in the pragmatics of engagement, with very few scholars grappling with questions of "why?" "why now?" or "for whom?" While organizations and higher education institutional working groups have encouraged and promoted engaged scholarship, some also have acknowledged the lack of a consistent understanding of what it is they are promoting. In this study I seek to contribute to a deeper understanding of CES in Canada, by exploring what CES might mean, how scholars are positioning community and how the larger context of higher education interacts with CES.

3. Research Design and Methods

Hermeneutic research begins with a question, the essence of which opens up the possibility of understanding. The initial research question influences the entire research process (Fleming, Gaidys & Robb, 2003). For me, the question forming the springboard for this study centered on the potential for community-engaged scholarship in Canadian higher education to facilitate our living well with one another. Could community-engaged scholarship help us collectively navigate this world in a ways that are not oppressive? It is this question that I carried throughout the study, and which influenced my analysis of the literature and, later, the data.

To answer this question, I designed a study that explored three key research questions through research conversations with Canadian scholars knowledgeable about CES. University of Alberta ethics approval for research involving human subjects was secured prior to any contact with participants.

Research questions

After identifying the key themes and conceptualizations in the literature on engaged scholarship, I developed three research questions that emerged from this literature:

1. How do scholars in Canada conceptualize engaged scholarship?
2. How do engaged scholars ontologically position themselves and Others in the engagement experience?
3. How does the changing context of higher education interact with the growing interest in engaged scholarship in Canada?

Methods

In this study, data were collected through semi-structured interviews with nine scholars. The following section details data collection, participant identification and selection, a profile of selected participants, and data management/analysis strategies.

Data collection

Transcriptions of semi-structured interviews I conducted between January and June of 2013 formed the main text that I interpreted in this study. The data collection design included two interviews with each participant. I limited the interviews to two for pragmatic purposes, and also because I expected two interviews to be sufficient to bring me to a place where a deep understanding of engagement could be achieved.

For the first semi-structured interview, I developed a list of guiding questions and conversation prompts linked to the study's research questions (Appendix A). The guide was not meant to be followed exactly, but to ensure the interview conversation maintained an orientation to the phenomenon of engagement. After conducting the first interview I undertook a preliminary identification of emerging themes, writing them up in a summary that included a second set of questions as conversation prompts (Appendix B). This document was shared with participants in advance of the second semi-structured interview.

Two participants (given the pseudonyms Sandy & Amy) were recruited late in the study and only available for one longer interview. In these cases, I shared the commentary and questions developed for the second interview but used conversation prompts intended for both the first and second interviews. Interviews were conducted by phone, with the exception of two that were conducted in person. All interviews were audio recorded and transcribed, with pseudonyms assigned to protect participant identities.

Data management

All audio recordings were kept in a password-protected file on my home office computer. Transcribed interviews were likewise stored electronically and all files were password protected.

Identifying potential participants

I began identifying participants by noting names of scholars and authors who appeared in the Canadian literature on CES. I also reviewed the online record of successful SSHRC Community Grant recipients and past recipients of community university research alliance grants (CURA). I visited the websites of major universities in Canada that were publicly branding themselves as community-engaged through their promotions materials. Here I conducted key word searches, noting any scholars who were using the language of community engagement to describe their work and/or who were formally associated with an institutional centre or unit that was focused on community or public engagement. I paid special attention to the eight Canadian institutions partnering on the *Rewarding Community Engaged Scholarship* project. I noted CES award recipients at universities in Canada as announced through these institutions, higher education and CES list serves, and the popular media. I also perused community-engaged scholarship conference programs online and other information sources in order to identify scholars for potential inclusion. Finally, I asked for recommendations within my own research networks and at the end of the first round of participant interviews.

In qualitative research language, this approach reflects the use of purposive sampling whereby the researcher does not select participants through some random generation, but is purposeful in whom to include (Creswell, 1998). My study included two

forms of purposive sampling: snowball sampling, a method of developing and expanding a sample by asking one participant to recommend others (Babbie, 1995), and intensity sampling, whereby participants are included in the study on the basis of having rich information and experiences that manifest the phenomena intensely (Creswell, 1998).

Inclusion/ exclusion criteria

Only scholars who appeared in multiple search results were included in the study. While I initially expected this number to be large, anticipating a large number of community-engaged scholars in Canada, I soon discovered that there were a large number of scholars who were positioning one or two of their research papers within the literature on engagement, or undertaking a community engagement study as a "one off", but few who really centered their scholarship or practice around CES. Identifying scholars for inclusion to the study was harder than I anticipated, but I combed the sources described above to ensure that scholars with the most in-depth experience of CES were included.

This study included scholars in tenure track positions and a limited number of scholars in administrative positions related to engagement. The latter were included only if they were significantly involved in CES activities, for example having an active research portfolio in the area of CES. While I initially sought to only include tenure track scholars, I determined that gaining the perspective of those who chose to study and publish and teach on CES from an administrative role, rather than aim for tenure track positions, would be important to the study. Senior administrators, provosts, vice provosts, and deans were excluded because the perspectives of senior administrators are over represented in the literature on CES. I excluded graduate students and sessional instructors, as I felt that they

would not be as attached to their institutions as those who had secure ongoing employment.

Because I was situating my study of engagement within Canada, I only included participants located at Canadian institutions. In selecting recipients, I made an effort to ensure that they spanned four regions: Western, Central, and Eastern Canada, and Quebec. I also attempted to ensure that participants were situated in a variety of faculties and departments. Finally, I tried to ensure that scholars were undertaking a number of different engagement practices in the areas of teaching, research and service.

In addition to the process described above, I included one participant who was repeatedly cited as someone with extensive experience in community engagement but who purposely did not identify as a community-engaged scholar. This participant provided an important counterpoint to the engaged scholars' perspectives.

Recruitment

In all, 14 participants were selected for inclusion, with nine agreeing to participate. All potential participants selected for inclusion were initially contacted by phone using a phone script to guide the messaging (Appendix C) and/or through an introductory e-mail with an information letter attached (Appendix D). While I had planned for contact through an intermediary, and developed a separate information letter for this kind of contact, intermediary contact proved unnecessary. After three attempts at contact with potential participants, I assumed dissent and removed them from my list of potential participants.

Those who agreed to participate in the study were sent an information and consent letter (Appendix E). When the interview was conducted in person, the consent form was signed and collected, with the participant retaining the information letter. When the

interview was conducted over the phone, consent to participate was captured on the audio file and in many of these cases consent was also reflected in email correspondence relating to the identification of an interview date and time.

Participant overview

Nine participants agreed to participate in the study, a number that Boyd (2001) suggested is sufficient for a study of this nature. Of the nine participants, six self-identified as female and three as male. Geographically, four participants worked in Western Canada (Manitoba westward), three in Central Canada (Ontario), one in Quebec, and one in Eastern Canada (all provinces east/south east of Quebec). Participants worked in various faculties/ areas including: arts, humanities, education, extension, business, science, planning, social work, and history. Two participants were in their early career (0-9 years working fulltime in higher education), four in their mid career (10-20 years working fulltime in higher education) and three later in their careers (over 20 years working fulltime in higher education). Finally, seven participants were tenure track and two were in administrative positions related to engagement, though many tenure track scholars were also responsible for institutional mechanisms (such as centers and institutes) and administrative strategies to support or promote engagement.

The following individual participant profiles are meant to offer a glimpse of each participant. I have also included one or two quotes that indicate the kinds of concerns and issues that the different participants brought to the interview process and how they came to be located in an institution of higher education.

Sandy

Sandy, who is fairly early in her career, has been working in a tenure track position for seven years. She describes her work as *"community-engaged scholarship."* Though she completed a *"traditional dissertation project*", she *"always wanted to do my work in this [engaged] way."* Sandy recognizes the organizational barriers to graduate students undertaking community-engaged research in their dissertation:

> *I think that there were good reasons for them to be wary of students taking that route for dissertation… it is time consuming, things can go wrong that you don't expect, it's a fairly high profile department that has a good track record of placing students and they wanted to make sure that students would get through in a timely fashion and would have the kinds of results that would allow them to get good jobs. So I think there is a pretty solid logic behind it, it just wasn't a good fit for me.*

Amy

Amy is a mid career female. She describes her work in a variety of ways including *"public involvement, public engagement, community engagement."* Within these areas she presents herself as *"someone who has expertise in the design, implementation, and evaluation of public involvement or public engagement processes."* Amy's work centers on engagement strategies and processes: *"I would describe myself as an analyst of public involvement, you know theories and methods and various approaches."*

Before completing her PhD, Amy was a research coordinator at a university, a job she took while making some career decision. She explains: *"part of the reason for my taking a break after my Masters was to consider did I really want a PHD at all and do the whole academic thing, I wasn't convinced."* Her work as a research coordinator motivated her to

continue her studies: *"So, got the bug and did the PhD and then still wasn't sure if I wanted to come into a traditional academic setting."* However, she found an environment that seemed to suit her work:

> *I happen to work in a center that…has always been about, not only doing, you know producing knowledge that is of academic import, but also translating that knowledge so that it is useful for policy makers. So I think that is really the environment that I was well suited to not the academic, any academic environment*.

Corey

Corey is a mid career, male professor who has been playing an administrative role for the past 18 months. Corey did a "*very traditional [discipline] master's degree"* and then secured a job working with a community that saw benefit in his research skills and academic background. This exposed Corey to community-based approaches and motivated him to do a PhD: *"I was doing [topic] research in the community…that made me decide, you know, I gotta go back and get my PhD but I'm going to do it in [discipline] that is community-engaged."*

Denise

Denise is a female, tenured professor. She is mid career. She describes her area as *"education and research involving the First Nations and Aboriginal people.*" Denise was motivated, after graduating with her PhD, by a desire to do education program development that was *"more responsive to the learning ways of Aboriginal people."* Initially Denise did not think she would become a tenure track academic, she was more interested in teaching and saw the PhD as a necessary credential for ongoing teaching opportunities:

[I] *was not going to be an academic… I was much more interested in teaching. I really wasn't very interested in research or publishing, it wasn't why I was there doing what I was doing. I came back to my PhD because I knew that if I wanted to keep teaching in First Nations with First Nations I was going to eventually need to have a PhD. So it wasn't ever about an academic appointment.*

Henry

Henry is a male, tenured professor in the later years of his career. He worked for many years doing research in community. He joined the university at a time *"before this kind of research was allowed, let alone semi-fashionable."* Henry describes himself as a scholar with some specific biases that orient him towards social change: *"I don't consider myself to be an objective or neutral scholar… I'm biased in favour of people who have less power."* He sees himself as a "*knowledge worker"* who is *"interested in ways in which construction of knowledge can be done that makes it more likely that we would have social change, economic change, political change."*

Jen

Jen is an administrator in higher education nearing the end of her career. She has been in both an administrative and tenure track position at the university, though she did not go forward for tenure, choosing instead to return to administration. She describes herself as a *"practitioner of community-university engagement"* and describes her work in the following way: *"I write about it, and I think about it, and I am a critical advocate for it. I don't know if I am a scholar and it really doesn't matter to me."* Jen describes the focus of her work as *"building connections between the university and [community] in order that we could*

all together explore the question of how social marginalization happens and how we could prevent it or remedy it."

Jim

Jim is currently in an administrative position with the university, in the middle of his career. He has a doctorate, but has not worked as a tenure track professor: *"I am not a faculty member. In my career path I've chosen…I am not prepared to go through all that crap."* Jim did not aspire to that role: *"I have a PhD…but I've never really wanted to be a faculty member."* Despite this, his work is very similar to that undertaken by tenure track academics:

> *I have a PhD, I probably publish more than half the faculty, nowhere near the stars… I might be just too hyper to spend more time just getting articles published.*

Jim sees himself as someone who bridges different sites/ideas/ways of thinking and has spent his life trying to link the university and community:

> *For the public, people who don't have PhDs they, there is an aura, like it or not about having a PhD. So some see me as being of the ivory tower, but the other part of my whole life is trying to get the hell out of the ivory tower… build the bridges and I'm a living, breathing bridge.*

Mary

Mary is a professor late in her career. She describes her research area as *"social movements, globally and locally, grass roots, with a definite focus on feminist movements."* Mary does not identify herself as a community-engaged scholar, though she works extensively in community. This is because "*the academic field doesn't define me.*" She

jokingly says, *"I think I was under socialized as an academic*", explaining that she was *"more of an activist … and I ended up getting a job in the academy. I [identify as] an intellectual and a scholar, not an [academic title]."* That being said, Mary is clear that the academy fits with her own interests: "*what I like to do is to think*." She shares her motivation to become an academic:

> *I was an activist before I was in the university…I've always been intellectual, I've always been one of those people that sought to understand why and how. .. I was quite doubtful when I went to do a doctorate …but it seemed the right place to do that kind of… work. …also, you know, it's a place... to have an income. And to be able to do your activism without having to get an income from it … is a freedom. I didn't go to the university just for that reason, but if you want to do f [independent] work…then it's a way*.

Mona

Mona is a 50-year-old female early in her career, who describes the focus of her scholarship as community-engaged scholarship: *"there are times that I do more traditional research, teaching, and service. But more generally I'd consider myself a community-engaged scholar."* Mona is purposeful in describing herself this way because others perceive it positively:

> *I do deliberately now use that language. Part of it is because… when I started talking about this, partly it was me finding language that fit with what I do, but I was suddenly on the forefront of a movement that was seen as positive, as important, as valued.*

Process of analysis

As I undertook this research, I continued to read broadly and explore literature on CES, higher education, engagement, intersubjectivity, and other relevant topics. In keeping with a hermeneutic approach, my review of these documents was a dialectical, not linear, process. As Smythe and Spence (2012) explained, inclining towards one particular text rather than another is a hermeneutic phenomenon; if one goes towards literature open for thought that may reveal a new horizon of thinking, then one is more likely to read widely. My document analysis was driven by inclination based on the interpretive experience and the themes that emerged from the data. While themes were shared with participants to prompt conversation in our second interview, not all of these themes proved important in the final analysis. Very early in the analysis of transcripts, it was clear that the themes of dissatisfaction with academic life and higher education, frustration with privilege, a desire for meaningful scholarship, an orientation to community as outsiders, and a leaning towards self/other relations that exceeded coloniality were emerging. My reading, therefore, pursued these themes through multiple interpretive and theoretical frames, ultimately weaving together an interpretation.

Fleming, Gaidys & Robb (2003) suggested four steps in analysis of texts for researchers adopting a Gadamerian hermeneutic approach. My analysis process loosely followed their suggestions, which include reading and rereading of all transcribed interview texts as a whole, a careful line-by-line reading of the texts, identification of themes, relating these themes back to the whole of the texts, and identifying key passages or sections of the texts. However, my process included additional back and forth movements between the text and my emerging interpretive work. I wanted to take extra

care to ensure I was capturing the complexity of CES and that any observations were not imposing a unity on the text, but included recognition of the heterogeneity in participants' understanding.

The following steps describe my interpretive process. I have listed them here in chronological order, though in reality some of the steps were integrated and repeated in a more dialectical fashion.

- Conducted first round of research interviews.
- Made notes after each interview, highlighting key ideas, words, images, themes, examples, and identifying key question that emerge for me. Documented suggestions given for research participants.
- Transcribed interviews, making note of key words, images, themes and examples.
- Reviewed all transcripts looking for broad level common themes, ideas that invoke a strong response from the interviewees, and responses to the hermeneutic concerns of language, history, etc. Identified and documented questions that arose for me.
- Wrote up a summary with conversation prompts to guide the second interview.
- Reread transcripts in the whole.
- Revised summary and shared with participants.
- Conducted second interviews and the combined interviews for the two participants who were only available for one.
- Made notes after each conversation, highlighting key ideas, words, images, themes, examples, and identifying key question that emerged for me.
- Transcribed second interviews.
- Read all transcripts from both interviews.

- Developed concept map based on my understanding so far.
- Read all transcripts again carefully, line-by-line, making notes and highlighting text.
- Revised concept map, wrote up summary of ideas and themes that seem particularly relevant to the research questions and/or important to the scholars.
- Read each scholars transcripts individually– both conversations together, doing a paragraph by paragraph summary and identifying key ideas/themes, images, examples for that individual and paying particular attention to the hermeneutic concerns of language, history, etc.
- Reviewed all transcripts and notes, looking at the relationship between ideas and the individual participant's perspectives. Revised the concept map.
- Returned to my research questions and began drafting the findings.
- Revisited transcripts and revised findings document continually until complete.

During all this time I continued to read the literature widely and also engaged in more focused reading to explore some of the themes that were developing. I also read publications from my research participants, those that they directed me to explicitly and those that I found and thought might be relevant.

Limitations and delimitations

Given the limits of time, my own perspective, and the hermeneutic recognition that a complete understanding is impossible, it was impossible in this study to unpack all of the complexities of engaged scholarship. Like all qualitative research, the study is limited in that it is not generalizable in the sense of discovering truths that apply across contexts and

history. However, this is balanced by the fact that hermeneutics allows for a deep understanding that reveals the *truth of the matter* in interpretation, but not in terms of finding an objective truth that transcends the interpretive act or is related to some external object (Schwardt, 2000).

There are three major limitations to this study: partiality, transferability, and researcher bias. There are also two delimitations: geography and affiliation with higher education. Given the limits of time, my own perspective, and the hermeneutic recognition that understanding is always incomplete, it was impossible in this study to unpack all of the complexities of engaged scholarship. What I offer here is an interpretation and since all interpretations are partial, my study findings are also partial.

Because of this partiality and because interpretation is shaped by the researcher's interpretive horizon, the direct transferability of these research findings is limited. My interpretation is shaped by my own bias, both positive and negative in explicit and sometimes unseen ways.

The study is also delimited geographically and in terms of institutional affiliation. It only included people positioned in institutions of higher education in Canada. It does not include community members who may have very different understandings of CES, nor does it include those outside of Canada whose contexts would also be different.

Observations about the study

Through this study I discovered some complications in attempting to undertake hermeneutic research.

First, my intention was to host two research conversations with participants. While I had a guide, with questions that functioned as conversation prompts to keep some structure to the interviews, I was trying to create a sense of mutual conversation rather than a transactional question / answer interview. However, without time to build relationships and identify shared interests, this approach proved unsuccessful. In many cases, my participants positioned me as interviewer and did not respond to comments I might make about engagement. In fact, in a number of cases the participant would answer a question and pause, and if I offered a comment they would wait quietly for the next question. This made the idea of conversations difficult and as a result I have used the term interview to describe these interactions.

The second observation is that only two participants actually read the document that I created and shared in preparation for the second interview, and they both said they just skimmed it. Given the desire to keep a short time frame between the first and second interviews, attempting to write up preliminary themes was probably ill advised since there was not time enough to delve deeply into the texts. Also, since most of the participants did not take time to read it, I can assume it did not have the intended effect of inviting a response and deepening the conversation. I would not recommend this strategy to others.

At times I struggled with the difficulty of trying to interpret the transcripts because of the information that is not captured in them wholly, information such as tone of voice, energy behind statements, emotions that come through the voice, etc. for this reasons, my post-interview notes proved crucial to the interpretation. I would like to explore, at some future date, the problematics of treating transcribed audiotapes as text. Participants did not have the opportunity to read, change, clarify and craft their ideas as one would in a

written text, particularly in a text for publication. There are both advantages and disadvantages in this fact. Reponses are less scripted and crafted, thus potentially more genuine, but also less thought out and consistent, making interpretation difficult and not necessarily providing the participant's deepest thinking on the matter.

Finally, reviewing the literature on engagement alongside participant transcripts enabled me to further identify my own prejudices, or pre-understandings, with regards to engagement. Through the writing process I wrangled with the material and my own assumptions, articulating my current understanding. This was a more emotional process than I had originally anticipated. In the middle of my own career decision making, considering a future academic career and wondering about my own, often frustrating, experience in graduate school, I was hearing scholars talk about their own frustrations with what I came to identify as neoliberalized higher education. Hearing their comments and knowing they were located institutionally and socially in very diverse spaces made it impossible for me to believe that the neoliberalization of higher education might be limited to a few problematic sites, disciplines, or topic areas. Working through this material I realized the extent to which my own prejudgments about academic life had shaped my interest in an academic career. I assumed it was one of the few spaces that was not shaped by neoliberal interests. What I learned is that institutionally it is no less shaped by these interests than other spaces. But, after months of intense agony over my own future and thinking about possibilities for keeping space open in higher education, I also realized that no space is fully closed and that there were some interesting possibilities emerging in higher education, and described by my research participants, that might prove essential in opening the space. It isn't the utopia I had assumed, but it isn't fully foreclosed either.

There is much to learn from the way that clever, wise and sometimes subversive scholars are maneuvering within the space of higher education.

4. Study Findings

Introduction

The rich research conversations I had with participants yielded numerous thematic areas for analysis. In what follows I offer the most salient findings relating to my research questions, including comments that exemplify these findings. The chapter is organized along the lines of four topic areas: how CES is described; the purpose of CES; how community is understood; and ideas about power, privilege and difference.

While many scholars talked about the process by which they engage communities, sharing details of specific negotiations of process and outcomes as well as strategies to gain an understanding of the realities facing partners, these pragmatic concerns are not explored in depth here. Given the emphasis in this thesis on substantive questions about the conceptualization of community-engaged scholarship, I have chosen not to include findings on how engagement is practiced, except where they serve to highlight assumptions and understandings relevant to my research questions.

Summary of findings

Participants in this study described the language of CES as confusing and contradictory, a factor they saw as indicative of both openness towards diverse practices and a problematic lack of clarity. Participants who identified as community-engaged scholars demonstrated different ways of talking about their own engagement while also articulating a common ground, namely that CES is actualized through relationships and includes mutuality or reciprocity of some kind. For some participants, CES names how their

scholarship has always been practiced, while for others, CES changes the nature of their work in virtue of its emphasis on bi-directionality.

Participants who identified as community-engaged scholars described the aims of CES differently. This finding is consistent with that of Kasworm and Abdrahim (2014) who studied exemplary scholars of engagement in the United States and found that they "held no monolithic definition, pathway, or understanding of the scholarship of engagement" (p. 125). However, underpinning the diverse aims of scholars in this study was embedded a more fundamental purpose: CES functions to make scholarship meaningful. This meaningfulness is understood to be manifest in scholarship that is useful because it has a direct effect on, and makes a difference to community partners. While participants recognized that they must also publish as a part of their work in higher education, the emphasis in engagement is on helping communities do what they want to do better.

Participants recognized that the concept of community may mean different things, and perhaps even be impossible to define. That being said, participants consistently described community as those positioned as outside of institutions of higher education. Participants also described the ways community and scholars differ through a series of binary opposites, even though some participants recognized that this description fails to capture the complexities of the relation.

Participants who identified as community-engaged scholars described engaged scholars' work in opposition to what they perceive to be the work of what I have termed *conventional scholars*. Conventional scholars were described by many study participants as disconnected from the concerns of communities outside higher education, enjoying privilege, which includes the luxury of time to reflect, and focusing solely on writing

directed at an academic audience. Additionally, participants described their relationship to the academic environment as complex and at times problematic.

Suggesting that with their position in institutions of higher education comes a certain amount of privilege, participants struggled to understand the complex power dynamics that develop when partnering with community. Participants highlighted power differences in CES but did not situate power consistently with any one party. Participants emphasized the importance of mitigating power differences by approaching community with openness, curiosity, and a willingness to listen and learn. One participant shared a particularly poignant story that questions the extent to which listening and good intentions can overcome difference. She describes an engagement experience where she was positioned structurally, within a system of power, despite the fact that she behaved humbly and had the best of intentions to not act from a position of power. Her story is included at the end of this chapter.

How is CES described?

Confusing and contradictory language used to describe CES

To begin, Participants in this study talked about the confusing and contradictory language used to describe CES, recognizing that this language ensured an openness that is positive yet problematic. The linguistic openness in the field of CES points to concepts that cannot be fully articulated. This openness is at the same time problematic in that it enables almost anyone whose work is connected to community in some way to claim that they are undertaking CES. It also prohibits discussion that might strengthen the academic rigour of the field.

Community-engagement cannot be clearly captured in language: "*The very nature of this is not so confinable… The more we try to understand it, define it, and explain it to others, the more I think we're gonna recognize that it is not definable, you know, explainable… "* (Mona). The experience of engaging with community is difficult to articulate:

> *Some of the things you see happening in community, it's ineffable. How does that happen? That is when it is most powerful. That is when you get shivers up your spine. That is why it is worth doing. Because you, I've seen so many students over the years and have talked to them about how being involved in the community has changed them….you ask them how that happened, I've never found a student yet who can actually tell me.* (Jen)

> *Every time I try to, especially sort of write about it or think about how it differs from some of the other pieces that are related, it feels like I am trying to set up parameters but it doesn't feel right to do it, you know?* (Mona)

The linguistic and conceptual openness of CES might resist exclusion but it also borders on meaninglessness. What is needed is a way of describing engagement that captures the field but isn't too restrictive:

> *There is a problem in it being so broad that it doesn't mean anything…everything can be seen as a community engaged project. But it also can't be so narrowly defined that it becomes only available to a very select kind of membership, you know?"* (Mona)

> *"We need a broad umbrella that can be adapted and tailored by discipline, by perspective. But terminology that immediately pigeonholes is not helpful"* (Jim).

Finding the right balance, in terms of articulating CES without foreclosing it, is important to ensure it does not come to mean everything and nothing:

> *I think often people just hear it and they then go off and, and print their own understanding of that… I think we are not spending enough time contesting and thinking about and trying to understand what we're all talking about.* (Amy)

Without some parameters around CES, collective debate and discussion, both of which contribute to academic rigour, is difficult:

> *Its really important to define what you mean by something… so that people who have different views can say "ya, ya, ya, you only count this stuff but I also include this stuff" and then you can have a discussion…and so the high tolerance for ambiguity isn't…It's not an excuse not to have rigour.* (Jim)

Scholar descriptions of CES differ

In response to confusion about CES and the desire for some delineation of the field, participants have developed different ways of talking about engagement. Three descriptions of CES emerged in the research data. CES is described as a methodology guided by principles, a conceptual mechanism to link diverse practices, and a political strategy.

CES can be understood as a methodology that is grounded in guiding principles: *"I do see it as a methodology and I think it would be helpful to engage people in kind of thinking about that and talking about that"* (Sandy).

> *There are principles, which, for me, help to distinguish community-engaged scholarship… If I really have to say that it is something more than principles, I would*

say that it is an approach, it's a methodology… So it is principles that inform the methodology. (Mona)

CES is also described as a conceptual mechanism that links diverse practices. As a continuum, umbrella, or common space, CES brings practices in relation to one another.

It's a continuum. So there is teaching that is not publicly engaged at all. There is research that is not publicly engaged at all. There is service that is not publicly engaged at all, internal to the university. And at the other end of the continuum there's totally engaged research, collaborative, co-creation, co-authorship, there is totally engaged teaching and learning and there is totally engaged service. And there is a continuum in between. (Jim)

I think until you do both [engaged teaching and research], you might not see how community-engaged scholarship captures, allows an umbrella to capture and integrate that work really well. (Denise)

This language isn't owned by a discipline…So what we are doing here is that rather than saying 'be an anthropologist, even though you are a historian', what we're saying is, 'is there a common space here that we refer to as community engagement that we can agree on, and some core measurable, you know clearly discernable activities either as inputs, outputs or activities in the middle that we could all agree on but that would still enable us to work within our discipline, but perhaps differently? (Corey)

Finally, CES is also seen as a political strategy. Here a variety of practices and approaches are linked conceptually to strategically position either communities, scholars, or administration:

> *Engagement is a strategy, which community groups should be promoting in order to get access to resources, which might be networks or people's time or might be databases or whatever, skill sets that are present in universities.* (Henry)

> *[CES] is being used as a legitimizing force to get recognition for, and support for, the kinds of activities that are activities where people from universities are engaging with community people… all these essentially diverse interests collected under this one banner. But they are not unified, by any means.* (Jen1)

CES is a terminology that appeals to many across the political spectrum: *"you do get both more conservative people and more left leaning people supporting similar stuff… they want to see something happen in their community, for people in their own place"* (Henry). As a political strategy, administrators use CES to enact organizational agendas:

> *CES is seen to be a little bit more what administrators feel more comfortable with, a more neutral kind of an idea... for the senior administrators, it's been a conscious move to shift the discourse a little bit. So they still want to have these functions, but they are trying to find ways to kind of de-, from their point of view, kind of de-politicize it a little bit, you know, just tone it down a bit. …* (Henry)

> *That's what this community-engaged scholarship is... it's a higher education initiated, the institutional, there is a mandate to bring something to [Community] or to hook up*

with this or that… it starts out altruistic and then ultimately it becomes quite, you know, serves the institution. (Mary)

Some agreement on relationship and mutuality

While scholars describe CES differently, there is some agreement at a broad level that the practices identified as CES work through relationships and include mutuality or reciprocity of some kind.

Working in and through relationship is a core part of engagement: *"the work of communicating with, building a relationship with, negotiating things… the relationship piece, that is a really significant part"* (Mona); *"we're talking about trusting relationships"* (Amy). CES requires a *"strong relationship with a community organization"* (Corey); *"when you're in community, the conversations are about 'what do you think?', 'how do you feel?', 'how are you positioned?'... the relationship… that is all on the table and it matters. In the university it doesn't"* (Denise).

Engagement often begins with relationship building: "*we try to build things up slowly so that we make sure we get partners who are going to be a good match and going to be able to engage well"* (Sandy); *"The evidence of my ability is in the relationships"* (Denise); "*CE requires that [research], but requires that to be done in partnerships"* (Corey)

Working together is key to the engagement endeavor:

The goal in all of my work is really to have the research be a collaborative effort in which community organizations or representatives from community organizations and researchers are working together to build their capacity to understand both the research processes and the contextual factors that need to be taken into account. And

to produce some work that is of the highest possible academic quality but which also serves an immediate purpose to our community partners. (Sandy)

What's important I think about the engagement piece is that you are having ongoing communication with real live people doing real live work and you get a much more accurate and rich understanding of what they are doing, the challenges facing them. (Mona1)

Alongside relationship, reciprocity and mutual benefit are also core to CES: *"We talk a lot about reciprocity… everybody involved benefits from it"* (Denise); *"It's about reciprocity. It's about mutual benefit. It's about building and sustaining relationships… "* (Mona). CES includes ensuring both partners benefit from engagement, through *"work that is of the highest possible academic quality but which also serves an immediate purpose to our community partners"* (Sandy).

Engagement is about people in the university partnering with people outside the university for mutual benefit. And where they both bring knowledge and expertise and there is reciprocity… in a way that advances the university's mission… (Jim)

Without mutual benefit, the scholarship is not considered engaged: *"I wouldn't call that full engagement because that doesn't have that two-way interactive component that I think is required for full public engagement"* (Amy).

Is there anything new here?

CES is described as a practice that is both new and not new. For some participants, CES provides a new language for work that they and others were already undertaking. For others, CES changes the nature of the work in virtue of its bi-directionality.

CES lends a name and a framework to a kind of scholarship already being undertaken:

> *I would say that I have been a community-engaged scholar all my life, but only came to the language relatively recently. So it's been great because it actually provided a framework for me to actually articulate in a clearer way, what it is I think I do.* (Mona)

> *That language, that approach just sat really well with me and made sense… I don't think it shifted the practice, but it gave me a label"* (Denise)… *I think it really is about what I do, who I am.* (Denise)

> *We actually have quite a long history of engagement between higher education and society and the people… But what seems to happen so often is our own history and roots get kind of blown away by just the sheer volume of US literature. So right now everybody seems to think that Ernest Boyer invented all this stuff…* (Henry)

CES is not a new practice, but it is a new language: *"This is not something new … some of what IS new is that there is new language, there is a new interest on the part of some. Though again, for some of us there is nothing new"* (Mona). *"Its not new and I am sure at every university there are individuals and centers that have been doing this stuff for years"* (Jim); "*People that never used the word engaged scholarship in the past suddenly say 'oh ya, we do that, we've been doing that for twenty years' … I think that there is constantly in academia new language that's emerging.* (Corey)

While much of what we now call CES is not new, labeling it as CES is important because it highlights partnerships, mutuality, and focusing on needs of community in a way that does, then, bring about something new:

> *The work that I do and the way that I do it has really not changed and I would consider myself an applied [discipline]. But part of what is missed in that language, that doesn't talk at all about the relationship… You can be, I think that you can be an applied [discipline] and still work in a way that you're deciding what needs to be done and how you are going to apply your work to whatever issue. I think the part that's important about the language of community engagement is that the community comes first… starting with needs and issues and me being guided…by what those needs are. So I'm not sitting in my office thinking up a really good project to do, in terms of the research. It comes from my knowledge of, work with, relationships with, folks outside of the walls of academia… That language for me helps to make explicit part of the process, which is so crucial to the work.* (Mona)

> *I think also there were certainly efforts being made to actually do some things in a fundamentally different way with various publics. So a little bit of both there, so labeling of something, giving a new name to something that might not change very much, but also giving a new name to something that actually was about something fundamentally different if you understand what I am getting at there.* (Amy)

What is the purpose of engagement?

Participants in this study referenced a number of different aims that CES might achieve. These included: creating greater access to the university, the co-generation of knowledge, establishing validity, mobilizing the student workforce, developing a more informed citizenry and better decision making practices, creating more impactful scholarship, and developing better theory.

CES is described as a way to create greater access to the resources of the university. One participant talked about the "*larger goal [of CES], which is to create ways for communities to have greater access to the skills, people and resources of higher education on terms that they determine themselves*" (Henry). CES is also cast as a means for the co-generation of knowledge: *"To me, what community engagement really is about is that cogeneration of knowledge…you get something that neither of us could have produced on our own.* (Jen)

CES is a way to establish internal validity in research and to ensure knowledge translation: *"I really think about community engagement as … as being able to establish again internal validity of the work that we do and being able to facilitate knowledge translation and dissemination"* (Sandy). CES is also described as a way to mobilize a workforce in order to save money:

> You *can get more people working on an issue in a more, you know, volunteer capacity and not have to pay for it. So if there are students and folks in universities working together with community partners, then some of the work that needs to get done doesn't have to be paid for by the state or by finding other money elsewhere.* (Mona)

CES is a way to achieve both better decisions and a more informed citizenry: *I would say that it is to inform and to hopefully improve [topic] decisions… you are also trying to*

contribute to a more informed, you know, physically competent public… that notion of trying to contribute to democracy" (Amy). CES is a way to ensure research has a greater impact: *"We know that the research works better, it's more relevant. We know that there's greater uptake, more likelihood of sustainability… "* (Denise). CES is also seen as leading to better theory:

> *Engaged work will actually produce better theory. It is a better way to understand the world if you're dealing with humans and human interaction. The more you are part of and listening to, working with, people who are experiencing whatever the kind of context that you are involved in, the more, the more you know your, any academic stuff that you produce is actually going to come closer to being true.* (Henry)

CES makes scholarship meaningful

The diverse aims participants attributed to CES are underpinned by their shared articulation of a more fundamental purpose: CES functions to make scholarship meaningful. This meaningfulness is understood to be manifest in scholarship that makes a difference to community and is immediately useful.

Community engagement is motivated, in part, by a desire to make scholarship meaningful: *"there isn't necessarily a really convincing perspective that what academics are doing really matters. Which relates to the community engagement drive… it is an attempt to make what happens in the academy matter"* (Jen); "*Why aren't we [scholars] engaged in some meaningful way? And if we are not all going to be meaningfully engaged, at least some of us should pick that up"* (Corey).

Through CES, scholars can engage with *"the incredible knowledge and wisdom and understanding that exists in the community"* (Jen) which would lead to academic work that

is valued by others: "*we would start to see research being done in the universities that people wouldn't say 'it's irrelevant, it's not connected to the real world, it has no impact on policy, it doesn't make a difference'"* (Jen). CES is meaningful to community because it involves them in "*making of meaning out of whatever the research process is"* (Henry).

Ensuring scholarship is meaningful to others is an academic responsibility: *" I feel that as a scholar that is part of my job to make my research and my knowledge meaningful and valuable to Canadian society as a whole"* (Corey). One participant shared her early experiences working on a research project that "*was very positive and very community oriented"* (Amy) and sought to "*involve publics in a meaningful way"* (Amy), as the impetus that ignited her interest in community-engaged scholarship. Having experienced meaningful scholarship she wanted to do more of it.

Partnering with communities takes extra effort, but is more rewarding than conventional scholarship because it is meaningful: *"It takes extra effort, but the rewards are actually greater, right? I mean you actually do something that's meaningful in the community* (Corey). Community-engaged scholarship is exciting because people care about it: *"It's quite a thrill if you're an academic and you can actually do something that people care about! Most of what we do, people could care less about*" (Corey).

It is by addressing the "*burning questions"* (Corey) that communities are struggling with that scholars can be "*engaged in some meaningful way"* (Corey). It is the link to community that ensures academic work is meaningful and that it matters:

> *So it is not like, if I wanted to produce something that is high quality and has context and is interpretable and has meaning for people, that I can go to an existing literature and draw from that. Really, the only way of validating our findings and ensuring that*

they reflect some kind of reality, that they are reliable, is to match against the experiences of people who work in the field. (Sandy)

High quality scholarship that has meaning for people cannot come from texts alone, but must be matched with the "*experiences of people who work in the field"* (Sandy) if that scholarship is to reflect "*reality"* (Sandy) and if it is to matter. Undertaking meaningful work is sometimes juxtaposed with the work of publishing and meeting academic standards:

I think if the language around community engagement continues to grow and everybody takes it on and everybody claims it as their area and their expertise, everyone will end up with the schizophrenia of publishing in peer review journals and meeting those academic standards, or doing work that's meaningful to the community. (Denise)

CES is meaningful because it makes a difference

In what ways is community-engaged scholarship seen as scholarship that matters, that is more meaningful? As we saw in the previous section, there are many differences in what engaged scholars express as the particular aims of their work. However, within their descriptions of community engagement, a pattern emerges whereby engaged scholarship is cast as meaningful because it makes a difference in the world outside academe and results in scholarship that is useful to community.

CES is aimed at affecting the world of community; it makes something different than it was before: "*Ultimately we are interested in making a difference*" (Amy); *So for me …engagement, the work that I do in [University], is a way to truly link the pursuit of knowledge, balanced with trying to make a difference...* (Jim)

One participant cites the desire to make a difference in a practical way as his motivation to not seek a tenure track position:

> *I'm really interested in making a difference and making a practical contribution…could have been a faculty member, [but] I was never content to teach and research and publish in peer review journals as the focus of my life.* (Jim)

Another participant shares an experience of being highly engaged, which centers on a sense of making a difference and effecting change: *I am not sure I'd say it was this moment of epiphany, of 'we're here!' … Having said that, I probably can think of moments where we met together and thinking that 'boy this is really making a difference'* (Amy). She offers the following anecdote, which further links engagement and effecting change, by way of example:

> *The [Organization], that had no expertise in public engagement whatsoever… we actually took them through a full engagement process using this methodology. And it was the best thing they'd ever been part of. And, you know, in our reflective discussions about it they communicated that to us. So you are asking the question, we felt like we got engagement? Well ya, I guess cause they felt like something immediately had been, had transformed the way they think, the way they behave.* (Amy)

This experience of engagement is understood with reference to making a difference: "*How would I think I was actually engaging with these folks? I guess actually feeling like I am making a difference, right?*" (Amy)

CES is meaningful because it is immediately useful

In addition to a sense of making a difference, participants asserted that engaged scholarship is more meaningful because it is useful to community: *"The outputs are the kind*

of things that the community would find immediately useful to them" (Corey). Producing useful scholarship requires collaboration with those who will be using it: "*To do the work in a way that works, that actually gets picked up… in terms of actual practices for improving community … disciplines have to be community engaged"* (Corey). Because it involves community, the research produced through engaged scholarship *"works better, it's more relevant, we know that there's greater uptake, more likelihood of sustainability"* (Denise).

> *It's not an academic publishing something and hoping someone reads it. The stakeholders are using it before it's even finished. And when the publication or report comes out, they are telling people about it, saying "I was part of this, you need to read this. This is important."* (Jim)

The extent to which scholarship is viewed as community-engaged can be determined by reference to usefulness: *"Everything can be seen as a community engaged project if you've got people saying 'ya, we can use that, it helps us'"* (Mona).

For Sandy, meaningfulness is not just an indicator of relevance, but is also a key part of what constitutes high quality scholarship:

> *Now honestly I really think about CE as being, as being about being central to the quality of the work. I really think about it as being able to establish again internal validity of the work that we do and being able to facilitate knowledge translation and dissemination in a way that we wouldn't be able to do otherwise. And so I see it as being the key to, to quality work, and the key to making sure that that quality work is meaningful in some way beyond the narrow academic standards of publishing and all of that.* (Sandy)

If community can use the product of engaged scholarship then engaged scholars are more likely to be part of having an impact, making a difference, and as a result, more likely to demonstrate the meaningfulness of what they do. *"I guess that really the motivation for it too, is to have some impact instead of just getting data to write up some papers"* (Amy).

While peer focused publishing, and other traditional aspects of scholarship, might be meaningful to the community of peers in academe, it is not talked about as being useful and meaningful to those outside academe. CES requires ensuring community concerns are addressed and community input considered, which leads to more impactful scholarship for community: *"sometimes the consequences are much greater than if we were sitting alone in our offices"* (Mona).

How is community understood ?

If CES is understood as a way to make scholarship meaningful, because it makes a difference and is useful to communities, then understanding who constitutes community is important.

Variable ideas about community

Participants in this study recognized that when talking about community in community-engagement there is *"enormous variability amongst people's understanding of what that means"* (Jim). Community is an entity that "*could be defined in any kind of way"* (Corey) and *"can mean different things"* (Mona). Amy also points out the ambiguity of meaning: "*publics, communities… while we might think we know what that means, each one of us, I think it is a much more murky area than we might think at first"* (Amy).

Despite this openness, communities are seen as held together by some unifying factor, be it culture, interests, class, geography, or even political values.

> *Like a First Nations community, an agricultural community, you know, a class identified community, a rural-urban community, a northern community, whatever it might be.* (Corey)

> *It [community] can be, it can be local, it can be national, it can be international. It can be a much smaller concept. It can be referred to something much larger. So, you know, I think it's important that the notion of community have some variability to it.* (Mona)

> *If I were to close my eyes and think about who do I see when I say that word, the [Name] community, I am really thinking about those people in that community and those organizations that are working for what I'd call progressive change. I'm not, everybody is a neighbor and all that. But I'm not, the community that I identify with are those people who are, you know, on the left, or social change people, or activists, or whatever.* (Henry)

Community can have all these different meanings but it can also be so amorphous as to defy meaning. Denise asks, *"It's interesting, that whole idea of being part of a community and when are you and when aren't you. What does it look like when you are part of a community?"* (Denise)

Community constructed as 'outside academia'

While the concept of community may be variable, mean different things, and perhaps even be impossible to define, in community-engaged scholarship community is

conceptually positioned as *outside* of academia: *"For people in the academy, why don't they understand that people out there in the community understand things*" (Jen)? Community is *out there,* or *outside of academia*:

> *So one of the bits of learning that has really helped me is thinking about this as the research teaching and service all are interrelated and inform each other… and that central to all those pieces and that integration is that the needs and issues facing community partners and communities largely outside of academia* (Mona).

The binary positioning of community as outside university, while sometimes questioned by participants themselves, is consistently present in their discourse on community-engaged scholarship. The irony of this is not lost on Mona who points out:

> *What we're after is a kind of work and a partnership that really, you know, that integrates our work. And yet we're using language to put ourselves in one or other of those places.* (Mona)

The conceptual positioning of community as outside the university is perhaps best captured by the way in which differences are described. The differences between community and university partners in community-engaged scholarship are expressed as a series of opposites: expecting practical results vs. research and knowledge-based results; working on the front lines vs. having some distance from the issues; possessing practical, contextualized knowledge vs. global or theoretical knowledge; and finally being part of different knowledge cultures.

Community is defined against the work and focus of scholars in a whole host of ways. Community members hope for different products out of the partnership than their

academic partners. Communities want accessible publications and practical tools while academics want critical and reflective publications:

> *The distinction is really clear. There is a sense that the community organization might want publications, but they want accessible communications… I'd like to publish in this critical reflective way in a peer reviewed publication where my publication is going to potentially help me get a promotion or a merit increment or something like that...* (Corey)

> *What they [community] are looking for is information that will help them to mobilize… you know a kind of practical thing. Or they want to find out what have people done… So they want something very practical.* (Henry)

The *immediacy of the situations* faced in community is opposed to the *luxury* of reflection without the pressures of doing:

> *Working on the front lines… their [community] focus is so immediately grabbed by the immediacy of the situations that they are in. Like, they're fighting fires everyday, every moment. So they don't have the luxury to sit back and say, gee, I'm noticing this trend.* (Jen)

Another participant invokes the idea of doing when she talks about community partners as "*people who work in the field."* (Sandy).

Community partners have expertise that is *practical*, or *practitioner focused*, while scholars can bring *new concepts and theories* to their partnerships:

> *We have access to the literature, we can bring new concepts, new theories, you know, a lot of the stuff that they [community] don't have the time to do or the expertise. We can*

help them think about new ways of doing it…I mean they [community] certainly have their own expertise. They have very hands on, very practitioner focused as opposed to having people bringing some of the more academic perspectives on this and critique and that evaluation lens. (Amy)

It's the marriage of the, of what is academic, the value of the academy at its finest, where it is taking a large perspective and a broad perspective and a long perspective and is able to say, 'this is what we've learned collectively over time and over space and how it can be applied to this particular set of circumstances' and where the community comes in saying 'we know what is going to work in our location or what is not going to work in our location. Let's bring together our instrumental local knowledge and your more academic, theoretical, more macro level knowledge and try to build something that is going to solve the problems that we're facing that neither of us could have done on our own.' (Jen2)

Scholars might bring conceptual knowledge to community-engaged scholarship, but communities are perceived to want to see that knowledge put to practical purposes. For Sandy this involves capacity development for both partners to be able to engage each other's different knowledge:

So on the one hand yes, the kind of developing capacity of community members to understand and to make use of and to critically engage with the research, on the other side I would say capacity development for scholars both in terms of understanding how the research process is different when you work with community members, but also in terms of developing contextual knowledge. (Sandy)

The practical knowledge held by community and the critical, theoretical knowledge held by scholars are thought to contribute to differences in culture. *"... knowledge cultures in a community group or a social movement are very different than the knowledge culture that academics inhabit"* (Henry). These differences are significant and not always appreciated:

> *But I, what I see at [University] and what I see in other contexts is academics not, not understanding sufficiently the difference between where they are in the academy and where people are in community environments. So being blind to the ways in which their power and privilege is influencing the interactions they are having... And what I repeatedly saw, and see, is people from the academy not getting that they're actually entering into a different world.* (Jen)

Dichotomous positioning of community is problematic

While participants in this study tended to use dichotomous language in describing community and university, some recognized that this description is problematic and fails to capture the complexities of the relation:

> *As much as we are talking about partnerships and mutual benefit and reciprocity, we continue to make a distinction between community and university and I think there is a problem with that... I am concerned about the way we tend to dichotomize community and university...I think we do a disservice in speaking as though there are these two worlds and they are different. And you know, I think there are all sorts of examples of people who would feel like because they happen to be scholars, I don't think they would dissociate themselves from being part of the community. And vice versa, that because you are, quote, 'community' means you don't have a clue about*

research or scholarship and you need somebody over in that other camp called university in order to engage in this process that is going to give you this great outcome. And I don't really know what to do about it. And I do understand, obviously there are some differences in terms of resources and skills and capacity and interest and all those things. And you know, and I think it is important that we not lose sight of the fact that there is a history of work done within institutions of higher education that has missed a whole lot, and…that the institutions have created this very insular world. So I understand the reason why we don't want to forget that history... (Mona)

The struggle is to talk about differences between community and university, and recognize past exclusions, without a dichotomous conceptualization of community and university scholars:

So, if we just said engaged scholarship… that opens itself up for, to hmmm… to miss the invitation to those who historically have not gotten an invitation to participate… But the language of community…I can tell you that there are people that I have engaged with for research purposes who are, would now be considered community, who are also academics. And so what the heck do we do with them? … It's not such clear-cut, pat parameters…. There is lots of folks working in what we define as community that are also scholars, that also have an academic background/experience whatever… all academics in some way or another are also part of community... I understand that there are differences, but I also think that sometimes solely talking about these places as though the people in these places are totally different, I think it is a problem. (Mona)

The distinctions between community and university are not clear, which points to the ways in which participants' understanding of community as outside academe is a construction, one that posits community as deficient in those very elements that the university excels at. Though many participants in this study were sure to talk about the strengths that communities bring, their *practical, local, contextual, front lines* knowledge, at the same time they described community as lacking in *research skills, macro perspectives*, and *critical, theoretical knowledge*. This lack is sometimes attributed to ability, sometimes to time constraints or interests. Nonetheless, communities need help to research their own issues, to develop better policies, to refine practice, to be more strategic in addressing community issues.

While some participants explicitly recognized that there is an academic community to whom they are accountable, they did not identify this community as the central entity to engage with in terms of the focus of their work. That said, in virtue of being located in a university, they recognized that some level of attention to the community of peers is important, particularly as it relates to tenure and promotion.

View of conventional scholars as privileged

In talking about their work with communities, many participants in this study emphasized the extent to which they were different from conventional scholars. Denise, for example, has a stronger sense of identification with community than she does with her peers in academia: *"I didn't strongly enough identify with my colleagues or maybe I didn't have the degree of relationship with my colleagues at the institution that I have with my colleagues across community"* (Denise).

Participants in this study described engaged scholars' work in opposition to what they perceive to be the work of conventional scholars. Conventional scholars are constructed as the opposite of engaged scholars in a number of ways. For many, though not all participants, the work of conventional scholars is described in negative and sometimes derisive terms.

Conventional scholars were described as having the luxury of time to hide in their offices, publish a lot, and court international reputations. They have the great circumstance of *"privileged, tenured, secured positions that don't require them to punch in and punch out…faculty members are not held accountable for doing, in some ways, even the basics of their role"* (Jen). There was a great deal of anger expressed when discussing the academic environment and working with scholars in the academy (personal notes). The quote below, with its reference to *those kinds of people*, gives some idea of the sentiment:

> *Most academics, in my experience, are much more connected to their discipline and sub-discipline, nationally and internationally, in a community of interest around economic geography or a community of interest around post-structuralist God knows what. And those are their friends and the people they resonate best with. And they are rewarded for publishing in the very specialized journals that appeal, internationally, to that very specialized community…Those types of people often are NOT the types who can go out to a community, or a business, or an NGO, or a government, and schmooze and banter and joke and do collaborative work successfully. They are drawn to the university where you can hide in your office and teach when you must and become the world expert in [topic] and write numerous journal articles and be rewarded for it, and celebrated for it, and attract like minded people to your*

community. And so maybe that is simplistic, maybe that is wrong, maybe there needs to be empirical research and maybe there is. But I don't think so, It's correct. And there is loads of exceptions. (Jim)

Even while recognizing that not all conventional scholars are the same, this participant's description of conventional scholars positions them as very insular in focus and in their professional and social circles. Non-engaged scholars are more focused on peers than the world outside of the academy:

But for the most part, those who are deeper into those kinds of discourses, that whole discursive universe are less engaged in, you know, are less linked to community groups or social movements or something like that. They tend to, it's a bit of a luxury and I'm perfectly happy to be involved in those kinds of luxurious conversations, I like words, but it's not, I mean when I came to the university from the NGO world, I had all these images of, I knew and had been reading all these progressive academics, but when I got to the university I discovered that they didn't, they never went outside the halls of academe. They just went to other conferences and they wrote their papers and they, you know they wrote about workers, but they weren't actually talking to workers… (Henry)

The scholars this participant admired before entering into academe turned out to be quite conventional, even though they were writing very progressively about social issues. They expressed great ideas but were not involved in the world outside *the halls of academe*, instead they enjoyed the *luxury* of participating only in the discursive universe of ideas.

Conventional scholars do not engage the world outside the university. Instead they *"hide in their office and publish in international peer review journals. And the more*

international it is, the less linked to community it is" (Jim). The questions driving conventional scholars are sometimes of little importance to the world outside the narrow peer group, which is problematic because they have an accountability to show how what they do matters:

> *I mean, my God, I'm paid for by taxpayer's funding, right? I think that I have some sort of obligation to the taxpayers, to society, to show them that what I am doing isn't just arguing how many angels can dance on the head of a pin for other people who care about that.* (Corey)

> *There's greater pressure from community to have the university accountable to them, we're publicly funded right? So where's the benefit to the general public?* (Denise)

Unlike the conventional scholar who is arguing about unimportant issues with peers in the very insular world of *other people who care about that* (Corey), community-engaged scholars were described as out in the social world: *"I'm not sitting in my office thinking up a really good project to do"* (Mona).

In summary, conventional scholars were described by many study participants as disconnected from the issues or concerns of communities outside the university, enjoying privilege, which includes the luxury of time to reflect, and focusing solely on academic writing aimed at the insular audience of peers.

Engaged scholars have a complex relationship to the academic community

Given their description of conventional scholars, it is not surprising that participants in this study had a very complex relationship to the academic environment.

Community-engaged scholarship is seen as a challenge to the conventional way of doing things in academe: *"We're taking on institutional structures… in order to make some of those changes"* (Mona). At the same time, there is recognition the culture in the academy influences scholars' work with community: *"I believe so strongly in the promise and the potential of community engagement and I believe so strongly that it's not being realized because of what I think of as the hubris in the academy"* (Jen); *"The problem hasn't been my relationship with the community, it's been my relationship with my colleague, my academic colleague. And that relationship has created, I think, difficult dynamics between the community and university…"* (Denise).

The competitiveness of the academy influences interactions with community. In sharing an example where a community group might have needs that could be better met by another faculty member one participant states:

> *I am the one that is here right. I've got the relationship. Do I really wanna, after all these years of hard work and relationship building and the time and effort that goes into that, I'm just gonna pass that off now to my faculty member over there who is gonna be competing with me in the merit pool for annual salary increases? I think some of that, I don't think we would think of it that way, but that is playing out under the surface.* (Corey)

One participant had a fairly positive outlook on the academic environment. She has found a supportive home for her scholarship within an interdisciplinary and research focused environment in the academy that centers on community, but she recognizes that the larger academic environment is not the same as her location:

I happen to work in a [unit] that… has always been about, not only doing, you know producing knowledge that is of academic import, but also translating that knowledge so that it is useful for policy makers. So I think that is really the environment that I was well suited to. Not the academic, not any academic environment. (Amy)

Participants in this study recognize that despite their frustrations, their position at a university means that they need to work within the academic system. Community-engaged scholarship involves the complexities of engaging community *as well as* meeting all of the scholarly demands that non-engaged scholars meet with regards to publishing, presenting papers, teaching, and engaging their peers. As one participant states, engaging community "*doesn't mean I've stopped doing research that gets published and peer reviewed…"* (Corey).

Struggling with power, privilege and difference

The privilege that many participants assert is enjoyed by conventional scholars also marks them, a dynamic they recognize and struggle with. Participants see engaged scholars as privileged in many ways, relative to their community partners. This privilege affects power relations in community-engaged scholarship, creating power dynamics that many participants struggle to understand. In some cases, participants assert that engaged scholars have power, in others they assert that community has power.

Some participants critiqued thinking of power along two-dimensional lines, as an object that either one party or the other possesses, suggesting that it misses the complexities of power dynamics as they play out in CES. Nonetheless, most scholars felt it important to counteract the power of the privileged "expert" scholar with a commitment to being open and listening to community in order to learn about them, their world, and their

concerns. The extent to which listening and good intentions can overcome difference is questioned by one participant whose story is provided at the end of this section as an example of the complicated nature of negotiating difference in CES.

Participants asserted that it is impossible to escape social positioning. Scholars occupy a privileged position of power in virtue of the benefits they enjoy with their position:

> *If we were really serious about engaging with community and producing knowledge jointly with people from community and including community professionals and community leaders as co-educators, like why then would one person in that multi-factored, multi-faceting network of teachers and learners and researchers, why would only one person in that network have the luxury of job security for life?... It puts the academic in a privileged position of power that I would argue, depending on the attitudes, unless it's a really, really exceptional person, that structural difference is going to inevitably infect the nature of the collaborative work that's done.* (Jen)

> *You know what's really uncomfortable? Is that I am this person that's in this power institution and I do see that. You know?... I will always represent White history. And if I go in as an academic I will always represent this power institution, and it's so not who I am.* (Denise)

Even when communities seemingly have power, such as the power to choose to engage, the dynamics favour the scholar:

> *The power still remains with us [scholars] because it is money flowing to their community and so even if they have the power to say no, do they really? I mean, cause*

if they chose to say no, it's not something this community wants to do, they forfeit hundreds of thousands of dollars. (Denise)

A good portion of their board actually doesn't want to entertain the possibility of engaging with an academic because their assumption is that if you do that you are on your way to hell in a hand basket. Cause you are going to lose the power you have. (Mona)

Power does not reside solely with academics, however; communities also have power:

When people are talking about power relationships in community engagement, they are usually talking about the academic having the power and the community group doesn't... They [academics] are cognizant of their privileged position, having a good job and having a decent income and some degree of security, and I think they are overly concerned about power actually… There is lots of bad research … where academics go out and they do have access to data and methodology and ability to publish… but that is almost a recipe for irrelevance not power, you have the power to publish irrelevant articles… I think the power is much more often with the community no matter who the stakeholder is… If the community-based organization that has limited staff and limited money goes to the media and bitches about some academic, it's the academic who looks awful… (Jim)

Oh the guilt, the liberal guilt!... picking to work with a group of poor women and writing about how they [researcher] didn't speak up because they were so aware of

their privilege… they need to work with these women…because they wanna do community engaged, if you wanna use that language, they want to do something useful and they care about poverty, right? They care. So they work with them and they are incredibly uncomfortable the whole time and they think that it is because they are so privileged. And really it's because they need those women so desperately for their data. The power, they don't have power in that situation, they are utterly dependent and they're scared. (Mary)

In some cases, scholars challenged the two-dimensional view of power, pointing to complexities in power relations, and the possibility of creating power:

I think about these questions in terms of, even in terms of something like OCAP principles, which I think are really well developed, in terms of the quality of guidelines that they offer for community engagement. I just think there is still, the conception of power that is embedded in those principles is so two dimensional, and my experience in working with groups is that it really doesn't do justice to the complexity of things. (Sandy)

When you think about situatedness… we all have multiple locations and they are not mutually exclusive and they tend to interact and create our own, provide us with the kind of background from which we operate. (Henry)

To me, what community engagement really is about is that cogeneration of knowledge… it goes beyond reciprocity… into the area of generating power and potential that isn't simply a function of I bring this and you bring that, we have a

reciprocal relationship. It's more 'I come with my stuff and you come with your stuff' and that creates a cauldron, that if you turn the heat on underneath it, you get something that neither of us could have produced on our own… It's about generating power. It's not about power conceived as a zero sum game, it's about creating new power that didn't exist before. And that for me is when I am engaged in a relationship or an activity or a project where that happens, that is where the magic is. I don't, you know, other stuff isn't really, isn't really worth doing from my point of view. The goal for me is creating magic. And you can't talk about that in universities. (Jen)

Openness and listening important in CES

While scholars were aware of, and highlighted, power differences in CES, they also believed that it was extremely important to mitigate these differences by approaching community from a position of openness, and being willing to listen and learn from community. Participants stressed the importance of not operating from a place of knowledge when engaging community, not assuming the power to define the issue or situation, but approaching the engagement endeavor with curiosity.

One participant expressed concern about the missionary zeal with which some students undertake community work: *"It is somewhat like an old nineteenth century missionary, I'm gonna come in and fix this. I know what your problems are, I took a second year course on globalization or development and now I'm ready to fix this*" (Corey). This impulse to assume one understands community needs should be checked in order for engagement to occur: *"No. No. You need to stop and listen and pay your dues"* (Corey). Scholars must be open to learning from community: *"I mean you basically, you lay yourself out and you open yourself up. Like, you have to"* (Denise).

One participant describes a mentor, a scholar whom he respects, and that scholar's way of interacting with others as important to engagement:

> *He was absolutely open, to others, to learning from others, absolutely porous. He just had this capacity for, he had this capacity for friendship, you know? You felt like a friend of his, which meant that you shared. You talked easily to him and he listened and all of that. Listening is the main thing.* (Henry)

Listening is an important part of being open to community: "*part of that openness is really being able and interested in listening for and looking for what is needed, what makes sense, what is sort of the way to proceed"* (Mona). Engaging community respectfully *"means listening to people and framing the research… and using their language and playing it back and not saying, 'oh well we better put it this way because this is the way we do it'* (Henry). Listening is important and might also be a mutual endeavor: "*I think what is important is that there is time and an interest in hearing about what is going on for both of us"* (Mona).

The need to listen and learn as a starting point for community-engagement can be difficult for those who experience privilege:

> *I think the biggest challenge for us, and the more education we have the bigger of a challenge it is, the more White you are, the more male you are, the more straight you are, and all of that stuff, the more of a challenge it is to learn to listen.* (Henry)

> *They'll [conventional scholars] come to you because you have this relationship...so they want to participate and be part of the projects or part of the initiative, whatever it might be, but I'm still not sure, when you ask them to step outside of the expert role how prepared they are to do that.* (Denise)

Without the important step of listening and learning, scholars might make assumptions about community needs, such as in the case of a community-focused approach described by one participant:

> *What is missing in a community focused approach is that you're making a lot of assumptions about the organization, about the need, and about what you think might make a contribution… I think it can actually get us, lead us to some of what has been really problematic and been criticized about the work and the history of university and community involvement. What's important about the engagement piece is that you are having ongoing communication with real live people doing real live work and you get a much more accurate and rich understanding of what they are doing, the challenges facing them.* (Mona1)

Part of the reason that listening is difficult, is because it assumes one does not know, and not knowing is discouraged in the academic culture:

> *What the academy is missing at this stage in its evolution is that allowing of not knowing, the allowing of ignorance and the allowing of confusion and the allowing of the discomfort of not having the answers. That has kind of been eliminated from the culture of the academy… in the sort of dominant norms of the culture, you are not supposed to talk about magic and you're not supposed to talk about inspiration, you're not supposed to talk about um, the power of ignorance, you're supposed to talk about the power of knowledge.* (Jen)

One participant shares that he has learned something about difference and not and questioning assumptions:

I guess people think of appropriation of voice like 'don't speak for me'. So, like, White person, don't speak for Black person. And there is that, and I do mean that. But also mean when my [child] comes home from school and says 'so and so was a jerk on the playground and they did this', you know, I say 'wait a minute, wait a minute. You are implying motivation… you don't know where they are coming from, their actions are this, but what was informing those actions?'…. And that's, knowing, distinguishing between those things is really, really important in community engagement. We reflect about that. We write about that. We wrestle with those issues. (Corey)

Difference in CES

Difference is an important element of learning in engaged scholarship:

You just keep learning and learning and figure out new things, and then get confused by what you thought you knew… I'm deeper in my sense of things. But, you know, it's developed, as with us all, it develops as we learn and as we are exposed to different situations with different opportunities and different people in different contexts. (Henry)

Encountering difference can be scary and scholars in these situations may fall back on their privileged position as the possessors of knowledge in order to mitigate their fear:

There is, I think, a realization that they are entering into a different world and so their fear, the fear that they're carrying about, 'oh my goodness what am I getting myself into, I have no idea what I am doing here', their, the reactions of that, is people falling into this expert role which then offends people in the community…I can't tell you how many times I've seen professors who think of themselves as highly engaged, highly capable community-engaged scholars coming into community environments and, for

example, in an hour long meeting, taking 45 minutes to introduce their topic… I think it's actually fear and defensiveness. And their typical, their conditioned response in environments where they're afraid and they don't quite know what to do, is to talk, is to present themselves as experts. (Jen)

One participant, who does not identify as an engaged scholar, highlights the kinds of complications that arise when students and researchers work on a project where difference is embedded within the idea of a definable Other.

When you think that the best you can do in a research relationship is to tread on eggs and be totally guilt ridden the whole time, there is no real, in other words if you don't think you can have a real relationship and do research, then honestly what I see … it really makes no difference for them how, what kind of research project they're in because they feel compromised the whole time. Everything they do, they feel, is compromised… Other times there is research money for some project that is absolutely contrary to everything they said they wanted to try to achieve, and so they go in and they take the money for that research. You see what I mean, because they don't have a real experience of a real research relationship that really is mutual. So they don't know the distinction between that kind of research relationship and a research relationship that is, you know, a paid piece of research to explore those Other people over there…There isn't the context within the academy these days… Even a notion that a mutual research relationship of [topic] for a common cause could be attempted, cause all the fear, I think, is about privilege and difference and essentialism and all that stuff. So right away you have no, you're totally disarmed, … you can't build that kind of research relationship. (Mary)

Mary, in her research with communities, asserts that while difference is recognized there is some sense of unity as well:

> *But generosity, do you know what I mean? The kind of relationships where you can do that, where you have a basis for unity if you want to call it that… you're all there because you want to be there. And you're the people you want to be working with or learning from or interviewing, cause there's a common cause. It's lovely. It's rare. It's rare. And it takes two sides; it's not something you are going to decide you're going to do. But if you're going in just as a researcher, not in an area where you're really committed to, where everybody cares about the outcomes, where everybody has an interest in it, it's impossible really… and you need to be aware, and that's very different from thinking 'oh, we're all in it together, we're all the same, we're all women.' It's not. It's being able to be there differently and in fact to appreciate each other really.* (Mary)

> *I think I kid myself sometimes because I see myself sometimes as 'I'm with them'. I might not be as fantastic as them as an activist, but I am an activist with them"* (Mary)

Mary does recognize that her perception of being with community as an activist may not be shared: *"We're talking about issues that are important to both of us. So when I'm in that context I don't think about myself as a researcher, but I am sure they do sometimes"* (Mary).

Mary explains her sense of connection with women she engages as coming together around being women, despite all their differences, in a way that creates a *"rich stew"* of knowledge and strength:

I was a lot better off financially than a lot of the women, but those differences were not just me, the academic researcher, in this community of poor women. We were all women coming together to use our resources to make the [Project] in as supportive was a possible; in ways that we understood we had interests in common. We had to be aware of those differences of course. But it wasn't me as the researcher who was in a very privileged position. There were all kinds of diversity in terms of women's needs and circumstances and there was, everybody was giving. And those are lovely contexts, when you get a project where everybody is committed and everybody is giving what they have and people have various things they can give, in a really, in a woman, a woman defined space, which is a very unfashionable term now, very unfashionable, essentialist term supposedly. When you can create that space, and I think many people have never even experienced it or can't even imagine it… it's a fabulous rich stew of women's knowledge and power, strength not power, strength. (Mary)

When I first started attending meetings with either First Nations, Metis, anybody from the indigenous community it was like, they would meet each other and go, 'oh your so and so's cousin or daughter', and they would find this relationship. And I'm finding now I'm the one going, 'oh ya I know your niece' or 'you know I know your elder'. I know people that they know. So there isn't a meeting very often anymore that I go to that I don't have a connection in some way to some relationship that they have in community…. it's starting to feel more and more that I am not an interloper into this community… There is this longevity that is, you know, making me much more a member of this community. (Denise)

While feeling connected to Indigenous communities she works with, Denise is careful to assert that she is "*still fully aware of the fact that I'm not Aboriginal.*" (Denise)

Denise wants her community members to see her as ready to serve their needs within the context of a reciprocal relationship, and as an ally:

> *I would say in service to the community where we're in very respectful relationship. We're [*scholars] *vulnerable to being exploited by community because communities who are strategic or have learned the in's and out's, they will exploit your, the money you have. They will come to you with the money they want and the things that they need and what you can provide them. But in good relationships you will be in service to each other. So I would like them to see me as their ally.* (Denise)

Power and social positioning: Jen's story

The extent to which listening and good intentions can overcome difference is questioned by Jen who shares a troubling experience from her own engagement with community, an experience of being positioned structurally, within a system of power, despite the fact that she behaved humbly and had the best of intentions. While she admits she is still trying to make sense of the experience, her conclusion is that no matter how good her own intentions in community engagement, she too is marked by her positionality in a system of power.

Jen shares a very gripping story of a time when a patron of the community-based facility that serves as a partnership site passed away:

> *One of the regular guys died… his roommate came in and told us that [Name] had died and we rallied around this guy and, you know, I went for a walk with him and he cried and we kind of tried to support him and we told the rest of the drop-ins that [Name]*

had passed away and the patrons asked if we would host a memorial service for [Name]. And so we did….so many people, a few short years before that, said nobody is gonna come here you know and [University] will never find a home here and never be accepted here. So I vividly remember sitting in the storefront as [Name]'s roommate was delivering the eulogy and there was thirty or so people there and thinking wow…we've been accepted and trusted and we're valued… So that was the story I told myself for a number of years, and told other people. And then probably about a year ago, I got an email from the man who died, from his roommate, who I thought we had been so supportive of and who I in particular thought I had a good relationship with as another human being. And this guy sent me this incredibly shocking email … he was telling me about something that he had done that proved his worth and proved that he wasn't a no good bum, because he knew that I believed him to be a no good bum. And he wanted me to know that he really wasn't. All of which was incredibly surprising to me. And he also said that he held me personally responsible for the death of his friend. Because I was part of a killing machine...And you know went on to say you know [Name], you're a really nice person and I am sure you won't really understand what I am getting at here, but nevertheless, this is my reality, right. And it was really hard for me to hear that. And yet I understand, I mean it was a really good lesson for me and I'm not trying to pacify the experience by saying "oh I learned a lot and then I moved on", its not that at all, it's a continuing um, there is a continuing reverberation for me around this. But what he taught me is that the way that I think of power and the way that he thinks of power are completely different. That being marginalized and being subject to the presumed if not actual judgment that you are a no good bum and you're

not worth anything and you're dirty and un-human, which is what people get in the [community] as one other person that I interviewed in the summer said, people here have been condemned. We've been condemned by the mainstream, we'll never not be condemned; our whole lives are those of the condemned…I thought you know in the midst of all of this that my being respectful and even reverential to people meant that we were on some kind of equal footing, you know this speaks to this notion of reciprocity and mutual benefit. I had this naive idea that I was minimizing the power differential by my behavior and by creating this respectful space where people weren't under surveillance and they could pursue their own learning and blah, blah, blah. What this email revealed to me is that there is a divide between the people with power and the people without social power that is not so easily crossed... Like he didn't say it quite that way, but his criticism, his irrevocable drawing of a line between him and me was because I was positioned in that system and by virtue of my acceptance of my position in that system, no matter how much I might think that I am a subversive and think that I am a change agent and think that I am trying to change the system from within, from his point of view that had no weight at all. I was still part of the killing machine. (Jen)

From this story, Jen extracts the following observations:

Real reciprocity isn't just saying I'm gonna do this for you and you're gonna do this for me. Or saying this is how this project is going to help me and this is how it's gonna help you. That is not real reciprocity. Not the kind that generates power. It is reciprocity that preserves and protects that traditional, conventional distribution of power as if

it's something that one partner has and the other partner doesn't have or only has some of. Cause it's like in a sense, this guy is pointing to, in another way, that thing that we talked about earlier. What is the toxicity? What are we defending against in academia? That is what this guy was pointing to, is our complicity… so many people in academia who are critical of let's say the political system or the economic system, whatever, act like they are not complicit in some way by accepting a paycheck in that system. And it is often people who are outside the system, people who are poor or marginalized for example or Aboriginal or whatever, they often see the system much more clearly than people who are inside it. So if we really want to be thinking about power, we should be thinking about inviting poor, marginalized, Aboriginal, immigrant people into the spaces where we are trying to understand. That is not what universities are doing, cause we're defensive against the truth, but we purport to be truth seekers. (Jen)

Despite admitting that being called part of a killing machine is hard to hear, Jen argued that this is the language of real life and is, therefore easier for her to understand than the critique she might get from a colleague. She explained:

Part of why I value working in community more than working in the academy, it is because it is real. It's a visceral, I can, you know you say to me '[Name] you're part of the killing machine', I get that. If you say to me, I'm part of a counterhegemonic, or I'm part of a hegemonic, whatever, whatever, whatever, using a whole bunch of big twenty-five dollar words, I am confused. (Jen)

While she might get the message, it is still difficult: *"What was so hurtful was that I thought we had a shared experience and what he revealed to me is that I was deluded in thinking that experience was shared"* (Jen).

Conclusion

As study findings indicate, participants who identified as community-engaged scholars described engagement as both a way to make scholarship meaningful and a corrective to the privilege enjoyed by conventional scholars who are seen as disconnected from the concerns of communities outside the university. While engaged participants recognized that they must publish ideas directed at peers, they described CES as aiming to produce scholarship that helps communities do what they want to do better. This approach was framed by linking usefulness, direct impact and accountability. The focus on community needs and the juxtaposition of these needs to scholar's own interests, and those of peers in academia, invites questions about the construction of community/scholar relations. Participants' descriptions of community invoked a series of binary opposites that serve to construct community as those who are outside institutions of higher education and whose attributes are opposite to those of scholars. In approaching community, participants struggled to understand power and difference, emphasizing the importance of openness, curiosity and listening.

Picking up these themes, and positioning them within the context of higher education in Canada, the next chapter will explore the conceptualization of CES as meaningful and useful, examining how this conceptualization relates participant's views of conventional scholarship and accountability. Following this, in chapter six, I will turn my

attention to the construction of community, the problematics of that construction, and the emergent possibilities to reframe relations in CES.

5. Community Engaged Scholarship in Neoliberalized Higher Education

Introduction

While there is much to unpack in participants' contributions to our research conversation, the themes of knowledge/ power and difference in relationship were particularly salient. As a result, my analysis of these findings draws on a number of theories and thinkers oriented towards these considerations. Given my intent to read widely in this study, I drew from a number of different theoretical traditions to inform my horizon of understanding as I analyzed the transcript texts.

Importantly, this analysis begins with an exploration of the context of community-engaged scholarship in terms of neoliberalized higher education. That neoliberalism impacts how CES is understood and articulated is not surprising; given the dominance of neoliberal ideologies it would be more surprising if study participants' work was not mediated by neoliberalism. However, both because their mediation takes a particularly problematic form and because points of resistance can better be identified if we understand the specifics of the mediation, I explore how neoliberalism is implicated here, in this topic. I devote some time early in the analysis to laying out my interpretation of neoliberalism, drawing from the work of David Harvey (2005, 2007, 2008), and how it has affected higher education. This becomes important ground for the analysis and for my identification of neoliberal dynamics throughout the different topic areas.

More specifically, however, I suggest that neoliberalism has had important and significant effects on higher education, effects that contribute to scholars' dissatisfaction with the work environment and the sense that they need rectify this dissatisfaction by

creating meaning in their scholarship. In the context of neoliberalized higher education, scholars who are not winners in this system seek to make their scholarship meaningful by turning their focus outwards, away from the peer group and towards communities outside the organizational boundaries of higher education.

Participants described the focus away from the peer group as the central audience for their scholarship as a rejection of problematic academic privilege and a turn towards greater accountability. The language of new public management, one effect of neoliberalization of higher education, is prevalent in how scholars who focus their scholarship solely on the peer group, scholars that I have termed *conventional* scholars, are constructed and problematized by participants. I analyze participants' view that higher education needs to be more accountable to the public and that academic privilege is problematic and self-serving with reference to neoliberalism and Foucault's work on disciplinary logics. Analyzing the multiple meanings of privilege I argue that the privilege/accountability nexus is an important site of struggle for scholars. Linking accountably and surveillance, I point out that the effects of disciplinary surveillance are not clear in CES.

I then turn my attention to how meaningful community-engaged scholarship is understood, noting an emphasis on useful knowledge and direct / immediate impact. By asking critical questions about usefulness, I explore who benefits from definitions of usefulness in CES and how that relates to changing notions of time that influence scholarship. I analyze how power is approached in CES and the effects of this approach on CES and higher education.

How is CES conceptualized?

In this study, participants who identified as community-engaged scholars described engagement as a way to make scholarship meaningful. They positioned engagement as a corrective to the privilege enjoyed by conventional academics, those whose focus is on their academic peers and field of interest. Conventional scholars were described by many study participants as disconnected from the issues or concerns of communities outside the university; enjoying privilege, which includes the luxury of time to reflect; and focusing solely on academic writing aimed at the insular audience of peers. CES, on the other hand, is described as a more accountable form of scholarship because it responds to the interests and needs of the communities outside the privileged peer group. For participants in this study, accountability is thought of in terms of being accountable to the publics who fund higher education, but also to the communities whose lives can be improved through scholarship and knowledge creation.

Community-engaged scholarship is meaningful because it means something to communities outside the academic peer group. It is also meaningful because it makes a difference to those communities. CE scholarship is immediately useful to communities; it can be directly applied to support the goals they have set for themselves. While participants recognized that they must also publish in peer reviewed spaces as a part of their employment in higher education, the emphasis in engagement is on helping communities do what they want to do better, within the context of shared interests and aims of scholars and community.

In terms of the three frames we explored in Chapter 2, participants in this study positioned community engagement as a means that supports diverse ends – ends that

emerge from community, though not necessarily from community alone. As a depoliticized language, community engagement is palatable for institutions of higher education; resonates with governments, alumni and funders; and functions to support scholars working with communities in a variety of ways, including some very radical projects. In this way, engagement acts as a kind of free-floating signifier, one that can be invoked by different academic actors connecting with communities outside of higher education for diverse specific purposes. As a free-floating signifier, CES is shaped around the aims of specific communities and as such is difficult to delineate out of context. Study findings do reveal, however, that CES is conceptualized as a form of scholarship that functions to render scholarship meaningful through relational knowledge creation and sharing that has a direct impact on and is useful to communities.

Conditions of work in HE: The ground for scholarship that is not meaningful

The view that scholarship needs to be made meaningful through CES begs the question of why it is not already meaningful for participants in this study who identify as community-engaged. I'd like to suggest that the desire to find meaningfulness by directing energy and attentions outside of higher education is one way of responding to working conditions within higher education spaces shaped by neoliberalism and its corollary, new public management. The neoliberalization of higher education invites academic practices that focus on production, thereby reducing meaningful scholarship and masking the meaningfulness in scholarship.

The process of meaning making is not always fast. Thus scholarship that is full of meaning, as we will see later in this chapter, takes time. Concepts and ideas must be placed

in relation, considered from multiple angles and thoroughly digested for meaning to emerge. Further, because neoliberalism positions knowledge in the economic realm, scholarship that does not have economic import appears devoid of meaning. Thus scholarship that does not bring in grant money, lead to a discernable product that can contribute to the smooth functioning of society and economy, or be packaged and sold to students is not seen as meaningful. For example reading, widely held as an important part of scholarly work, is viewed as meaningful in promotion and tenure processes only if it leads to a knowledge product: a publication or a course lecture for example. That scholars should be rewarded for reading itself seems nonsensical in today's higher education context. As another example, the meaningfulness of constantly questioning our own and others' presuppositions by examining absurd logical arguments has come to be hidden by ideas of practicality (a colleague of mine once proved that nothing can be proved, a seemingly silly argument that, if taken seriously, has profound implications for how we think about knowledge).

It is in this context of the contestability of the meaningful that we can begin to unpack the allure of engaged scholarship, and scholar's claims that it is meaningful because its effects are immediately apparent.

What is neoliberalism?

Developments in higher education are taking place in the context of sweeping changes around the world enacted by the global spread of neoliberalism (Harvey, 2005; Hill & Kumar, 2009; Shizha & Kariwo, 2011). As a hegemonic discourse, neoliberalism has

had a powerful effect on Canadian higher education (Fanelli & Meades, 2011). It is important to begin, then, with an understanding of neoliberalism.

As Springer (2012) noted, however, while scholarship on neoliberalism and its relationship to various aspects of the lifeworld is extensive, there is little consensus on what is actually meant by neoliberalism. As a result, he argued, four broad understandings of neoliberalism can be identified: as policy and program, which focuses on the state transfer of ownership from public to private sector; as a state form, which centers on the transformations states undertake to be economically competitive; as governmentality, which emphasizes it's articulation as processual and arising through endlessly unfolding relations between people and their social realities; and as a hegemonic project whereby dominant and elite actors circulate a program of interpretation that serves their own interest and which is met with a degree of consent. Of course, each interpretation of neoliberalism does not exist in isolation, they are connected and recursive of one another (Springer, 2012).

For the purposes of this study, I will be drawing primarily from the work of David Harvey (2005, 2007, 2008) who emphasized the powerful hegemonic discourse of neoliberalism, pointing to neoliberal concepts, such as those of individual freedom and autonomy, as having gained common sense status. Tracing the history and effects of neoliberalism around the world, Harvey highlighted the differences between neoliberal economic theory and neoliberalism in practice. In doing so, he exposed the ways in which neoliberal actions on the part of states and organizations, such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Trade Organization (WTO), actively served to construct and maintain a powerful economic elite. Later in the chapter, I'll explore how neoliberalism

impacts higher education, here picking up on thinkers who incorporate an understanding of neoliberalism as producing particular subjectivities and organizing social relations.

In theory, argued Harvey (2005), neoliberalism can be understood as an approach to political economic practices that view the advancement of human well being as best achieved through "liberating entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade" (p. 2). Neoliberalism seeks to free capital and markets from governmental, legislative and policy constraints. Thus, he suggested, the role of the state within neoliberal theory is minimal. The state's responsibility, Harvey explained, is to ensure the framework needed to enable neoliberalism, a framework that includes legal structures that can address private property concerns, mechanisms to ensure monetary integrity, and the ability to create markets in areas currently outside the market system. These elements are necessary to guarantee individual freedoms. In addition, privatization and deregulation, when combined with competition, are seen as leading to the elimination of bureaucratic red tape, increased efficiency and productivity, better quality and lower costs (Harvey, 2005). Beyond these crucial functions, State interventions in markets, existing or created, must be minimal since states can not interpret information that informs pricing in a timely manner, nor can they act without being tainted by the perspectives of powerful interest groups (Harvey, 2005).

As a result of viewing human well being as a function of the market, argued Harvey (2005), neoliberalism seeks to bring all human action into the market domain. This is done by privatization of public services, deregulation of certain markets, and withdrawal of the state from provision of social supports, moves that are supported by appeals to human

dignity and individual freedom, both of which resonate with the public and with a "common sense" understanding that masks the hegemony of neoliberal ideological beliefs (Harvey, 2005, p. 5). The idea that individual freedom is guaranteed by freedom of the market and free trade is central to neoliberal thinking and has become a dominant component of neoliberal ideology.

Neoliberal practice differs, however, from neoliberal theory. Unlike neoliberal theory, suggested Harvey (2005), the practice of neoliberalism results in markets that embody freedoms based on the interests of private property owners, businesses, corporations, and capital. This hidden aspect of the neoliberal state is masked by reference to the market benefits that all citizens will experience (Harvey, 2005). By examining the actual practices of neoliberal states, Harvey (2005) argued that the move to neoliberalism was motivated by the ruling elites of the upper classes, who by the 1970s were facing political and economic annihilation. He explained that political threats by organized labor and others were mounting, coupled with a very real economic threat resulting from policies that afforded labor a much greater share of wealth than in the past.

Harvey (2005) argued that neoliberalism is, in fact, a political project that aims to re-establish the power of economic elites and the conditions for capital accumulation by those elites. This is particularly visible, he asserted, in the lack of success that neoliberalism has had on economic growth. As difficult as it is to say with certainty what the mitigating factors may have been, Harvey (2007) pointed to the low rate of worldwide economic growth associated with neoliberalism and demonstrated how its main success has in fact been redistribution from the poor to the wealthy. Given the interventions undertaken by the state to achieve this redistribution, he concluded that neoliberal ideology is used less as

a guiding utopian ideal and more as a means of justifying and legitimizing actions that benefit the global elite.

Harvey (2005) argued that through IMF and World Bank practices of debt relief on the condition of the adoption of neoliberal principles, neoliberalism has spread across the globe. In return for debt rescheduling, he explained, countries with debt were required to implement key policies such as welfare expenditure cuts, flexible labor market laws, and privatization. The insistence on the adoption of these policies, Harvey claimed, demonstrated the neoliberal focus on debt repayment regardless of effect on the well-being of citizens. When faced with the choice between human well-being and debt repayment, neoliberalism focuses on the latter, even when it is at the expense of the former (Harvey, 2005).

The effect of neoliberalism, then, has been to increase social inequality and move towards the restoration of class power (Harvey, 2005, 2007, 2008). Despite its claims to the contrary, neoliberalism demands a strong state that can promote its interests and has resulted in a greater gap between the rich and the poor (Harvey, 2005; Hill & Kumar, 2009). While sold as an approach to foster economic growth, in practice, wealth has not grown, but simply changed hands. Neoliberalism is not just a way that riches are created and divided up, but also a discourse that shapes the relations of those creating this wealth – one that values market exchange as an "ethic in itself" (Harvey, 2005, p. 3).

Neoliberalism has thus become more than a theory, and more than a practice that both supports and deviates from theory, it has become a hegemonic discourse that holds the ideals of individual liberty and freedom as the central values of civilization (Harvey, 2007). The corresponding diminishing openness to public spaces, services and goods, and

the ways in which this inhibits the recognition and negotiation of collective goals in society, is an important context within which scholarly work is conducted (Shultz, 2013).

Neoliberalism and higher education

Any attempt to write about the context for Canadian higher education has to begin by recognizing the uniqueness of the Canadian model. The Canadian federal government has long been involved in higher education, but constitutionally, higher education falls within provincial, and more recently territorial, jurisdiction; thus there is no unified and consistent Canadian higher education system (Jones, 2012). That being said, my intent here is not to look at specific jurisdictions and the specific structures and policies that shape higher education in each part of Canada, but to look at how higher education overall in Canada is shaped by economic forces of neoliberalism.

Neoliberalism has significantly transformed Canadian higher education (Fanelli & Meades, 2011). As Kumar and Hill (2009) pointed out, "The restructuring of the schooling and education systems across the world is part of the ideological and policy offensive by neoliberal capital" (p. 1). Universities throughout the capitalist world, having been privatized to some extent, (Harvey, 2007) and education's public value are increasingly cast in economic terms rather than in terms of the public good (Fanelli & Meades, 2011). Neoliberalism has led to the establishment of competitive markets in higher education, mostly as a result of the broader strategies of privatization of public services. Institutions of higher education are thus undertaking constant efforts to streamline and be more efficient: a reflection of neoliberal logics of maximizing profit by minimizing costs.

Within neoliberal discourse, higher education is viewed as an input-output system that serves economic production (Olssen and Peters, 2005) and institutions of higher education as being in service of the knowledge economy: an economy based on knowledge and information (Robertson, 2014) at the service of capital. Bok (2003) suggested that commercially oriented activities will come to completely overshadow intellectual ones in the neoliberal university, as students chose programs on the basis of what will prepare them for employment. Further, university programs themselves will be judged more predominantly by the money and students they bring in, not by the importance of their contribution outside the market. The market regime of neoliberal discourse has meant increased competition between institutions for funding, a dynamic that has led to a need to find resources from non-public sources (Currie & Vidovich, 2009; Schuetze & Mendiola, 2012). These sources include student fees, tuition, increased recruitment of international students, and a focus on private and non-traditional sources of funding for research (Schuetze & Mendiola, 2012). Because public funding has fallen short of operational costs, Canadian universities have tried to make up the shortfall by entrepreneurial activities, including connecting the goals of academic research with those of private enterprise and industry (Kirby, 2012). As a result, higher education is funded, assessed, and rewarded by what the market and governments, who act as market supporters and partners, say they want.

New public management

The discourse of neoliberalism has contributed to a series of higher education reforms, which include: encouraging increased student fees that undermine the public status of the university, internationalization and global competition for international

students, development and expansion of research partnerships with private sector and commercialization of research, and a huge growth in administration of teaching and research (Peters, 2013).

These reforms are collectively referred to as "new public management" or "new managerialism" and involve a shift from a focus on administration and policy to an emphasis on management that draws theoretically on models of private sector management (Peters, 2013, p. 13). Olssen and Peters (2005) explained that

> The ascendancy of neoliberalism and the associated discourses of 'new public management', during the 1980s and 1990s has produced a fundamental shift in the way universities and other institutions of higher education have defined and justified their institutional existence. The traditional professional culture of open intellectual enquiry and debate has been replaced with a institutional stress on performativity, as evidenced by the emergence of an emphasis on measured outputs: on strategic planning, performance indicators, quality assurance measures and academic audits. (p. 313)

New public management has had other repercussions, including recasting the public sector as a service sector that is most efficient when following open market principles (Lorenz, 2012). The effects of this shift, Lorenz (2012) pointed out, include: a repeated revisiting and worsening of student/faculty ratios that lead to large class sizes, promotion of online education, and growing teaching loads; shrinking tenured positions alongside growing part-time, sessional, and term teaching positions that relocate the work from relatively stable employment to positions that require cheap and flexible labor; the delinking of teaching and research through creation of teaching-only positions; and an

increase of tuition costs coupled with a decrease in the duration of studies. In new public management, the public service ethic with its assumptions about the public good that served to guide the management of public sector organizations, including higher education, shifts to a system characterized by labor flexibility through contract positions, clearly defined objectives for both the organization and individual, and an orientation to measurable results (Olssen and Peters, 2005). New public management, as a mechanism for the neoliberalization of higher education, brings market logic and central control together to position education within the economy.

De-professionalization

New public management also leads to the deprofessionalisation of scholars. Neoliberal ideology contributes to changed management structures in the university sphere that include less collaborative decision-making by scholars and instead more centralized decision-making (Shultz, 2013). Pressure on academic autonomy does not happen in isolation. It is part of wider transformation in how governments relate to a variety of professional and other work sectors under neoliberalism (Cauldry, 2011). Trust that public sector professionals would act in the public good, and the accompanying delegation of power to use their best judgment, is replaced by hierarchical forms of authoritative structure, which seeks to inhibit individual judgments through policies, procedures and identification of definitive outcomes (Olssen & Peters, 2005, p. 324). As Lorenz (2012) argued, convincing arguments have not been made as to why academic autonomy should be mistrusted or why moving the site of control from academics to managers solves the problem of self-interest. On the contrary, he asserts, there is evidence

that this relocation makes matter worse and serves to control academics and take over power:

> The introduction of permanent control over faculty – which is unprecedented at least in the history of universities in democracies worthy of the name – is nothing other than the introduction of a culture of permanent mistrust. (2012, p. 609)

For academics in higher education, this permanent mistrust results in a form of de-professionalization that includes a shift from collegial governance in relatively flat organizational structures to hierarchical models based on specifications of job performance that are dictated by superiors; increasing determination of workloads and course content by management; and the re-scripting of rights and power over work from the scholar to the market such that market trends come to dictate labor conditions (Olssen & Peters, 2005).

The professionalism associated with academics is replaced by a logic of specification, one where the terms of academic practice are dictated by someone outside the peer group. The logic of specification is aligned with neoliberal ideology; the patterning of power in professionalism stands in contrast to the neoliberal impetus to restore power to the elite few, whereas specification ensures power is centralized at the top of hierarchies of power. Olssen and Peters (2005) explain:

> In neoliberalism the patterning of power is established on contract, which in turn is premised upon a need for compliance, monitoring, and accountability organized in a management line and established through a purchase contract based on measurable outputs. (p. 325)

In reshaping power relations in higher education, neoliberalism alters the nature of the academic's professional role. Within neoliberal discourse, professionalism is seen as

problematic because it invites opportunism and enables professionals to set self-serving standards. Academics are not trusted to act in the public good but are thought to act for their own self-interest.

Relations of competition

Olssen and Peters (2005) explained that one of the major objectives of recent higher education reforms has been to create "relations of competition" as a way of increasing productivity, accountability and, ultimately, control over academic work (p. 326). The neoliberal valuation of competition in an unfettered market as a driver of quality is evident here. In the context of academia, this construction of competitive relations undermines both innovation and quality. Scholars are under competitive pressure to produce and are less likely to take the kind of time and risks in their research that are required for new knowledge. Instead a repackaging and rebranding of ideas becomes the temptation, all of which can be captured on a CV and annual report by the number of differently titled contributions a scholar might make. In teaching, competition ensures discipline. Scholars do not risk poor student evaluations and often shape their courses to meet students' (consumer) demands and demonstrate their relevance (Olssen & Peters, 2005).

This competitive ordering of relations works against traditional notions of professional and academic autonomy and freedom and contributes to the development of neoliberal subjectivities. As Lorenz (2012) asserted, inserting new public management in the previously professional space of higher education and the deprofessionalization that results undermines "the essence of what drives academics to do what they do" (p. 613) ensuring ongoing chronic job dissatisfaction.

Neoliberal subjectivities

Given the central role of higher education in the production of knowledge and knowledgeable subjects, it is not surprising that higher education is being reformulated in ways that enable the construction of new subjectivities that will serve a neoliberal knowledge-based economy and society (Robertson, 2014). As an economy driven by innovation, the knowledge economy requires subjects that actively produce new knowledge and, therefore, potential new products and markets (Robertson, 2014). This dynamic, along with the move to bring higher education itself within the market logic as a service that can be privatized and as a sector in need of open competition (not government monopoly and subsidy of any particular institution) has a number of implications, one of which is to construct the academic subjectivity of the scholar. The state seeks to create an individual that is an enterprising and competitive entrepreneur (Olssen & Peters, 2005). Thus marketization has become a new universal theme in higher education, manifested in the trends towards the commodification of teaching and research and the various ways in which universities meet the new performative criteria, both locally and globally in the emphasis upon measurable outputs (Olssen & Peters, 2005).

Neoliberalized higher education and community-engaged scholarship

The neoliberalized context of higher education acts as a push outwards in virtue of the chronic job dissatisfaction of academics that Lorenz (2012) asserted accompanies new public management in higher education. He pointed out that the efficiency focus of higher education reforms, the constant push to do more with less, is dissatisfying and problematic, particularly for scholars who are not among the very few highly successful scholars within

that model. For the majority of scholars, the effect that their work might have is hard to spot; they are not seeing their effect on the peer group, nor on students, and thus cannot be clear what impact, if any, their scholarship is having. The mechanism of efficiency also delinks scholarship from its broader purpose – it invites fast work not deep and well thought out work. It insists on innovation within short timeframes and spaces closed to experimentation, which leads to an ongoing relabeling of scholarship under the guise of innovation. Everything becomes something new and the ability to follow an academic trajectory that takes you deeper and deeper into an area of study is thwarted by the innovation rhetoric, not to mention policy mechanisms that necessitate funded research in a context where funders are constantly changing priorities. This results in both language games and a project-based approach to research. It is easy to imagine, then, that academic work can seem to be devoid of meaning and the academic role akin to that of a widget maker in a factory production line whose product is not in high demand.

Despite relatively secure employment for some scholars, good pay, and, a significant degree of autonomy over their work, scholars are positioned within relations of competition where pressure to perform is very intense. This has led to increasing expectations for research productivity levels (Polster, 2007). Funding for higher education has not kept pace with higher student numbers, putting pressure on academics to teach and supervise more students (Currie & Vidovich, 2009). Cote and Allahar (2011), reported that many professors, including those who participated in a University of Alberta study, report an average of 50-60 hour work weeks, high levels of workload stress, as well as high levels of stress related to competitiveness with peers and with teaching disengaged students who, seeing higher education as a credential, are not excited about the curriculum.

They also note that the path to a professorial position is one of prolonged periods of poverty and the incredible uncertainty that comes with graduating into a saturated job market where PhDs outnumber advertised tenure track positions exponentially.

The ability to study what interests you is extremely difficult in the context of heavy teaching loads, the expectation that scholars will teach outside their area of expertise (esp. at the Jr. undergraduate level), the role deans play in assigning teaching, and the pressure to publish and secure research funding. Further, tenure track scholars at Canadian universities report dissatisfaction with the administrative and managerial processes and structures, including top-down management styles and the lack of scholars' involvement in decisions made at an institutional level (Weinrib, Jones, Metcalfe, Fisher, Gingras, Rubenson & Snee, 2013).

It is within this context, then, that engaged scholars find themselves. While it is safe to assume there are many different responses to the increasing neoliberalization of higher education, as well as winners and losers constructed through this increase, CES represents one strategy that is adopted by study participants to render scholarship meaningful.

In addition to shaping their experience and sense of meaning in academia, neoliberalism also mediates how participants in this study who identify as community-engaged describe and socially construct their academic colleagues. The language of deprofessionalism is especially apparent in their comments about academic privilege, a point that we'll explore below.

Privilege and accountability

Participants in this study critiqued and objected to the privilege they believed conventional academics (those who are seen as not community-engaged) in higher education hold, and the lack of accountability that comes with that privilege. Indeed, Gelmon, Jordan and Seifer (2013a) pointed out that CES raises questions about accountability since it is closely linked to community relevance, inclusivity and applicability.

Echoing the mistrust facilitated and maintained by new public management strategies, study participants emphasized the need to ensure academic accountability through CES as a counterpoint to what they viewed as problematic academic privilege. When they spoke of problematic academic privilege in higher education it was with reference to a kind of self-governance, as well as an exclusion of those outside the inner circle of academic peers. Academic privilege was described as manifest in the activities of academics researching what they want to research, especially when it was perceived to be obscure and not immediately useful, and communicating that research to the narrow group of peers in their academic area. To understand this dynamic, it is imperative to explore what privilege might mean and why it might be an important site of contestation.

The Oxford Dictionary Online (n.d) defined privilege as a "special right, advantage, or immunity granted or available only to a particular person or group." Thus privilege involves having something that others do not. In the case of conventional scholars, the (supposed) ability to explore one's own interests, and those of a fairly narrow peer group, while receiving public funding is seen as a special right that others do not enjoy. In the context of earlier university models this kind of exploration was important and, it could be

argued, of benefit the entire society. It furthered our collective knowledge in many directions and contributed to the goals set by an enlightenment approach to education.

However, the economic context as well as the tightness of the relation between higher education and economic interests changed through the neoliberalization of higher education (Giroux, 2003). In the context of a neoliberal university, the ability to determine the focus of one's work can be reinterpreted as a waste of resources that represent lost profit; the time and energy spent on exploring one's own curiosities and sharing what you learn could be directed somewhere else where it supports the economy or student's future employment. Thus the labor conditions of (relative) independence and the ability to direct one's own work that were at one time the condition of the possibility of contributing to the wider society, the condition of the possibility of new knowledge, become re-coded to signify unacceptable privilege under neoliberal logics.

Mohanty (2013) identified this dynamic when she pointed out that the neoliberalization of higher education leads radical critique to appear as nothing more than a sign of prestige and radical scholars as disconnected, living the life of privilege. She argued that radical knowledges are domesticated by the neoliberal restructuring of higher education and can become a commodity to be consumed; they are no longer seen as a product of activist scholarship or connected to emancipatory knowledge, but circulate as a sign of prestige in an elitist, neoliberal landscape.

I would like to suggest that not only does radical critique circulate as a sign of prestige, and critique itself invite a sense of elitism, so too does scholar's independence. Critique invokes a sense of direct resistance to hegemonic understandings. Scholars studying "unimportant" questions, and producing work that is not relevant and, therefore,

not widely read would seem to be far less disruptive, but their work is also subject to the same dynamic of signification. That being said, it is not only the critical form that one's independent thought takes that is under attack in the neoliberalization of higher education, but also the ability to operate outside the sphere of influence and surveillance that lay at the heart of the matter.

This can be seen when we note that privilege also has another meaning that is important to the discussion here. In the context of law, privilege is seen as an exemption specifically related to the right to privacy, as in attorney-client privilege, or privileged information (Oxford Dictionary Online, n.d.). To challenge privilege, then, might also in some ways be a challenge to privacy. In the context of academia, this challenge centers on the right to have some ideas that escape surveillance. In this sense academic privilege is the ability to develop and share ideas that are not shaped by the power of potential sanction because they are outside of the logics of surveillance. While we might note that no ideas operate completely outside social forces, the point here is not that academic ideas are a challenge to neoliberalism because they are completely independent, but that they are not *fully* subjected to the same logics of disciplines that apply to the circulation of ideas in other contexts. Additionally, I do not claim that scholars who write from a very specialized literature and address their peer groups are not subject to discipline, but that the power remains with the peer group to determine the extent to which they will recognize and reward ideas. This privilege is problematic to the neoliberal state because its mechanisms are not fully visible to those outside the peer group and therefore it is much more difficult for governments and the economic elites to exert control over scholarship and ensure that higher education is serving the market.

As Foucault (1977) pointed out, the logics of surveillance function to ensure a disciplinary society. In *Discipline and Punish*, he compared the seventeenth century approach to managing the plague to that of dealing with Lepers. Lepers, he pointed out, were cast out of social spaces, excluded because they disrupted the political dream of a pure society. Political response to the plague, however, did not call for a binary split and the massive exclusion of those who were defined as Other, but multiple separations, individualizing distributions, and "an organization on depth of surveillance and control" (Foucault, 1977, p. 198). Households were kept from interacting, with even the slightest movement cited, and each person had to be accounted for daily by presenting themselves for view at a household window. This strategy was not based on the political dream of the pure society but the dream of the disciplined society. Employing Jeremy Bentham's panoptic prison construction as a metaphor for understanding this example and others, Foucault pointed out how surveillance functions as a disciplinary power. The Panopticon allowed for the disciplining of prisoners on the basis of surveillance from a central tower that could see into each prisoner's entire space, which was backlit by natural light. Likewise, the surveillance strategy in response to the plague is at its heart a matter of achieving social discipline and creating self-censoring subjects by denying them any opportunity to go unseen.

The same logic of surveillance is at work in challenges to academic privilege when we understand this to be a privilege associated with privacy, with maintaining some element outside surveillance. Though conventional scholars are subject to the same social and political systems and structures as others, the genesis of ideas is a very interior matter – interior to the individual, the peer group, and the field of study. It is also a very time

consuming and unpredictable matter. Ideas can germinate for years without a visible and measurable product. As a result, knowledge-based work is not fully visible. This in itself is enough to threaten disciplinary strategies based on the logic of surveillance. The efforts to bring academics into the visible space of surveillance is at work in the increasing focus on accountability through measurable and countable outputs that forms a significant part of new public management and the neoliberalization of higher education. It is also at play in the silencing of researchers, most recently by government vetting and influencing of Canadian scientists' research findings (Canadian Science Writers' Association, n.d.). This enables a visibility and therefore disciplining of the end point of academic work. However, it doesn't necessarily help to police idea generation; it doesn't help to introduce accountability for *which* ideas scholars chose to pursue.

Within CES, however, we can observe another mechanism. Both in the literature on engagement and in participant's responses in this study, community engagement is positioned as a way to ensure that the research, curriculum and pedagogy pursued by scholars is relevant to those outside the academic peer group: to communities, and to students by linking them to communities. Thus the very genesis of ideas that form the basis of knowledge work becomes visible and accountable in that these ideas exceed the scholar, their peers, and the academy. Just as new managerialism requires accountability to those who are not peers, community-engaged scholarship requires accountability to those who are outside the academy altogether. Both strategies depend on de-professionalization of academic work and the moral argument that without external surveillance of some sort, academics will set self-serving and self-interested standards for themselves and each other.

That a group of scholars themselves adopt the language and logic that deprofessionalizes academics is indicative of the extent to which the logic of surveillance has been effective. This form of disciplinary power does not require actual persecution or exclusion of those putting forth radical ideas. Surveillance acts by inviting scholars into a space of visibility, where the genesis of their ideas can be seen, mapped, and delineated because it occurs in a collective space with non-academic involvement. Thus the ever-visible scholars become self-regulating neoliberal subjects who begin to themselves believe that research that does not respond directly to the external influence of community is selfish, privileged, and problematic. This is a predictable effect of disciplinary power based in surveillance. As Foucault (1977) notes the major effects of the Panopticon are:

> …to induce in the inmate a state of conscious and permanent visibility that assures the automatic function of power. So to arrange things that the surveillance is permanent in its effects, even if it is discontinuous in its action; that the perfection of power should tend to render its actual exercise unnecessary; that this architectural apparatus should be a machine for creating and sustaining a power relation independent of the person who exercises it; in short, that the inmates should be caught up in a power situation of which they are themselves the bearers. (p. 201)

Participants in this study put forward a description of conventional scholarship that supports the logics of surveillance, in that it problematizes privilege, using neoliberal discourses relating to accountability and deprofessionalization. The privilege that academics enjoy is described as problematic and unresponsive to the wider needs of society; it is self-centered and self-serving scholarship. Community-engaged scholarship,

on the other hand is described as mutually beneficial. Its content is informed by community needs and perspectives. Even when it does not involve the full co-generation of knowledge, engagement involves community in ensuring ideas pursued are selected not solely on the basis of academic interest and knowledge, but also on the basis of community interests. Making the distinction between scholars' interests and those of the broader community, is a condition required to hold this view. Thus despite the fact that conventional scholars might be deeply embedded in the social world, and attentive to issues that affect their lives outside the academic sphere in a way that shapes their research and teaching, they are not seen as community-engaged. We'll explore this problematic in chapter seven when I examine the ways that study participants understand community.

The construction of conventional scholarship as privileged and self-serving provides a moral argument for CES, which is not self-centered because it includes others. There is a discord here between the discourse of privilege and the reality of academic working conditions discussed above. While there may be the odd superstar who does really lead the charmed academic life described by study participants, for certainly there are winners in a neoliberal model of higher education, the reality is that most scholars work under very difficult conditions as I explained earlier in this chapter, conditions that create the perception of meaninglessness that CE scholars are responding to. Nonetheless, the discourse of unfettered academic privilege persists both outside the academy and within it. The effect of this discourse is that it secures public support for reforms to higher education. Under the guise of refusing to support academics who do not contribute to the wider world, governments can insist on more academic accountability and more academic applicability. The discourse of privilege also serves to undermine any resistance that academics might

create to the dominant neoliberal ideology – their critique itself becomes cast as a self-serving attempt to maintain privilege, a signifier that circulates as a sign of prestige.

Sixties social movements and the appeal of critiquing privilege

The effectiveness of the critique of academic privilege in shaping subjectivities and scholars' relations with others is partly explained by its nostalgic invocation of the social movements and critiques of privilege in higher education brought forth in the 1960s. Given the positioning of CES as a challenge to unacceptable privilege, the argument that study participants put forth to support CES might resonate with those who recognize the dynamics of oppression and how they have functioned to exclude those positioned as different: women, sexual minorities, and racialized people, to name a few. In North America, politically organized marginalized identity groups identified and problematized their exclusion from the system of higher education as well as administrative control over higher education (Lorenz 2012). Lorenz (2012) pointed out that the 60s marked an important time of social reform broadly speaking, and in the context of higher education resulted in a rights based movement that was grounded in an idea of social rights that extended well beyond the economic context. The calls to expand access to higher education have been well heeded. As the Canada Council on Learning (2009) reported, there is a larger number and more broad range of individuals than ever in post secondary education in Canada today. Often termed massification, this opening up of higher education reflects the "transformation of an exclusive, elite system of higher education into a more egalitarian system serving a significantly higher proportion of the population" (Canada Council on Learning, 2009, p. 10). In Canada, 52% of the age cohort appropriate for higher education

is enrolled in studies (Currie & Vidovich, 2009). Despite these changes, the discourse of privilege and elitism surrounding higher education continues as strong as ever.

Lorenz suggested that since the rise of neoliberalism in the 1980's, the 60's critique that led to greater access to higher education has been turned on its head. The demands for social relevance of higher education put forward by students and in the context of rights to education have been recast as demands for economic relevance to private sector actors operating in a knowledge-based economy (Lorenz, 2012). Thus the massification in higher education does not satisfy those who critique privilege. The terms of the critique have changed from a rights based claim for access to higher education to a demand that scholars demonstrate their accountability to the market, understood as value for money. The current context of neoliberalized higher education has led to a redefining of privilege with reference to economic structures.

It is in this context of neoliberal economic relevance that the notion of privilege is used to critique conventional scholarship and promote CES. And it is in this context that a defense of the ability to practice scholarship in a way that is not fully contained by surveillance of market interests can be made.

It is unclear if community-engaged scholarship can contribute to maintaining that space or if it serves to weaken it because it introduces an additional layer of surveillance through relationships with community. Scholars have always related to communities, they are embedded within them. With increasingly problematic control being exerted over scholars' work, the act of broadening surveillance might be a move that democratizes knowledge production, a fact that some scholars in this study pointed out. Including community as a partner, but also as a disciplinary force that counters the disciplinary force

of government, is a subtle and subversive move. Perhaps if the academic space is to remain open, the visibility of the work needs to run in multiple directions, thereby weakening any one point of surveillance. Community engaged scholars' work, as I have argued, is visible in terms of both its genesis and results, and is therefore open to surveillance as a disciplinary strategy. But it is not only governments and administrators in higher education who are watching, it is also the wider community, the wider public who can see the genesis and results of CES knowledge.

Communities have diverse interests and by bringing them into the knowledge creation and sharing process, community engaged scholars are complicating the lines of accountability. Where communities might have once elected governments who influenced higher education and the work of scholars, through engagement they become directly involved. As Peters (2013) noted, we can no longer assume that citizens are members of a political community whose will is expressed and enacted by elected governments. Rather, as he pointed out, in the context of neoliberalism, "the old presumed shared political process of the social contract disappears in favor of a disaggregated and individualized relationship to governance" (p. 16). The citizenry are divided individuals, and power concentrated with the economic elites who guide government decision-making in their own interests.

Through community-engagement, communities can become involved in higher education in a very direct way. The benefit these communities derive from being part of the knowledge process might translate into support for higher education as a public good. The visibility of the prisoners in the Panopticon not only highlights the prisoners themselves, but also serves to make visible the conditions of their confinement and in doing so becomes

a disciplinary force for those responsible for these conditions. Likewise, the visibility of the genesis of knowledge to communities who are involved, and in many cases have a shared stake in the process and product of CES, makes visible the conditions of higher education.

Thus CES might be an effective process for building public allies for higher education and for the valuation of academic work. This hinges, however, on who community partners are and how they relate to scholars; it depends on engagement with communities who are not themselves aligned with the power of governments and economic elites. However, community-engaged scholarship, as it was described here, does not explicitly suggest engagement with any particular community. Thus while it may function to disperse the points of surveillance in ways that loosen the disciplinary hold of power, it may also serve to tighten this hold. The question hinges on whom one understands appropriate community partners to be: a question that is not specified in community engagement.

In summary, participants in this study invoked the discourse of privilege to support CES in terms of its ability to bring accountability to scholars' work. As mentioned earlier, neoliberal discourse in universities has led to a shift from bureaucratic-professional forms of accountability to consumer-managerial forms. Scholars, who are perceived to have the *privilege of secure work for life*, as one study participant put it, and generous salaries, must account for their market value. They must demonstrate a return on investment on behalf of the public purse. Increasingly this demonstration must be tangible and visible to managers outside the peer group: students recruited, articles published, research monies secured, and products developed.

For participants in this study, accountability is thought of in terms of being accountable to the publics who fund higher education, but also to the communities whose lives can be improved through scholarship and knowledge creation. The focus of participant's comments is on the problematics of scholars who do not sufficiently attend to the needs of communities outside the institution. The call is, in some ways, a call to use privilege in a way that benefits communities, not just oneself as the discourse of new managerialism suggests happens when groups of peers self-manage and self-assess. Community-engaged scholars may enjoy all of the same privileges (albeit diminishing ones) that other scholars enjoy, but unlike the conventional scholar, they are focused outside the institution, busy being responsive, helpful, and accountable to a wider public. As a result, the genesis of their ideas and the impact of their work is much more visible, just like the bodies of prisoners in Bentham's Panopticon.

Unpacking useful scholarship

Community engaged scholarship not only works through partnership with communities outside of higher education, it also is oriented to a particular kind of knowledge. Participants in this study who identified as community-engaged attributed the meaningfulness of CES to two key factors. Meaningful scholarship was described as that which has a direct impact on and is useful to communities. While I don't take issue with scholars in higher education noting that they have a civic responsibility, are accountable to the public, should contribute to the social good and democracy, and all the other ways they describe their work, it is in how these elements are understood that I believe is where the crux of the matter lay.

The shift to include community actors in knowledge creation activities is not in and of itself problematic, but can become problematic if the intent and approach are not carefully thought out. Lövbrand's (2011) exploration of the literature on engaged science might be helpful here in that she identified two predominant ways in which the co-production of knowledge is talked about: each framed by either ontological or pragmatic concerns. Ontological co-production of knowledge with those outside the academy has its basis, she argued, in critiques of universal approaches to knowledge that have demonstrated how universal knowledge can mask exclusion and oppression by suppressing difference. In this way, Lövbrand explained, co-producing knowledge represents an opportunity to open knowledge up to deliberations that invite debate, expose differences, and provoke a recognition and interrogation of assumptions. There is an opening of possibilities in the ontological co-production of knowledge that can serve to push the boundaries of what we thought was possible because it aims to expose and challenge dominant forms of knowledge.

Pragmatic co-production, on the other hand, does not aim to open up the terms of engagement. The pragmatic approach, suggested Lövbrand, follows a logic of accountability in that it is aimed at adjusting knowledge production portfolios to better align with community needs. She positioned this move not as that of expanded knowledge but expanded governance: whereby publics become directly involved in shaping research priorities and portfolios. In pragmatic knowledge co-production, scholars are encouraged to help with priorities and needs already identified and are therefore discouraged from taking risks or challenging the very frameworks within which the topics are defined (Lövbrand, 2011). In this way, engaged scholars with an interest in being accountable and

useful are far more likely to explore pragmatic solutions that require thinking in technical and instrumental ways about an issue within a *given* situation than expose dominant forms of knowledge as problematic and embrace the full range of choices in responding to social issues (Lövbrand, 2011).

These two different was of approaching co-production of knowledge are not mutually exclusive binaries, at least not in my reading of them. They are overlapping forms that highlight different things. Participants in this study primarily identified with pragmatic engagement that rests on ideas of accountability, but that is not to say this is all they are doing or that they are not also at the same time considering ontological concerns. In fact, as I will argue in Chapter Seven, research findings reveal that participants are grasping for new ways of collaborating with community partners that are very much aligned with ontological concerns. That being said, this grasping is currently overshadowed by a clear and articulated sense that meaningful scholarship is directly useful to communities.

Since the purpose and meaningfulness of engaged scholarship is defined through activities and outcomes that are useful, then the key question in unpacking participant's emphasis on the usability and direct impact of their work is this: "useful for what, and for whom?"

Useful for what and for whom?

For participants in this study, useful knowledge is described as knowledge that can be used for the ends that communities have set for themselves and which overlap with scholars' interests. These aims ranged from economic development to strengthening social movements to developing public policy to individual betterment. Participants recognized that community engagement also serves the scholar in that it enables material for research

publications and curriculum development/strengthening, but this is not the primary emphasis. Participants see the direct impact of their work being a direct impact on community partners and participants (in community or in CSL classrooms). They know they are having an impact because they can see it in the project, and partners tell them that the collaboration changed them, their practices, or perspectives.

Given that what is useful in CES is determined with reference to diverse ends identified through relationships of some sort with community, we can identify a form of instrumental rationality at work in the conceptualization of CES. According to the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (2013), instrumental rationality is displayed when someone adopts a suitable means to his or her end. Thus useful knowledge is defined with reference to the ends community and scholar partners set for themselves. It becomes an instrument, a tool that can be used to construct a desired object.

There is much alignment here with the literature on community-engaged scholarship, research that casts engagement as being in service to people's well-being (e.g. Boyer 1990, 1996; Fear et al., 2006; Sandmann & Weerts, 2006, 2008). Schaefer and Rivera (2013), for example, suggested that in CES local, insider knowledge held by community members carries the potential to effect change. Without this knowledge scholarship will not be directly useful to communities. They also suggested that, when viewed through the lens of value and purpose, scholarship and service to others become inseparable and mutually constitutive. Thus being useful and being in service to others are inseparable. The notion of useful scholarship is also picked up by Bowen & Graham (2013) who pointed out that if the aim is for research to be used, it must answer questions the knowledge user is

struggling with and be integrated into their context. Thus involving the user in shaping knowledge creation is essential to its usefulness.

If useful knowledge is defined as knowledge that can be put to use for any goal communities deem important, we might also ask, while keeping in mind the policy, organizational, and funding constraints that shape academic work, as well as the distinction between ontological and pragmatic approaches, "who benefits from this definition?" As Learmonth, Lockett and Dowd (2012) reminded us ideas about usefulness are contextually contingent, shaped by power relations, and themselves relational. They emphasized that our ideas about usefulness vary depending on the historical time period, culture and context such that what is useful at one point in history is not useful at another point in history. If what counts as useful changes over time, then we might ask questions about how it becomes defined in any particular time period: questions about the relations of power that shape our understanding of usefulness. What counts as useful knowledge excludes some forms of scholarship; in any unproblematized understanding of a concept, something is excluded. What is excluded in useful scholarship in CES, what gets cast out as useless, and who does this exclusion serve?

In CES the framing of engagement in predominantly pragmatic ways leads scholars to take the role of providing useful technical (research, teaching, expertise) assistance. Even though community partners might, in a few limited cases, be radical social groups working on longer-term systemic change or resistance strategies, and in this particular case being a helpful scholar might contribute to a more just world by supporting the resistance activities these communities have set as their priorities, it does not serve to support the importance of higher education as one space that is a site of struggle and

resistance. Given that higher education is one of the few spaces where critique is not completely foreclosed, where one can still speak out critically, it is a space that needs to be protected. If the ground on which engagement with radical groups is not protected, the space will become closed to those kinds of practices of CES, further defining service to the public through technical and non-disruptive forms of scholarship. As Giroux (2012) explained, higher education as a site of struggle is crucial for understanding intellectual practice as the interrelated dynamics of morality, rigor and responsibility that enables scholars to enter the public sphere and address social problems in a way that demonstrates models of public-scholar connection that do not depend on and support neoliberalism. Engaged scholars cannot afford to turn their back on the institutions within which they work if they want to keep the space of higher education open for multiple kinds of engagement.

While some participants in this study who identify as community engaged are undertaking very critical work with community, they are doing so in a way that links the civic mission of higher education with being helpful and useful. Those scholars operating in an ontological approach, such as the social critic or public intellectual, are not concerned with being useful for the immediate goals of community but of contributing to the alleviation of human suffering in the longer term by unearthing oppression and opening spaces for new ways of being. He or she might spend decades thinking deeply about a social issue and has something to say about it that might disrupt community views, but will in the end expand them.

Diving deeper in the confusion of a complex social issue is unlikely to help community partners working on that issue in any direct way. Unpacking concepts, say

through a Derridian deconstruction to give one example, takes us ever deeper into the complexities of knowledge, power, and the social world (Learmonth, Lockett & Dowd, 2012). As Learmonth, Lockett and Dowd (2012) pointed out, it is the powerful elites benefitting from neoliberalism who stand to lose through this type of useless scholarship. That engaged scholars might develop critical theoretical texts for publication on the basis of their engagement with communities is not disputed here. However, in this study, participants described usefulness by linking it to pragmatic community interests, not to the kind of collaborations where academic partners might serve to disrupt community goals and aims.

Public time and corporate time

Understanding the implications of how participants in this study positioned themselves visa vi pragmatic concerns might be more clear if we look at the important qualifier they introduced in describing meaningful scholarship as *immediately* useful and having a *direct* effect. I would like to suggest that there is an important notion of the relationship between scholarship and time that informs how participants understand their work, and that the importance of immediacy both reflects and enacts the neoliberalization of higher education.

As I argued earlier in this chapter, the neoliberalization of higher education is supported by unproblematised understandings of usefulness that obscure relations of power and assume fixed and absolute definitions of the term. The importance of securing research funding coupled with the decisions made by research funders to prioritize some activities over others, along with policies, legislation and international accords, means that

scholar's work is increasingly shaped by state interests. These dynamics shape all scholarship, including the most critical thinking that takes place within the academy.

That being said, it is possible to resist the forces that shape and, as we saw in our discussion of pragmatic knowledge co-production, limit scholarship. This resistance is threatened, however, by the adoption of corporate time and the insistence not just on useful scholarship but scholarship that can be used right now, a factor that further invites technical problem solving that does not expose systems of domination. This is not a trivial distinction. The question of time is key for higher education, not only in terms of how scholars' time is spent but also in terms of the way that social relations are shaped by time, for time is required for contemplative and critical thinking (Giroux, 2003). For this reason, when time in higher education is shaped by corporate interests, what Giroux (2003, 2012) terms *corporate time*, the market is positioned as a master and pursuing the concerns typically central to a just society is seen as inefficient and wasteful. In corporate time, he explained, efficiency rules and thus hierarchy, competition and excessive individualism are cast as positive and reasonable supports for the production of scholarship.

In opposition to *corporate time*, scholarship that operates along the lines of what Giroux (2003, 2012) calls *public time* is better positioned to identify and resist systems of domination. Public time:

> Slows time down, not as a simple refusal of technological change or a rejection of all calls for efficiency but as an attempt to create the institutional and ideological conditions that promote long-term analysis, historical reflection, and deliberations over what our collective actions might mean for shaping the future. Rejecting an

instrumentality that evacuates questions of history, ethics, and justice, public time fosters dialogue, thoughtfulness and critical exchange" (Giroux, 2003, ¶15)

Some scholars have chosen to themselves adopt the language of engagement to describe their work, for complex and contradictory reasons as we saw earlier, and to undertake what they perceive to be bottom up reforms of higher education such that institutions of HE and academic peers might recognize CES as a legitimate form of scholarship. What is obscured in this move are the deeper questions that might challenge powerful elites and systems of knowledge domination, deeper questions about the kind of higher education that can generate new and innovative ideas by propelling us beyond current understandings. Should higher education focus too much on producing immediately useful knowledge, the potential for emergence is shut down. As Learmonth, Lockett and Dowd (2012) pointed out, exploration and knowledge that appears to be useless sets the ground for some undetermined innovations to emerge. Without it, they suggest, programs fall into long-term decline and stagnation.

As one of many practices, CES might simply be a pragmatic counterpoint to the dominant critical forms of scholarship in higher education. There is, of course, room to practice scholarship in many diverse ways within the academy. However, as part of a larger trend of the neoliberalization of higher education, an emphasis on scientific, technical and technological knowledge, and the dismantling of humanities and social sciences, the calls for CES in institutions of higher education across Canada might also be seen as a mechanism that directs attention away from critical disruptive scholarship and towards technocratic and instrumental practices. We'll explore this dynamic a little bit more in the following section.

Power in CES: micro/macro political focus

In the section above, I suggest that emphasis in CES on immediately and directly useful knowledge de-emphasizes the important role of critique and of spaces such as higher education as a ground from which critique might emerge. Here I would like to suggest that CES might also obscure relations of power at the macro-political level. To begin, we might note that the emphasis on relationship in CES invites a micro political approach to power dynamics that serves to obscure the macro political dynamics at play within institutions of HE. Hodkinson (2014) described these as two distinct yet interwoven levels of political challenge: the micro, which is individual and personal, and the macro, which involves a state level orientation. Each stands in a dialectical relation of interdependence to the other and each is important. It is the emphasis on only one side, the micro level, that is problematic in CES.

Regardless of the aims of individual engagement endeavors, some of which were very macro political in that they sought to challenge international systems of power in a particular topic area, the considerations of *power relating to knowledge construction and sharing* taken up by participants in this study were largely taken up at the micro level. Participants asserted that community engagement involves attention to power in relationships and challenging knowledge legitimation processes to gain peer and organizational recognition, but they did not necessarily take up the macro level of policy constraints and financial support for scholarship, the changing working conditions for scholars, and the eroding autonomy that results. While some participants recognized these factors as shaping their work, they did not center their concerns about power and knowledge in CES at this level. Rather they focused on power between themselves and

community partners on the one hand, and power to determine legitimate scholarship within the academy, particularly in terms of promotion and tenure and therefore in their relations with academic peers, on the other.

Hodkinson (2014) asserted that the micro political debates that happen between academics in a field and/or with organizations that support scholarship (for example, associations such as the Canadian Society for the Study of Education) are part of the political striving for influence in the research field that is a core component of academic life. This striving, he noted, is not just about good-natured scholarly debate, it has implications for access to resources, such as research funding and dissemination opportunities. It is, therefore, a striving that is inextricably linked with job security, promotion and pay. In micro-political striving, the legitimation of knowledge is key: it underpins the criteria by which ideas, research, and even teaching strategies are rewarded (Hodkinson, 2014).

Macro-politics also operate in the academy through government, politicians, and international bodies who assert the need for research to make a direct contribution, to improve societal functioning, and develop mechanisms, funding and otherwise, to support these ends (Hodkinson, 2014). This macro political ideology was not problematized by participants in this study nor is it picked up in any significant way in the literature on community engagement, which focuses instead on the micro political issues of reward and recognition (e.g., Diamond, 2006, 2009; Diamond & Adam, 1993, 1995; Finkelstein, 2001; Sandmann et al., 2000; Vogelgesang, Denson & Jayakumar, 2010) as the site of knowledge contestation, and power and trust in reciprocal, mutually beneficial relationships (e.g., Bringle & Hatcher, 2002; Fogel & Cook, 2006).

Unpacking the macro-political dimensions and their relationship to micro-political considerations of knowledge legitimacy is important in community-engaged scholarship because, as Hodkinson (2014) pointed out, the impetus from macro-political forces is to help those in power (governments and the organizations they support and the private sector) do whatever they do better. This is a form of technical assistance that works to support reforms and subvert transformation. As we saw above, the emphasis on direct impact and useful knowledge as meaningful scholarship achieved through CES fits well with this approach.

CES challenges micro-political level decisions about what counts as knowledge, and the micro-politics of power in relationships, but does not challenge the macro-political interest in instrumental /technical knowledge that has a direct impact and improves the functioning of existing social, economic and political structures. When put in the context of neoliberalism and the neoliberalization of higher education, community engaged scholarship could function as an effective political strategy for those wanting to discourage a critique of changes to the funding and management of higher education, even as it is billed as itself a disruptive alternative to the academic status quo. Without a strong sense of belonging to a community of academic peers or an eye to macro-political level changes affecting higher education, and with an orientation to collaborative change strategies, it is hard to imagine how community engaged scholars might contribute to an effective resistance to neoliberalization in higher education and in the broader society. This is not to say that community-engaged scholars ignore these dynamics while others do not. There is very little effective coordinated resistance on the part of *any* scholars in Canada to the neoliberalization of higher education, as is evidenced by the failure to stop this process

(despite mechanisms such as the Canadian Association of University Teachers and a few collective letter writing campaigns). Coordinated resistance would require a strong sense of an academic community, but this sense is effectively undercut by the working conditions and relations of competition in higher education that I identified at the beginning of this chapter. That being said, community-engaged scholars, in focusing their energy and attention outside the academic peer group do not necessarily contribute to an effective collective resistance movement either. And, given the assertions participants in this study shared about accountability and privilege, they may even be unwittingly supporting the neoliberalization of higher education. Individual scholars might be highly critical and outspoken about neoliberalization, but the focus on direct and useful scholarship reveals a willingness to work within corporate not public time and work with what is, not argue for what could be.

Conclusion

That there is very little theorization of CES as a field, its conceptual underpinnings and the assumptions and traditions on which it rests, starts to makes sense when we understand the technical, pragmatic and directly useful nature of this work.

For participants in this study, CES is one way of responding to the dissatisfaction that develops with the neoliberalization of higher education and the resulting obscuration of the meaningfulness in disruptive, critical, time consuming, complex scholarship that is generated through scholars' reflection on the lifeworld. Through effects such as new public management, deprofessionalization of scholars, relations of competition, neoliberal subjectivities and increasingly difficult working conditions for scholars, the

neoliberalization of higher education forms a complex web in which scholars are trying to make sense of the value and meaningfulness of their work. Because its value and meaning have been challenged by neoliberal ideologies that position all goods, even democracy and justice, within the economic realm, scholarship appears to study participants as something that must be *made* meaningful and CES appears as one way to achieve that.

Even while responding to neoliberal conditions in higher education, engaged scholars in this study re-enforced those conditions by accepting a very narrow definition of accountability and viewing their conventional peers in the academy as being problematically privileged and self-interested. Participants described CES as a corrective to the self-interest of conventional scholars in that it is directed at meeting the needs of communities and contrasted this with pursuing ideas that conventional scholars create in isolation. The argument against privilege that is invoked here might have once been a challenge to social oppression but is re-inscribed within the context of neoliberalized higher education as a challenge to privacy, to operating outside the realm of surveillance.

The effects of this surveillance, which in CES focuses on which ideas are pursued as well as what is achieved through knowledge activities, are unknown. These effects might further entrench the power of governments and private interests to shape scholarship and squelch critical opposition that reveals systems and structures of domination. Or, they might complicate the lines of accountability by expanding those doing the surveillance to include community, and thereby building important alliances for scholars and institutions of higher education. The answer to this question rests on which communities scholars are engaging with and what their engagement is for, two elements that are not specified in CES at the level of the field of practice, though perhaps might be specified in individual projects.

CES was described by study participants as meaningful because it is useful for communities and has an immediate / direct impact on them and their work. Engaged scholars help community do what they do, or want to do, better but they do so through collaboration not the ontological co-production of knowledge that disrupts plans, slows down fast action, provokes revelation of assumptions and dominant knowledge/power. In its focus on communities outside of higher education, CES may at times contribute to radical social acts at an individual or project-based level. But as a field, it directs energy and attention outward, away from the space of higher education and in doing so does not take up macro-political questions relating to knowledge in higher education.

The space of higher education as a space of critique and the scholar as a public intellectual are both threatened by the dominance of neoliberalism. CES scholars, in supporting the view that most scholars are self-interested and in positioning themselves as more accountable by insisting on the usefulness and direct impact of their work, provide little hope for a less fractured scholarly community. Though participants in this study might attend to the micro-politics of power in individual relationships and projects, and with regards to knowledge at the level of peer review, they did not question the macro forces shaping their work and work environment. Without a strong collective, and without careful attention to changes in the funding and control of scholar's work, it may be difficult for CES scholars to contribute to a collective resistance of the neoliberalization of higher education. Problematically, it is this threatened public and (at least somewhat) open space of higher education that serves as a platform from which they engage communities and which ultimately is the home from which they work.

In the chapter that follows, I will look at how this work with communities is understood in terms of the construction of the Other and the implications of this construction. Following that, I will turn towards an important and significant impulse in study participants' work with communities, an impulse that seeks to find new ways of being together. Given the complexities of participants' work, identities, social positioning, community partners, and contexts, it is not surprising that they do not fit neatly into any one analytic frame. Though I have been very critical of their work in this chapter I also see much in CES that might point a way forward, at least at the level of non oppressive partnerships. My worry is that the space of higher education, if not protected and defended as a critical space of ontological questioning, will disappear before these very positive impulses have an opportunity to manifest in action, a worry I take up again in the concluding chapter.

6. Constructing Community: Othering and Opening

Introduction

The focus on community needs and the juxtaposition of these needs with a scholar's own interests, or that of his/her peers in academia, invites questions about the relationships within which meaningful knowledge is created. While participants in this study describe CES in different ways, there is some agreement that the practices identified as CES work through relationships with community and include mutuality or reciprocity of some kind. This way of describing CES is consistent with much of the literature, which frames it as reciprocal and mutually beneficial partnerships between institutions of higher education and their communities (i.e. Boyer, 1996; Holland, 2005; Kellogg Commission 1999a; Van de Ven, 2007).

In this chapter I explore the relational dynamics of CES, specifically how participants in the study who identified as community engaged articulated their relationships with community. Participants emphasized relationships as a central component of community-engagement and talked about the need for trust in these endeavors. However, in our dialogue on relationships with community, participants who identified as community engaged consistently referred to the organizational boundary of higher education as a boundary that delineated and positioned community as outsiders to institutions of higher education. Even when partners were fellow scholars who were volunteers with a community organization, they were still positioned as outsiders to the institution. In addition, despite the fact that some study participants write about non-dual relations, oppression and the problems of Othering in their published work, participants who

identified as community engaged consistently described community members with reference to a set of characteristics that are the binary opposite of those they attributed to themselves. Binaries embedded in participant's descriptions of projects or specific stories of engagement experiences included, for example, theoretical scholars and practical community, globally linked scholars and local community, and leaders and community members working in the field.

Pulling from Spivak's (1985, 1988) writing, I draw on the notion of Othering to analyze the construction of community by study participants. I suggest that as a dominant cultural paradigm, one that has been critiqued as an oppressive European intellectual legacy (Morton, 2003), Othering mediates the relations between engaged scholars and community members and becomes visible through their dialogues on community. I then explore how this Othering serves to affirm higher education institutions' role in legitimating knowledge through the simultaneous exclusion and inclusion of community. As a result, the institutional role of knowledge legitimation is re-entrenched and community aims and abilities are obscured.

Following this, I explore how participants sought to mitigate self-Other relations through listening, openness and positioning themselves as learners. Participants talked about the importance of being open to community rather than imposing on them a set of priorities or approaches. They also talked about the need to listen carefully, rather than enter the relation as the "*one who knows*". Participants struggled to understand power and difference in community-engaged scholarship, recognizing that both of these concepts are highly contextualized and will thus be different in different engagement relationships. I describe this approach to community as both insufficient in its failure to tackle larger

systemic power dynamics and promising in that it reflects an intuitive leaning towards non-binary, non-oppressive forms of interaction. While good intentions are not enough to ensure non-oppressive relations, we can see in these attempts an as yet unarticulated orientation to moving beyond binary approaches to interaction. Through the work of both Andreotti (2014) and Mignolo (2013), I then look at how CES might nurture this orientation and move closer to becoming a decolonizing scholarship.

Why *community* engaged scholarship?

The construction of community as Other to the institution and to scholars themselves invites a question about why this particular discourse is important. Why is CES shaped around relationships with the entity identified as *community*? Engaged scholars' and higher educations' interest in community is part of a larger dynamic where the concept is re-emerging as a key social construct (Creed, 2006; Dorow & Shaughnessy, 2013; McBride, 2005). The discourse of community is both powerful and predominant in contemporary understandings of social life in Canada. As Dorow & Shaughnessy (2013) noted, many academic disciplines have demonstrated a renewed grappling with the concept of community:

> The term was revived for a broad range of scholarly interests, from its significance to new technologies of power, government, and affect (Rose 1999; Larner 2000; Joseph 2002; Ahmed 2004) to its alleged demise in the face of heightened consumerism and individualism (Putnam 2000; McBride 2005); and from its intensified and restructured geospatial relations with circuits of capital, technology, and people (Gustafson 2006; Graham and Healey 1999) to its political potentialities

> across the differences of identity implied by these intensified relations (DeFilippis 2004; Etzioni 2007). (As cited in Dorow & Shaughnessy, 2013, p. 122)

Ferdinand Tonnies, who many consider to have undertaken the first sociological treatise on community (Dorow & Shaughnessy, 2013), characterized the move to urbanization and industrialization as "a move from GEMEINSCHAFT (community) to GESELLSCHAFT (society)" (Kelly & Caputo, 2011, p. 6). As Kelly and Caputo (2011) explained, Tonnies argued that the social relationships and shared values that held people together, community, were being replaced by social relations based on impersonal formal rules and regulations, a governing approach Tonnies understood to be that of society. Tonnies' analysis, though now problematized as overly binary, points us to the ways in which the conceptualization of community is linked to economic structures.

As noted earlier, as neoliberalism developed in Canada, the idea of state social support for members of society faded from focus and the good of all was trumpeted as best achieved through markets (Harvey, 2005). Kelly and Caputo (2011) argued that community is a necessary construct for the aims of the neoliberal state and as such community-building activities have become particularly important to the continued growth of global neoliberalism. As a result of a political shift to neoliberalism, they suggested, the state in Canada and other Western nations has increasingly sought to cut the costs of social support programs and has achieved this, in part, by downloading responsibility for the delivery of programs and services to the community level. Because this move requires a definable community to take responsibility, communities must become "known entities", their

features mapped and classified so that the state can decide whom to be involved with (Kelly & Caputo, 2011, p. 2).

Given the reemergence of community as an important signifier, for individual scholars, the labeling of their work *community* engagement may simply reflect their strategic adoption of an organizationally led discourse that was itself strategically adopted because it aligns with the interests of neoliberal states, donors, and those outside the academy. The image of a tight relationship between institutions of higher education and community, which connotes a group with shared values who support and look after one another, is powerfully seductive and makes for excellent promotions and fundraising materials. That being said, how community, as a complex signifier, organizes social relations in community-engaged scholarship is important to unpack. In CES, the interest in community translates into an interest in scholarship that is undertaken in and through interpersonal relationships with community members and organizations. For scholars in this study, community engagement relations are described through binary logics and reflect a divisive Othering that some participants at the same time problematized. To understand this dynamic, we might begin by looking more closely at how Othering occurs and what its impacts might be.

What is Othering?

One of the most significant systematic treatments of Othering is found in the work of G. C. Spivak (1985) where she explores the ways in which Europe created itself as a sovereign subject by Othering its colonies while simultaneously creating these colonies in its own image. Through the establishment of borders between Europe and those who were

not-Europe, a sense of a bounded in-group was developed. Thus Europe's identity was secured by the simultaneous exclusion of the Other, as non-European, and the inclusion of the other as a subordinate being, as those against whom the European identity is established. Spivak's later work (1988) questions the extent to which those who are Othered can speak and be heard, an important question for scholars working with community.

Spivak's concept of Othering develops in critical response to an intellectual engagement with European philosophy, in particular that of G.W.F. Hegel. In *Finding Antigone's Voice: Woman and the Dialectic,* Kajner (1997) explored Hegel's system of philosophy as it pertained to women and identity politics at that time. Key to this understanding, Kajner argued, was the idea of Othering, of self-determination through the Other, an understanding that she problematized through feminist critique and attempted to rectify through Julia Kristeva's subject-in-process.

A brief overview of the ways in which the self achieves itself through a process of Othering might be helpful here. It is the logic of this process that Spivak (1985, 1988) critiques through a post-colonial analysis and which informs her theorizing of Othering. As Kajner (1997) explained, Hegel argued that self-consciousness develops out of an encounter with difference; because consciousness is not yet conscious of itself, it assumes that it is all that exists and this assumption is confirmed by its appropriation of all that it encounters. However, when a consciousness encounters another not yet differentiated consciousness the situation is different. As Kajner (1997) pointed out, here both sides of the interaction have agency, assume they are all that exists and that their desire is essential, for this reason each consciousness seeks to have itself confirmed by negating the

other and thus a fight to the death ensues. Kojeve (1969) describes it this way: "Human reality is created, is constituted, only in the fight for recognition and by the risk of life that it implies" (p. 12). Both are initially willing to risk their biological life in order to be confirmed in their undifferentiated existence. However, as Kajner (1997) explained, Hegel argued that one consciousness values life itself above recognition of its desire as essential. Thus this consciousness chooses to give up the struggle to assert its desire and becomes enslaved to the other; the slave recognizes the master as such and the master has achieved self-consciousness in a way that asserts his desire as the essential desire for both (Kajner, 1997).

We can see then that the movement described is that of going from an undifferentiated "I" who encounters another and in the process of fighting to have its desire recognized simultaneously establishes the other as "-I" and the self as "- - I". Because this process is one of introducing differentiation, it allows consciousness to know itself. Without differentiation it had no boundaries, nothing appeared foreign and independent to its desire, therefore it had no firm existence. Now it knows itself through encountering and subordinating the desire of the Other. As Spivak describes this process, Othering both creates and subordinates difference, simultaneously excluding and including the Other (Morton, 2003).

Though the dynamic of Othering is complex, the heart of the matter is that because the Other is seen as "-I", self-consciousness cannot encounter the Other in their actual being, in their reality, and respect their desire as essential to their own self-determination. The Other's desires are subsumed within their function as a negation upon which self-knowledge of a more powerful consciousness is developed. The logic is one of self-

validation through the creation of an Other who is not seen in their specificity, but only as the binary opposite of oneself, and the subsumption of that difference within a unity of understanding.

Othering in CES: Establishing and supporting organizational boundaries

In articulating their community engagement, participants in this study engage in an Othering of community, both on an organizational level, and at the more specific level of individual attributes, skills and abilities.

At the broad level, community is constructed as "-I" for scholars in higher education by invoking organizational boundaries. As the logic of Othering reveals, this both excludes those outside higher education and includes them, it both affirms the organizational boundary of institutions of higher education by pointing to what is outside at the same time as bringing what is outside within for its own self-understanding. This has the effect of shoring up institutions of higher education and, despite the call to co-create knowledge and share power on behalf of some engaged scholars, reaffirms their dominance. Thus institutions of higher education continue to be central in granting legitimacy to knowledge even while recognizing that legitimate knowledge rests in multiple locations. Institutions of higher educations' embracing of community engagement not only offers a powerful rhetorical device for fundraising, it also solidifies their role in the validation and legitimation of knowledge, thereby ensuring their relevance and continued role in the knowledge market.

This move may be more important than scholars realize for, if the international trends hold, the role institutions of higher education play in the legitimation of knowledge

is about to be challenged. As Amrhein (2014) suggested, other parts of the world are already taking steps to develop government infrastructure to assess foreign experiences and foreign education of immigrant newcomers and issue credential equivalencies without involvement of institutions of higher education. This move may be only a first step in governments wrestling control from institutions of higher education. As he suggested, a future might emerge whereby governments issue degrees and institutions of higher education are merely teaching sites, delivering mandated courses to masses of students.

CES resists this move in unexpected ways. By embracing multiple sites of knowledge and working toward knowledge co-creation and mutual benefit, CES reaffirms the role of institutions of higher education as central to knowledge legitimacy and the knowledge validation process. Thus even while scholars might critique the organizational discourse of CES (e. g. Fear et al., 2006) and scholars might see themselves as working quite apart from the interests of administrators in their institutions, they construct community in a way that serves to solidify the organizational identity and boundaries of higher education.

Because the Othering of community is an Othering based on organizational status, it serves to position the institution as dominant in the arena of knowledge and scholarship even as it recognizes and includes community knowledge.

Community specification and Othering

There is a second dimension of Othering that takes place in CES that is important to examine here. When describing community, participants in this study ascribed to them a host of attributes that were the binary opposite of their own attributes: scholars are theoretical, community practical; scholars' knowledge is global and abstract, communities

have context specific knowledge. Scholars assert their desire to value community knowledge, yet this binary description is suspect, as are comments about community being "*on the front lines*" *"fighting fires"* and *"in the trenches"* all of which imply that community partners are not only action oriented but also at the command of generals and other leaders. The power relations invoked in these examples seem to point to a hierarchy of power. The claims made in CES literature relating to mutually beneficial partnerships become suspect when we understand the power dimensions in Othering at the specific level of community partners.

Despite the emphasis on relationships of trust and working for mutual benefit in CES and in participant's responses in this study, their description of community members' interests, skills and attributes reveals an Othering that is highly problematic. Like the European construction and subordination of those who were non-European, and the efforts to remake the non-European on the basis of the European model, that Spivak (1985) pointed to in her theorization of Othering, community partners are constructed as different at the same time as they are being reconstructed in the model of the scholar, reconstructed as desiring to co-create knowledge. In reality, communities have diverse interests. Denise recognizes this when she notes that community agreement to undertake research is constrained by funding parameters that emphasize research:

> *Like we're not going to push it from the institutional lens. But having said that, the power still remains with us because it is money flowing to their community and so even if they have the power to say no, do they really? I mean, cause if they chose to say no, its not something this community wants to do, they forfeit hundreds of thousands of dollars. (Denise2, p. 26)*

Would research, course development, or other forms of knowledge creation be the first choice of community partners if funds were not earmarked and could be spent on anything? Community desires, their self-determination and the kinds of projects they might want to undertake as mutually beneficial are obscured by funding policies that shape what is possible, as well as by scholar's assumptions about what communities desire and what they can bring to a partnership. Othering of community involves the trifecta of binary, hierarchy and homogeny. The Other is constructed as opposite, subordinate, and remade as duplicate. This latter part of this dynamic explains how difference in CES can remain, at least for a time, invisible.

My point here is not that engaged scholars completely oppress community, nor that they are not genuine in their engagement, I don't doubt that some CES endeavors are very beneficial to community. But it is the way community is constructed in relation to the scholar within the realm of knowledge that is problematic. By Othering community in this way, binaries are supported even as they are challenged. Participants' responses in this study reveal an Othering that is larger than their individual perspectives. I do not want to suggest that the issue here is a group of individuals who in their written communications are careful, but when speaking freely reveal their own "real" perspectives on community. I think it is far more complex than that. Speaking freely, scholars mediate the dominant discourse on self/other relations that Spivak and others point to as the oppressive European legacy. Without problematizing this discourse, without careful attention to how relations are logically structured in CES, the aims of trusting and reciprocal relations cannot be achieved.

It is important to note, however, that participants in this study talked about the importance of subverting this starting point even as it is undertaken. They emphasized the importance of listening, openness, ego negation and respect towards community, points that I will take up later in the chapter when I look at the potential for emergence in CES. The nuance here is that at this moment in CES, scholars are both exhibiting a colonial self/other discourse at the same time as they are exceeding it. Through engagement with the constructed Other, participants in this study are fumbling forward, in many cases seeking different ways of interacting that might not yet be intelligible or articulable.

Good intentions are not enough: Jen's story

It is clear from the story that Jen shares that good intentions and a desire to be respectful and open, a desire to learn from the Other, are not enough. While Jen saw her interaction with the community member as reciprocal and respectful, he saw it as an encounter with someone who is *part of the killing machine*. From this example we can begin to see that good intentions and a desire to listen do not necessarily ensure that scholars are capable of hearing Others. Within binary relations of self and Other, the Other cannot speak their desire (Spivak, 1988), which renders any desire to listen openly problematic. Additionally, good intentions towards the Other do not in any way reposition the larger systems and structures of power that are at play in the social world. As Jen's community contact so readily points out, one's positionality is not so easily overcome and the social structures of inequality remain incredibly resilient.

What sense, then, can be made of community-engaged scholars' attempt to be open to the Other? To listen and learn from the Other? Jen's story is also instructive here in that

it reminds us that even if the Other cannot fully be heard, there are moments when the Other disrupts our assumptions about the world, a disruption that necessitates a reframing of what we thought we knew and of the binaries undergirding this knowledge. Learning happens through these disruptions. While the person that Jen encountered was not heard in the original interaction, I believe that the disruption of the email she later received, explaining to her how this person was understanding the past, was a moment where the Other broke through.

What continues to be problematic, however, is that these sorts of individual disruptions themselves do not affect the underlying logic that created the conditions of the possibility of their emergence in the first place. The logic of Othering that renders the desire of the Other invisible is not replaced with another structure of interaction. Rather, an element of specificity of the Other is rethought. They are still Other, but now they are an Other who is better known in their Otherness.

That there is an awareness of this problematic is evidenced by some study participants' problematizing of the dichotomous positioning of scholar and community, and by the fact that the one participant who does not identify as an engaged scholar spent a long time explaining that community is not someone or something *over there* but a space that she herself always already occupies.

The struggle to find a non-dichotomous way of relating, and the desire to expand beyond fixed Self-Other relations is evident in participant's insistence on being humble and open, listening to learn from community. But, questions of power cannot be ignored in these relations. What is important is not just understanding how participants in this study sought to mitigate their power position as knowers by listening, instead of just speaking,

and being open, instead of being the one who knows, it is also important to ask about the underlying structures of power that shaped the entire engagement endeavor at a macro level, at the level of *the killing machine* or social structures and systems.

Opening to the Other: The seed of non-oppressive interactions

I have suggested that good intentions and openness to the Other are not enough to ensure reciprocal and non-oppressive forms of interaction. I also want to suggest, however, that it is within these actions that we find the seeds of a way forward. In purposely taking a position of not knowing, participants in this study who identify as community engaged are stumbling forward, through the binary construction of self/Other that is a European legacy, trying to find new ways of being together. It is here that we can see the real potential in engagement for finding new ways to be together in the world.

While participants tended to fall back into ways of describing their relations with community through an Othering lens, they also recognized the limits of this approach as overly dichotomous in the context of engagement attempts to collaborate. They described strategies that they use when working with others that reflect new ways of being together and learning together: openness, listening, and learning. Gadamer (1982) emphasized this approach to the text, and by implication to the Other. He asserted that in order for a fusion of horizons to occur, in order to learn something, one must be open to being told, open to what the Other might have to say. This, he reminded us, might require that we accept some things that at first blush seemed opposed to what we know and who we are, which is difficult, but this kind of openness is crucial to the establishment of a genuine human bond. Wallace (2000) builds on this view with a framework that emphasizes the importance of

interactions that enable I to know the Other through an authentic openness that lets something be said.

Engaged scholars might not have the words to articulate their relationships, and as I indicated earlier, might be enacting the logic of Othering, but they are also oriented towards collaboration as the site for emancipatory change. Through collaborations that go beyond pragmatic concerns, there is the possibility that CES can be tightly linked to collective social action. As Freire (2007) explained, is the critical intervention of thought and action together that creates the conditions for actors to become human by acting upon the world to transform it. However, in order for this to happen, the aims of collective scholarship, of CES, need to be much larger than meeting the immediate needs of community. CES would need to adopt a systemic and ontological orientation, as a field and not simply within individual projects.

This orientation, described by many participants in this study, might also point the way forward for non-oppressive models of interaction that disrupt the conceptualization of Self-Other interaction, models that are emerging from the community engagement experiences. Andreotti (2014), recognizing the ways in which Self-Other relations are understood and discussed in literature about essentialism and education, pointed to the importance of mourning the limits of "over-socialization" in "the use of modern reason with its focus on 'knowing' the world and the Other", a process that involves "learning to unlearn, to listen and to reach out" (p. 142).

This mourning, Andreotti (2014) asserted, is an important first step in shifting Self - Other relations that have rightly been critiqued as oppressive. She carries forward the critique made by Spivak (1988) and others who point to the misrepresentation and

silencing of the Other that occurs in this model, and suggests that new ways of interaction can only emerge from residing with the discomfort of provisional understandings, dissensus, not knowing, non-teleological futures, and where difference is positioned as a powerful force that pushes up against the limits of existing possibilities.

While participants in this study articulated their relationships in a way that reflects Othering, they also talked about their approach to the other in terms of openness and listening. While this may not in itself be enough to lead to non-oppressive forms of interaction, it reflects an almost intuitive orientation towards new ways of interacting with Others. It leads to moments such as the one that Jen described as *magic* and collaborative knowledge creation that *generates power* for everyone involved. It is within these moments that scholars are taught by the Other, taught how to live and conceive of new ways of interacting with one another.

The impacts of this learning on education, and on subjectivities, are really important. On the platform of openness, listening and learning in community engagement, it might be possible to build a decolonial approach to collaborative knowledge creation. It is this potentiality that I turn to in the next chapter.

Conclusion

Study participants emphasized trusting relationships as a central component of community-engagement. At the same time, they consistently referred to community as those who were positioned outside the organizational boundary of higher education and described community partners through a set of binary oppositions that I made sense of in terms of the concept of Othering. This Othering ensures that institutions of higher

education retain the power to legitimate knowledge through a simultaneous exclusion and inclusion of community. Even while framing their relations in terms of Othering, participants also attempted to mitigate power in Self-Other relations through listening, openness and positioning themselves as learners. This approach is both insufficient because it doesn't tackle larger systemic power dynamics and promising because it reflects an intuitive leaning towards non-oppressive forms of interaction. In the next chapter, I explore the ways in which this leaning might be nurtured to develop non-oppressive ways of being and knowing through a decolonial CES.

7. The Potential for Decolonial CES

In Chapter Seven, I suggested that it is on the platform of openness, listening and learning in community engagement, that it might be possible to build a decolonial approach to collaborative knowledge creation. Though study participants are in many ways speaking and acting from colonial logics they are also intuitively leaning towards the very practices that might serve to ignite ways of interacting that do not directly address and, therefore, reinforce colonial logics but exceed and explode them. In this chapter, I explore Walter Mignolo's (2013) and Tlostanova and Mignolo's (2012) theorization of decoloniality, including his emphasis on border thinking and epistemic disobedience, to explore if and how CES might be conceptualized and practiced in a way that moves beyond oppressive binaries.

Why decoloniality?

Decoloniality may offer a way forward for those scholars positioned in the Western neoliberal university, experiencing the discipline that comes with surveillance of ideas and scholarly outputs, the exclusions that support pragmatic approaches in the context of corporate time, and the sense of meaninglessness that is experienced when one's work does not appear to contribute to the social world in positive ways. That community-engaged scholars are privileged, located as they are in tenure track and administrative positions in Canadian universities, need not impede their ability to learn different ways of being and knowing from others. As Tlostanova and Mignolo (2012) commented, "the decolonial is an option for all those human beings who want to participate and share rather than be managed and integrated to master plans that are not theirs or to be expelled and

marginalized" (p. 192). Theories that emerge in the Third world[2] can be picked up by all those seeking knowledge. This is not an appropriation, rather, it is a recognition that knowledge emerging in the Third world is just as globally valid as knowledge emerging in the First world:

> ...there is an unconscious tendency to think that theories that originate in the Third World (or among Black or gay intellectuals), are valid only for the Third World (or Black and gay people) while theories that originate in the First World (and created by White and heterosexual people) have a global if not universal validity. (Tlostanova and Mignolo, 2012, p. 3)

We might add to this idea feminist critiques of patriarchy that are mistakenly thought to apply only to women, as well as other forms of critique. It is from those who Western binary logics have positioned as Other, that we might all learn different ways of knowing and being.

Part of the richness of decoloniality lay in its refusal to be positioned as against the dominant logics currently circulating. In his critique of post-coloniality, Tlostanova and Mignolo (2012) pointed out the ways in which post-colonial critique cannot be written without a reference to, and therefore a reinforcing of, European history. Indeed, Spivak, whose thought I engaged with in Chapter Seven, presents a critique of binaries that makes continued reference to European history and in doing so continually draws the eye to that

---

[2] I am using the terms Third World and First World here because Mignolo uses them in his original text. The terms reflect the kind of valuation that has, under coloniality, been given to differing geographical and economic locales.

area, even while she weaves a narrative about the oppression of the colonial Other. The difficulty, as I understand it, is how to speak from outside the dominant position, described as that of the Self in Hegelian logics, without taking up the position of the Other. It is because of this impossibility that the subaltern, for Spivak (1988), cannot speak; for the logic of self/Other positionality requires the dominance of one desire. If the Other speaks their desire and is heard and affirmed in their desire they are no longer an Other, for silence is an enforced prerequisite of the position.

Within binary Self/Other relations, the Other functions as a negation as difference against which the Self learns about itself. To reconceive this relationship would require of community-engaged scholars that they be open to learning from the Other, who ceases to be an Other once they are heard. This learning is not just about local circumstances or experiences of the topic of scholarship, but learning about a different way of being, non-binary ways of interacting with one another. This approach aligns well with Gadamer's (1982) call to engage in ways that function to expand the horizon of both parties and shifts our being in the world, a move that requires an openness to being told, to hearing what the Other might have to say. Tlostanova and Mignolo (2012) emphasized this point when he talked about needing to create new subjectivities in order to move beyond oppressive relations. These new subjectivities would not be a result of a centered Self learning about itself by creating and negating difference. Rather, they would emerge from a deep listening and learning that can only develop through a de-linking with the colonial matrix of power.

We find, then, in decoloniality another way of envisioning relations between people. Through decoloniality, Tlostanova and Mignolo (2012) asserted, experience, not academic disciplines, becomes the guide for a narrative that captures how the colonial matrix is lived.

This emphasis on experience might resonate well with many community-engaged scholars. Being guided by experience requires taking a position of epistemic equity, not relying on the sanctioning of knowledge by authorities. In CES this move might disrupt the power of institutions of higher education and the scholars who work within them to legitimate knowledge. Instead, knowledge might be positioned in multiple places and might move towards achieving the kind of knowledge equity that some CES scholars hope might emerge through their work.

What would a decolonial CES require?

To support the emergence of decolonizing practices in community-engaged scholarship, knowledge creation would need to be informed by decolonial logics whereby articulation emerges from the site of the Other and where the genesis for that articulation is not merely rational, but also intuitive and embodied (Mignolo, 2013). It would need to emerge from border thinking and would have to result from a delinking of the discursively produced binaries that currently mark engagement as well as the current (Western) way of thinking about engagement in Canada. This delinking is a form of *disengagement* with what Mignolo termed the "colonial field" (Tlostanova & Mignolo, 2012, p. 17) in order to engage with decolonial thinking. He emphasized that this way of seeing is not in opposition to colonial thinking, it is not a negation of coloniality, but a disengagement with coloniality such that the "colonial matrix of power" becomes the centre for political and social theorizing (Tlostanova & Mignolo, 2012, p. 17).

Border thinking is described as the epistemic singularity of decolonial projects. Mignolo (2013) explains that Fanon's work captures this idea of border epistemology well when he exhibits

> …the basic categories of border epistemology: the biographical sensing of the Black body in the Third World, anchoring a politics of knowledge that is both ingrained in the body and in local histories. That is, thinking geo- and body-politically. (p. 132)

The emphasis here on articulation by what Mignolo (2013) termed the *anthropos*, which might be described as the Other in many discussions of difference. Mignolo used this term to remind the reader that the Other is a discursive production, a point we saw earlier with our exploration of participants' construction of community. He reminded us that this discursive production is only successful if one has the power to name and describe an entity and thereby convince others that it exists as such. In decolonial approaches, the anthropos refuses to play by the rules of the game, refuses to speak from the position of Other, for this affirms the relations it is seeking to upset. For Mignolo (2013) there is a process of delinking whereby one unbinds oneself from the self/Other dynamic in that they realize their difference is constructed as a fiction that enables domination, thereby refusing to accept the options available, refusing to identify with the binary logics.

Mignolo (2013) asserted that this is possible, even within a dominant binary discourse, and here we begin to see where hope for a decolonial CES might emerge. When the conditions are right for awareness of coloniality to emerge, new understandings are created that exceed and explode the borders they inhabit. From within the borders of coloniality, decoloniality can emerge. How? Mignolo (2013) encouraged the anthropos whose awareness of coloniality allows them to delink to embrace what he terms "epistemic

disobedience" (p. 137). He explained that by delinking from the discourses that produce the anthropos / Other one can "become epistemically disobedient, and think and do decoloniality, dwelling and thinking in the borders of local histories confronting global designs" (p. 137).

Decolonial CES in the neoliberalized university

While recognizing that decolonial thinking can be done within the borders of existing academic structures, Mignolo (2013) asserted that it will not be rewarded or encouraged because its goals, those of contributing to democratic futures and harmonious society, are not the goals of higher education, despite what may be rhetorically espoused. He reminded us that the goals of institutions and systems of higher education are to compete with other institutions and systems in a global context for domination and that the rhetoric used is actualized in the context of valuing personal success and innovations as contributors to this competitiveness: a view that fits well with our earlier discussion of the neoliberalization of higher education. That being said, if the academy is not a friendly environment for decoloniality, and if decoloniality must therefore exist on the fringes of higher education, then perhaps it might find a home in CES.

However, what this would require, following the logic of decolonial thinking, that scholars give in the same way that those they've constructed as Other have been required to give. Mignolo (2013) explained that in the context of colonialism:

> Nothing prevents a white body in Western Europe from sensing how coloniality works in non-European bodies. That understanding would be rational and intellectual, not experiential. Therefore, for a white European body to think

> decolonially means to give; to give in a parallel way than a body of color formed in colonial histories has to give if that body wants to inhibit postmodern and poststructuralist theories. (p. 145)

What Mignolo is calling for is a change to the rules of the game, not just the positions within it. Though many community-engaged scholarship activities do not make explicit reference to imperialism and colonial/racist politics, and as a result the position of the anthropos becomes harder to imagine, we might find in this approach a way to build on the magic that develops when approaching community partners through not knowing.

Learning to unlearn to relearn

Study participants, in articulating CES, struggled to capture something in their experience that they described as unnamable, ineffable, and sometimes as magic. The inability to voice their experiences in those instances where framing in binary logics would not suffice is not surprising given the dominance of colonial logics in knowledge production. Attempting to speak outside these logics is difficult, for what is being articulated is intuitive and embodied (Mignolo, 2013). This kind of knowing is not easy to place within rational knowledge systems and for this reason, it remains unnamable, outside language, or is constructed as the opposite of rational enlightened knowing - constructed as magic. The emphasis study participants placed on connecting with *real live people* instead of texts begins to make sense when we understand that at its most powerful moment, CES involves learning and knowing that is outside of language, that happens between bodies and on an intuitive level. This knowing is only possible when we disengage from a rational process of ascertaining knowledge, a form of de-linking.

Tlostanova and Mignolo (2012) emphasized that the necessary precursor to learning from the anthorpos, the Other in Western binary logics, is de-linking from the colonial matrix. This de-linking, or disengagement from hegemonic ways of knowing and being in the world opens up the possibility that relations can be transformed. It is crucial, then, that scholars who wish to undertake decolonial engagement begin by learning to unlearn. It is only when we know how to unlearn the colonial logics that are at the very core of how subjectivities have been theorized in First World that we can truly be open in a way that enables us to relearn new ways of being and knowing. Unlearning is the first step in disengagement from colonial logics. Andreotti (2014) explained the process in this way:

> *Learning to unlearn is defined as learning to perceive that what we consciously identify as 'good and ideal' (however complex it might be) is* ***only one*** *possibility and this possibility is conditioned by where we come from socially, historically and culturally* (p. 142 italics original)*... Learning to listen is defined as learning to recognize the effects and limits of our perspective, and to be receptive to new understandings of the world. It involves learning to perceive how our ability to engage with and relate to difference is affected by our cultural 'baggage' – the ideas we learn from out social groups.* (p. 143, italics original)

Within the context of the neoliberalized university, unlearning is a difficult endeavor. As one study participant commented, there is no room for not knowing in the university. Scholars are expected to take up a position of knowing, a position of power in the colonial matrix, and are rewarded both socially and financially for doing this well. While community-engaged scholars might be trying to practice outside of this model,

unlearning is problematic for them as well in that it is not immediately or directly useful for addressing social issues and concerns and thus might not be constructed as meaningful by them.

That being said, community engagement in higher education is not a fully foreclosed space. There are opportunities in classrooms, in research, in interpersonal relations with colleagues, students, and communities where those interested in de-linking from the colonial matrix might begin. Thinking and theorizing from the borders, scholars interested in CES might begin to transform their own ways of being and knowing, while also shifting the institutional space.

New subjectivities and ways of being and knowing cannot simply be learned without first being unlearned and then relearned, for no one is outside the social conditioning into which they are born. In Gadamer's (1982) articulation of this, we all have prejudices and prejudgments that shape what it is possible for us to know and who it is possible for us to be. Seeking to engage with others is a way of provoking awareness of these prejudices and is one reason why I think that CES, when practiced ontologically, is one of the most promising areas for the development of decolonial practice. Engaging with others, when the intent is to be told something and to learn something, an intent that already requires letting go of the position of one who knows, is a way of bringing prejudice into awareness in order to spot the constructions that both form and constrict being. It is the beginning of learning to unlearn. When faced with knowledge about the historical and social construction of who we are, we can begin to deconstruct our being, unlearning who we are in relation to others. It is at this point that we become open to relearning new subjectivities that do not depend upon and support the colonial matrix of power.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have suggested that study participants, even though they articulated their relationships with community through binary and colonial logics, also demonstrated an intuitive leaning towards practices that might serve to disrupt these logics. I then explored the ways in which a decolonial CES might be possible, emphasizing the need to learn to unlearn in order to relearn as an important moment in developed a decolonial CES. The effects of decolonial CES might serve to disrupt the neoliberal university in unknown and unexpected ways. As Tlostanova and Mignolo (2012) reminded us, capitalism and colonialism run parallel to one another. Moving to a decolonial approach that does not retrench coloniality by opposing it but exceeds and renders it powerless to shape an emerging future might also serve to disrupt capitalism and neoliberalized higher education which rest on the same set of binary and exclusionary logics. Thus there is much hope for a decolonial CES to concurrently shift human interactions, knowledge systems, and higher education structures.

8. Concluding Thoughts

Study summary

A review of the literature

Chapter two of this thesis explores the literature on community-engaged scholarship, examining the themes that arise and the different conceptualizations of CES. I trace the emergence of engaged scholarship from the work of Ernest Boyer (1990, 1996) and argue that the current literature on CES reflects a myriad of practices, theoretical orientations, and political approaches, in service to differing and sometimes competing aims; as a result CES as an academic field is not well understood. Scholars undertaking everything from traditional research and writing activities that reflect on community, but do not include community in their development, to highly collaborative projects with community that are based on shared decision making, power, and interpretation, are describing their work as engaged scholarship. Without a clear articulation of engagement, it can come to stand for everything and nothing at the same time.

Key issues in the literature on CES reflect a disproportionate interest in the pragmatics of engagement: developing guidebooks and strategies for engagement; examining the engagement relationship; and identifying best practices related to encouraging student engagement with community or within a particular discipline, for example. As the field evolves, however, scholars are beginning to direct more attention to how community-engaged scholarship is conceptualized, asking questions about the purpose of engagement and critically examining the epistemological roots of this activity. In my analysis of the literature I identify three conceptualizations: overlapping and

mutually informing trends in the literature, differentiated by the extent to which they emphasize a particular framing of engagement.

The first conceptual frame envisions engagement very broadly, as a valuable end-in-itself, an end of linking community with higher education. The second frame positions engagement as a means to an ill-defined end, often as a means to democratic renewal and support, though without advocating for any particular understanding of democracy. The third frame envisions engagement as a philosophical orientation embedded within practice, one that disrupts the dominant epistemology and culture of the academy in order to achieve equality and emancipation in knowledge production.

While individual practice areas, such as community-based research, or experiential learning, may draw from well-established theoretical traditions, there is very little theorizing *on* engaged scholarship as an overall field of practice. Further, the vast majority of authors seeking to understand engagement are not reflecting on this practice in Canada. This is problematic because many institutions in Canada have adopted engagement strategies, developed special task forces on community engagement, created organizational mechanisms to support community-based research and community-service learning, and introduced awards and incentives for scholars engaging with community. Canadian scholars themselves are embracing community engagement as a new and potentially transformative way of practicing scholarship. But what do they mean when talking about community-engaged scholarship?

Research approach

Given my interest in developing a deep understanding and conceptualization of CES, I positioned this study within a qualitative research approach framed by Gadamer's (1982,

1988) hermeneutics. Gadamer's hermeneutics provides a good framework for this study because it focuses primarily on the meaning of qualitative data, helping us to understand phenomena. Gadamer emphasized how interpretations are framed and that we are socialized into particular interpretive traditions, assumptions, and histories, without which no understanding would be possible. Thus a Gadamerian approach enabled me, as the researcher, to offer an interpretation of CES, at the same time recognizing that there is always more to be interpreted, as no interpretive act is ever final.

Study purpose and research questions

The purpose of this study was to explore how Canadian scholars understand CES. Specifically, I sought to answer three key questions:

1. How do scholars in Canada conceptualize engaged scholarship?
2. How do engaged scholars ontologically position themselves and Others in the engagement experience?
3. How does the changing context of higher education interact with the growing interest in engaged scholarship in Canada?

Methods

This qualitative research study proceeded through semi-structured interviews that I held with 9 scholars located in different institutions of higher education across Canada.

Participants were selected for inclusion in the study through two forms of purposive sampling: intensity sampling, whereby participants are included in the study on the basis of having rich information and experiences that manifest the phenomena intensely

(Creswell, 1998) and snowball sampling, a method of developing and expanding a sample by asking one participant to recommend others (Babbie, 1995).

Of the nine participants included in the study, six self-identified as female and three as male. Geographically, four participants worked in Western Canada (Manitoba westward), three in Central Canada (Ontario), one in Quebec, and one in Eastern Canada (all provinces east/south east of Quebec). Participants worked in various faculties/ areas including: arts, humanities, education, extension, business, science, planning, social work, and history. Two participants were in their early career (0-9 years working fulltime in higher education), four in their mid career (10-20 years working fulltime in higher education) and three later in their career (over 20 years working fulltime in higher education). Finally, seven participants were tenured or tenure track, while two were practicing researchers/educators employed in continuous administrative positions related to engagement. Many tenure track scholars were also responsible for institutional mechanisms (such as centers and institutes) and administrative strategies to support or promote engagement.

I held two interviews, where possible, with each scholar. For the first interview I developed a list of questions to loosely guide my conversation with the participants. For the second interview, I shared with participants some of my initial observations and questions emerging from the first round of interviews. This document formed the basis of our conversation in the second interview. The audiotapes from these interviews were transcribed and, along with my notes and the literature, formed the basis of my interpretation of CES.

Fleming, Gaidys & Robb (2003) suggested four steps in analysis of texts for researchers adopting a Gadamerian hermeneutic approach. My analysis process followed their suggestions, which includes reading and rereading of all transcribed interview texts as a whole, a careful line-by-line reading of the texts, identification of themes, relating these themes back to the whole of the texts and identifying key passages or sections of the texts. My process included additional back and forth movements between the text and my emerging interpretive work. I wanted to take extra care to ensure I was capturing the complexity of CES and that any observations were not imposing a unity on the text, but included recognition of the heterogeneity in participant understandings.

Findings summary

A number of important findings emerged from the research data. Participants in this study described the language of CES as confusing and contradictory, a factor they saw as indicative of both openness towards diverse practices and a problematic lack of clarity. Participants who identified as community-engaged scholars demonstrated different ways of talking about their own engagement while also articulating a common ground, namely that CES is actualized through relationships and includes mutuality or reciprocity of some kind. For some participants, CES names how their scholarship has always been practiced, while for others, CES changes the nature of their work in virtue of its emphasis on bi-directionality.

Participants who identified as community-engaged scholars described the aims of CES differently. However, underpinning the diverse aims of scholars in this study was

embedded a more fundamental purpose: CES functions to make scholarship meaningful. It is the sense of meaninglessness that accompanies scholarship in the neoliberalized university that CES is meant to address. It is the question of meaningful scholarship in this context that CES answers. For participants, meaningfulness is understood to be manifest in scholarship that is useful because it has a direct effect on, and makes a difference to community partners. While participants recognized that they must also publish as a part of their work in higher education, the emphasis in engagement is on helping communities do what they want to do better.

Participants recognized that the concept of community might mean different things, and perhaps even be impossible to define. That being said, participants consistently described community as those positioned as outside of institutions of higher education. Participants also described the ways community and scholars differ through a series of binary opposites, even though some participants recognized that this description fails to capture the complexities of the relation.

Participants who identified as community-engaged scholars described engaged scholars' work in opposition to what they perceive to be the work of what I have termed *conventional scholars*. Conventional scholars were described by many study participants as disconnected from the concerns of communities outside higher education, enjoying privilege, which includes the luxury of time to reflect, and focusing solely on writing directed at academic peers.

Participants struggled to understand the complex power dynamics that develop when partnering with community. Participants highlighted power differences in CES but did not situate power consistently with any one party. Participants emphasized the

importance of mitigating power differences by approaching community with openness, curiosity, and a willingness to listen and learn.

Key insights

From the research findings, a number of key insights arose. CES is understood by study participants as a way to make scholarship meaningful by ensuring it is directly and immediately useful for community ends. CES was contrasted with what I have called *conventional scholarship*, which participants described as scholarship associated with professors who sit quietly in their offices, dreaming up research questions that are largely centered on their own curiosities and disconnected from the wider social world, and publishing academic work that uses highly specialized language and addresses a small audience of academic peers.

Conventional scholarship was problematized by study participants because it was seen as not contributing, but rather as a way of enjoying privilege and practicing scholarship that lacked accountability. Echoing many of the arguments made by proponents of new public management, study participants emphasized the need for external accountability in scholars' work and saw CES as one way of achieving this.

In making sense of these comments I unpack the multiple meanings of privilege, pointing out that scholars' independence has come to circulate as a sign of prestige and is seen, within neoliberalized higher education, as problematic. I point out the ways that a social critique of privilege that has roots in the 1960's has been recast in neoliberalism as demands for economic relevance to private sector actors operating in a knowledge-based

economy (Lorenz, 2012). Thus critiquing privilege can appear to be a radical social move but may, in actuality, come to reflect the neoliberalized environment.

CES, as a response to academic privilege not only introduces community into knowledge co-production, but also into the governance of scholars work. Scholars become accountable to communities outside the institution of higher education. This accountability is twofold, they are accountable for visible products, but also they become accountable for *which* ideas they choose to pursue. This move serves to broaden the lines of accountability from the peers and administrators to include community organizations and individuals.

Using Foucault's (1977) notion of the Panopticon I note the disciplinary effects of this widened accountability that expands to the actors involved as well as the site of discipline to include the genesis of ideas. What remains an open question, however, is how CES might affect the neoliberalization of higher education. The visibility of the prisoners in the Panopticon not only highlights the prisoners themselves, and therefore creates self-disciplining subjectivities, but also serves to make visible the conditions of their confinement and in doing so becomes a disciplinary force for those responsible for these conditions. Likewise, the visibility of the genesis of knowledge to communities who are involved, and in many cases have a shared stake in the process and product of CES, makes visible the conditions of higher education and might, therefore, be an effective process for diluting the power of governments and elites while also building public allies. This hinges, however, on who community partners are and how they relate structures of power, both of which are not specified in CES.

By rejecting what they understood to be problematic academic privilege, and instead embracing CES, study participants see their work as more meaningful. This

meaningfulness is also wrapped up in ideas of usefulness. CES is meaningful because it is immediately useful to communities and has a direct impact on them and their work. I unpack the understanding of useful scholarship by looking at the neoliberal context of higher education and its link to pragmatic knowledge coproduction.

The neoliberalization of higher education has served to encourage and support scholarship that lacks meaning and to obscure the meaningfulness in scholarship that is not directly useful. In the first instance, scholars in Canada have to prove their worth through increased scholarly outputs, a dynamic that leads to a focus on quantity over quality. The working conditions for scholars in higher education, along with deprofessionalization, corporatization, and relations of competition created through neoliberalization, exert pressure to produce identifiable and quantifiable products, with scholars being rewarded more for volume than depth. Thus is it possible to see how scholars might perceive this work as lacking in meaning and social impact.

In addition, neoliberalization serves to obscure the meaningfulness embedded in scholarship that does not lead to concrete and countable products because it insists on an identifiable product of scholarship within the context of corporate time. Giroux (2003, 2012) argued that in *corporate time*, the market is positioned as a master and pursuing the concerns typically central to a just society is seen as inefficient and wasteful. In corporate time, he explained, efficiency rules and thus hierarchy, competition and excessive individualism are cast as positive and reasonable supports for the production of scholarship. Useful scholarship, then, is understood as scholarship that is helpful in moving a project forward, not as scholarship that is helpful in that it asks important ethical questions, critiques assumptions, and slows things down.

This distinction is also made by Lövbrand (2011), who picked up on the social critique of the 1960s to look at ontological knowledge co-production and contrasts this with the current neoliberalized pragmatic knowledge production. Ontological co-production of knowledge with those outside the academy has its basis, she argued, in critiques of universal approaches to knowledge that have demonstrated how universal knowledge can mask exclusion and oppression by suppressing difference. In this way, Lövbrand explained, co-producing knowledge represents an opportunity to open knowledge up to deliberations that invite debate, expose differences, and provoke a recognition and interrogation of assumptions. In contrast, the pragmatic approach, suggested Lövbrand, follows a logic of accountability in that it is aimed at adjusting knowledge production portfolios to better align with community needs. She positioned this move not as that of expanded knowledge but expanded governance: whereby publics become directly involved in shaping research priorities and portfolios. Here knowledge is useful and helpful to communities and does not serve to disrupt in the same ways.

As one of many practices, CES might simply be a pragmatic counterpoint to the dominant critical forms of scholarship in higher education. There is, of course, room to practice scholarship in many diverse ways within the academy. However, as part of a larger trend of the neoliberalization of higher education, an emphasis on scientific, technical and technological knowledge, and the dismantling of humanities and social sciences, the calls for CES in institutions of higher education across Canada might also be seen as a mechanism that directs attention away from critical disruptive scholarship and towards technocratic and instrumental practices.

It might also serve to direct attention away from macro political concerns emerging in the field of higher education. Emphasis in CES on immediately and directly useful knowledge de-emphasizes the important role of critique and in turn delegitimizes spaces such as higher education as a ground from which critique might emerge. Regardless of the aims of individual engagement endeavors, some of which were very macro political in that they sought to challenge international systems of power in a particular topic area, the considerations of *power relating to knowledge construction and sharing* taken up by participants in this study were largely taken up at the micro level. Participants asserted that community engagement involves attention to power in relationships and challenging knowledge legitimation processes to gain peer and organizational recognition, but they did not necessarily take up the macro level of policy constraints and financial support for scholarship, the changing (negatively) working conditions for scholars and the eroding autonomy that results.

CES challenges micro-political level decisions about what counts as knowledge, and the micro-politics of power in relationships, but does not challenge the macro-political interest in instrumental /technical knowledge that has a direct impact and improves the functioning of existing social, economic, and political structures. When put in the context of neoliberalism and the neoliberalization of higher education, community-engaged scholarship could function as an effective political strategy for those wanting to discourage a critique of changes to the funding and management of higher education, even as it is billed as itself a disruptive alternative to the academic status quo.

Having unpacked the meaning of CES for study participants, I then turn to the ways in which community is constructed. Pulling from Spivak's (1985, 1988) writing, I draw on

the notion of Othering to analyze the construction of community by study participants. I suggest that as a dominant cultural paradigm, one that has been critiqued as an oppressive European intellectual legacy (Morton, 2003), Othering mediates the relations between engaged scholars and community members and becomes visible through their dialogues on community. By describing community members as outsiders to institutions of higher education, and as a group whose attributes are the binary opposite of scholars' attributes, study participants create community as an Other that is different from them and against whom they understand themselves.

This Othering affirms institutions of higher education's role in legitimating knowledge through the simultaneous exclusion and inclusion of community. At the broad level, community is constructed as an Other, a "-I" for scholars in higher education, by invoking organizational boundaries. As the logic of Othering reveals, this both excludes those outside higher education and includes them, it both affirms the organizational boundary of institutions of higher education by pointing to what is outside at the same time as bringing what is outside within for it's own self-understanding. This has the effect of shoring up institutions of higher education and, despite the call to co-create knowledge and share power on behalf of some engaged scholars, reaffirms their dominance. Thus institutions of higher education continue to be central in granting legitimacy to knowledge even while recognizing that legitimate knowledge rests in multiple locations.

This is not the full story, however. Within study participants' descriptions of how they work with community there is also an attempt to mitigate Self-Other relations through listening, openness and by scholars' positioning themselves as learners. Study participants emphasized the need to subvert their own position as a knower in order to be open to

learning from community. I describe this approach to community as both insufficient in its failure to tackle larger systemic power dynamics and promising in that it reflects an intuitive leaning towards non-binary, non-oppressive forms of interaction. While good intentions are not enough to ensure non-oppressive relations, we can see in these attempts an as yet unarticulated orientation to moving beyond Othering and the related binary approaches to interaction.

It is this unarticulated orientation that I believe could be nurtured through the development of a decolonial CES. Decoloniality may offer a way forward for those scholars positioned in the Western neoliberal university, experiencing the discipline that comes with surveillance of ideas and scholarly outputs, the exclusions that support pragmatic approaches in the context of corporate time, and the sense of meaninglessness that is experienced when one's work does not appear to contribute to the social world in positive ways.

To support the emergence of decolonizing practices in community engaged scholarship, knowledge creation would need to be informed by decolonial logics whereby articulation emerges from the site of the Other and where the genesis for that articulation is not merely rational, but also intuitive and embodied (Mignolo, 2013). It would need to emerge from border thinking and from a delinking of the discursively produced binaries that currently mark engagement as well as the current (Western) way of thinking about engagement in Canada. This delinking is a form of *disengagement* with what Tlostanova and Mignolo termed the "colonial field" (2012, p. 17) in order to engage with decolonial thinking. He emphasized that this way of seeing is not in opposition to colonial thinking, it is not a negation of coloniality, but a disengagement with coloniality such that the "colonial

matrix of power" becomes the centre for political and social theorizing (Tlostanova & Mignolo, 2012, p. 17).

Study participants, in articulating CES, struggled to capture something in their experience that they described as unnamable, ineffable, and sometimes as magic. The inability to voice their experiences in those instances where framing in binary logics would not suffice is not surprising given the dominance of colonial logics in knowledge production. Attempting to speak outside these logics is difficult, for what is being articulated is intuitive and embodied (Mignolo, 2013). This kind of knowing is not easy to place within rational knowledge systems and for this reason, it remains unnamable, outside language, or is constructed as the opposite of rational enlightened knowing - constructed as magic. The emphasis study participants placed on connecting with *real live people* instead of texts begins to make sense when we understand that at its most powerful moment, CES involves learning and knowing that is outside of language, that happens between bodies and on an intuitive level. This knowing is only possible when we disengage from a rational process of ascertaining knowledge, a form of de-linking.

The effects of decolonial CES might serve to disrupt the neoliberal university in unknown and unexpected ways. As Tlostanova and Mignolo (2012) reminded us, capitalism and colonialism run parallel to one another. Moving to a decolonial approach that does not retrench coloniality by opposing it but exceeds and renders it powerless to shape an emerging future might also serve to disrupt capitalism and neoliberalized higher education which rest on the same set of binary and exclusionary logics. Thus there is much hope for a decolonial CES to concurrently shift human interactions, knowledge systems, and higher education.

Implications and lingering questions

This study, which is the first to my knowledge to study Canadian CES from the perspectives of scholars in diverse social, organizational, disciplinary and geographical locations, is a small step towards theorizing CES. Much more needs to be done to understand the boundaries of the field and the impacts of its various practices.

As stated in my introduction, the question of how beings might live well with one another was central to my interest in community-engaged scholarship. I hoped that by furthering my understanding of CES, I might at the same time discover new ways of being and approaches to scholarship that I could put to work in my own life. Does CES provide insight to how we might live well with one another, what we might become together? As I've argued in this thesis, CES is itself an attempt to create meaning, to make scholarship meaningful. Here my own ontological interest in possibilities for being is well aligned with study participants' desire to make sense of one part of life, scholarly work, in a way that "enables life to go on" (Smith, 1991, p. 200), and enables scholars to go on in the context of neoliberalized higher education.

That the context of neoliberalization of higher education has a significant effect on CES is not surprising, since it is a pervasive force in much of higher education. However, it is important that scholars are aware of the unintended consequences of their approach to knowledge in CES, particularly the ways in which their perspectives support neoliberal ideas of privilege, accountability, usefulness and direct impact. These elements of CES are ripe for deconstruction and discussion, to explore the complexities of how the field might evolve and the impacts of different evolutionary choices. Though the temptation exists to share best practices and become more accomplished engaged scholars, the purpose and

meaning of this work is equally important to explore. In my analysis I have pointed to the way that meaningfulness is understood by study participants and the implications of this understanding for "community", higher education, and scholars themselves. I also pointed to some emerging decolonial practices that I find promising for a way of engaging that enacts the dialectical ethics that Gadamer asserted is part of an openness that lets something be said (Wallace, 2000). My interpretation here has led me to wonder if engagement itself might be explored as a mode of being, rather than a scholarly practice or process. Given that we are all born into tradition, culture, history, and born into language, we are all already engaged in community as a precondition to any attempt to understand. Building on the understanding I have developed through this thesis, I'd like to undertake research that explores more closely what happens in the "event" of engagement.

Also important is ensuring that CES can be practiced in ways that are not destructive to the community of scholars in higher education, or to the few spaces of institutional openness that remains. If engaged scholars want to be sure that their work can truly be responsive to an evolving social world, they might do well to attend to the macro-political dynamics in higher education, including how management practices are shifting, who is funding research and how ideas of usefulness can be expanded to ensure diverse scholarship. That scholars might become the public service consultants of the future, helping private and public sector individuals and organizations, is a serious risk. The independence of scholarship is important to defend, even as one recognizes that knowledge resides in multiple areas. This is also an area for further research.

Finally, if the decoloniality implicit in CES practices of openness, listening, and seeking to learn from community partners is to be nurtured, developing pedagogical

approaches that support learning to unlearn in order to relearn is of central importance. As graduate programs in community engagement develop and more junior scholars are starting to engage communities in their work, it is important that decolonial approaches are available and embedded in educational and professional development programs. What this pedagogy might look like in the Western institution and how it might harness community partnerships is an area for future exploration.

References

Alperovitz, G., Dubb, S., & Howard, T. (2009). The next wave: Building university engagement for the 21st century. *The Good Society, 17*(2), 69-74.

American Association of State Colleges and Universities Task Force on Public Engagement. (2002). *Stepping forward as stewards of place: A guide for leading public engagement at state colleges and universities.* Retrieved from http://www.aascu.org/pdf/stewardsofplace_02.pdf

Amrhein, C. (2014). *Keynote.* Presentation at the Canadian Society for the Study of Higher Education conference, 2014, St. Catherines, Ontario.

Andreotti, V. (2014). Strategic criticism and the question of the (in)accessibility of the Other. *Glottopol 23*, 134-147.

Aronson, K., & Webster, N. (2006). A model for creating engaged land-grant universities: Penn State's engagement ladder model. *Innovative Higher Education, 31*(5), 265-277.

Avila-Linn, C., Rice, K., & Akin, S. (2012). *Designing community-based courses: A guide for instructors to develop community partnerships and create engaged public scholarship courses.* Retrieved from http://ccrec.ucsc.edu/news/new-guidebook-designing-community-based-courses

Babbie, E. (1995). *The practice of social research* (7th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Badley, G. (2003). Improving the scholarship of teaching and learning. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 40*(3), 303-309.

Barker, D. (2004, September). *From service learning to the scholarship of engagement: A taxonomy of civic renewal in American higher education*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Chicago, IL. Retrieved from http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p59505_index.html

Bernardo, M., Butcher, J., & Howard, P. (2012). An international comparison of community engagement in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Development, 32*(1), 187-192.

Bernstein, R. (1986). *Philosophical profiles: Essays in a pragmatic mode*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Bok, D. (2003). *Universities in the marketplace: The commercialization of higher education*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Bowen, S., & Graham, I. (2013). From knowledge translation to engaged scholarship: Promoting research relevance and utilization. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, 94*(1) Supplement, S3-S8.

Boyd, C. (2001). Phenomenology the method. In P. L. Munhall (Ed.), *Nursing research: A qualitative perspective* (pp. 93-122). Sudbury, MA: Jones and Bartlett.

Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered*: *The priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: Jossey-Bass.

Boyer, E. (1996). The scholarship of engagement. *Bulletin of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 49*(7), 11-20.

Braxton, J., & Del Favero, M. (2002). Evaluating scholarship performance: Traditional and emergent assessment templates. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 2002*(114), 19-32.

Bringle, R.G., & Hatcher, J.A. (1996). Implementing service learning in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education, 67*(2), 221-239.

Bringle, R.G., & Hatcher, J.A. (2002). Campus-community partnerships: The terms of engagement. *Journal of Social Issues, 58*(3), 503-516.
Bringle, R.G., Hatcher, J.A., Hamilton, S., & Young, P. (2001). Planning and assessing campus/community engagement. *Metropolitan Universities, 12*(3), 89-99.
Butin, D. W. (2007). Focusing Our Aim: Strengthening Faculty Commitment to Community Engagement. *Change, 34-37*.
Butin, D. W. (2010). *Service-learning in theory and practice: The future of community engagement in higher education*. New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.
Buys, N., & Bursnall, S. (2007). Establishing university-community partnerships: Processes and benefits. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 29*(1), 73-86.
Calleson, D., Jordan, C., & Seifer, S. (2005). Community-engaged scholarship: Is faculty work in communities a true academic enterprise? *Academic Medicine, 8*(4), 317-321.
Canada Council on Learning. (2009). *Up to par: The challenge of demonstrating quality in Canadian post-secondary education.* Retrieved from http://www.ccl-cca.ca/pdfs/PSE/2009/PSEChallengesInPost-SecondaryEducationNOV2009_EN.pdf
Canadian Science Writers' Association. (n.d.). *Let Canada's scientists speak.* Retrieved from http://sciencewriters.ca/initiatives/muzzling_canadian_federal_scientists/
Carr, G. (2012, June 25). University-community collaboration across the country creates some beautiful things. *The Hill Times*. Retrieved from http://www.hilltimes.com/opinion-piece/politics/2012/06/25/university-community-collaboration-across-the-country-creates/31212
Cauldry, N. (2011). Fighting for the university's life. In M. Bailey & D. Freedman (Eds.), *The assault on universities: a manifesto for resistance* (pp.37-48). London, England: Pluto Press.
Chang, J. (2010). Hermeneutic inquiry: A research approach for postmodern therapists. *Journal of Systemic Therapies, 29*(1), 19-32.
Checkoway, B. (2013). Strengthening the scholarship of engagement in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 17*(4), 7-21.
Checkoway, B. (2000). Renewing the civic mission of the American research university. *Journal of Higher Education, 72*(2), 125-147.
Church, R., Zimmerman, D., Bargerstock, B., & Kenney, P. (2003). Measuring scholarly outreach at Michigan State University: Definitions, challenges, tools. *Journal of Higher Education and Outreach, 8*(1), 141-152.
Code, L. (2003). Introduction: Why feminists do not read Gadamer. In L. Code (Ed.), *Feminist interpretations of Hans-Georg Gadamer* (pp. 1-38). University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.
Colbeck, C. (Ed.). (2002). Evaluating faculty performance (special issue). *New Directions for Institutional Research, 114*(1), 1-108.
Colbeck, C., & Michael, P. (2006). The public scholarship: Reintegrating Boyer's four domains. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 2006*(129), 7–19. doi: 10.1002/ir.168
Colbeck, C., & Weaver, L. (2008). Faculty engagement in public scholarship: A motivation systems theory perspective. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 12*(2), 7-32.
Commission on Community-Engaged Scholarship in the Health Professions. (2005). *Linking scholarship and community: Report of the Commission on Community-Engaged*

Scholarship in the Health Professions. Seattle, WA: Community-Campus Partnerships for Health.
Cote, J., & Allahar, A. (2011). *Lowering higher education: The rise of corporate universities and the fall of liberal education.* Toronto, ON, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
Cox, D. (2000). Developing a framework for understanding university-community partnerships. *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research, 5*(1), 9- 26. Retrieved from http://www.huduser.org/periodicals/cityscpe/vol5num1/ch1.html
Creed, G. (2006). Reconsidering community. In G. Creed (Ed.), *The seductions of community: Emancipations, oppressions, quandaries* (pp. 3-22). Santa Fe: NM:School of American Research Press.
Creswell, J. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.
Currie, J., & Vidovich, L. (2009). The changing nature of academic work. In M. Tight, K.H Mok, J. Husman, and C. Morphew (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook of higher education.* New York, NY: Routledge.
Diamond, R. (2006). *Tenure and promotion: The next iteration.* Retrieved from http://www.thenationalacademy.org/readings/tenpromo.html
Diamond, R. (2009). *Priorities and the promotion and tenure process: The faculty reward system*. Retrieved from http://www.thenationalacademy.org/readings/priorities.html
Diamond, R., & Adam, B. (Eds.). (1993). Recognizing faculty work: Reward systems for the year 2000. *New directions for higher education, 1993*(81), 1-110.
Diamond, R., & Adam, B. (1995). *The disciplines speak: Rewarding the scholarly, professional, and creative work of faculty.* Washington, DC: American Association of Higher Education.
Doberneck, D., Glass, C., & Schweitzer, J. (2010). From rhetoric to reality: A typology of publically engaged scholarship. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach & Engagement, 14*(4), 5-35.
Dorow, S., & Shaughness, S. (2013). Fort McMurry, Wood Buffalo, and the oil/tar sands: Revisiting the sociology of "community". *Canadian Journal of Sociology 38*(2), 121-140.
Dragne, C. (2007). *Background document for the University of Victoria Task Force on Civic Engagement*. Retrieved from http://www.google.ca/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CFMQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Ftalloiresnetwork.tufts.edu%2Fwp-content%2Fuploads%2FBackground_UVic_Task_Force_CE.pdf&ei=OhzmT9mMN6rO2AXs0YDZCQ&usg=AFQjCNHjaYsFlL66YBETi0_o_6v4MxafEw
Driscoll, A., & Lynton. E. (1999). *Making outreach visible: A guide to documenting professional service and outreach*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
Ellis, J. (1998). Interpretive inquiry as a formal research process. In J. Ellis (Ed.), T*eaching from understanding: Teacher as interpretive inquirer* (pp.15-32). New York: Garland.
Engaged Scholarship Consortium. (2012). Retrieved from http://www.outreachscholarship.org/About/AbouttheESC.aspx

Fanelli, C., & Meades, J. (2011). Austerity, Ontario and post-secondary education: The case of "Canada's capital university". *Journal for Critical education Policy Studies, 9*(2), 216-240.
Fear, F., & Sandmann, L. (2001/2002). The "new" scholarship: Implications for engagement and extension. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 7*(1&2), p. 29-39.
Fear, F., Rosaen, C., Bawden, R., & Foster-Fishman, P. (2006). *Coming to critical engagement: An authoethnographic exploration.* Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
Finkelstein, M. (2001). Towards a unified view of scholarship: Eliminating tensions between traditional and engaged work. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 6*(2), 35-44.
Fleming, V., Gaidys, U., & Robb, Y. (2003). Hermeneutic research in nursing: Developing a Gadamerian-based research method. *Nursing Inquiry, 10*(2), 113-120.
Fogel, S., & Cook, J. (2006). Considerations on the scholarship of engagement as an area of specialization for faculty. *Journal of Social Work Education, 42*(3), 595-606.
Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (A. M. Sheridan Smith, Trans.). New York: Pantheon Books.
Franz, N. (2011). Tips for constructing a promotion and tenure dossier that documents engaged scholarship endeavors. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 15*(3), 15-29.
Freire, P. (2007). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York, NY: Continuum International Publishing Group.
Gadamer, H.G. (1975). Hermeneutics and social science. *Philosophy & Social Criticism, 2*(4), 307-316.
Gadamer, H.G. (1982). *Truth and method*. New York, NY: Crossroad Publishing Company.
Gadamer, H.G. (1988). On the circle of understanding. In J. M. Connolly & T. Keutner (Eds.), *Hermeneutics versus Sciences? Essays by H.G. Gadamer, E. K. Specht, W. Stegmuller* (pp. 68-78). Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
Gallagher, S. (1992). The nature of hermeneutics and its relevance to educational theory. In *Hermeneutics and Education* (pp. 1-29). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
Gelmon, S., Jordan, C., & Seifer, S. (2013a). Community-engaged scholarship in the academy: An action agenda. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, 45*(4), 58-66.
Gelmon, S., Jordan, C., & Seifer, S. (2013b). Rethinking peer review: Expanding the boundaries for community-engaged scholarship. *International Journal of Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement, 1*(1), 1-10.
Glass, C., Doberneck, D., & Schweitzer, J. (2010). *The engagement exchange.* Retrieved from *www.*ncsue.msu.edu/files/EngagementExchange_No.1_Jan2010.pdf
Giroux, H. A. (2012). The crisis of education as a public good: The disappearance of public intellectuals. *Counterpunch*. Retrieved from http://www.counterpunch.org/2012/10/08/the-disappearance-of-public-intellectuals/
Giroux, H. A. (2003). Public time and educated hope: Educational leadership and the war against youth. *The initiative anthology: An electronic publication about leadership, culture & schooling.* Oxford, OH: Miami University. Retrieved from http://www.units.miamioh.edu/eduleadership/anthology/OA/OA03001.html

Glassick, C., Huber, M., & Maeroff, G. (1997). *Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Gunn, J., & Lucaites, J. (2010). The contest of faculties: On discerning the politics of social engagement in the academy. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 96*(4), 404-424.
Hall, B. (2009). Higher education, community engagement, and the public good: Building the future of continuing education in Canada. *Canadian Journal of University Continuing Education, 35*(1), 11-23.
Hall, B. (2011). Towards a knowledge democracy movement: Contemporary trends in community-university research partnerships. *Rizoma Freireano, 9*. Retrieved from http://rizoma-freireano.org/index.php/towards-a-knowledge-democracy-movement-contemporary-trends-in-community-university-research-partnerships--budd-l-hall
Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
Harvey, D. (2007). Neoliberalism as creative destruction. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, 610*(1), 21-44.
Harvey, D. (2008). The right to the city. *New Left Review, 53*, 23-40.
Hekman, S. (2003). The ontology of change: Gadamer and feminism. In L. Code (Ed.), *Feminist interpretations of Hans-Georg Gadamer* (pp. 181-202). University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.
Hesse-Biber, S. (2012). Feminist research: Exploring the interconnections of epistemology, methodology, and method. In S. Hesse-Biber (Ed.), *Handbook of feminist research: Theory and praxis* (pp. 2-26). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.
Hill, D., & Kumar, R. (2009). Neoliberalism and its impacts. In D. Hill & R. Kumar (Eds.), *Global neoliberalism and education and its consequences.* New York, NY: Routledge.
Hodkinson, P. (2014). The politics of legitimating research. In A. Reid, E. Hart, & M. Peters (Eds.), *A companion to research in education* (pp. 407-415). Dordrecht: Springer.
Holland, B. (1997). Analyzing institutional commitment to service: A model of key organizational factors. *Michigan Journal of Service Learning, 4*, 30-41. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3239521.0004.104
Holland, B. (1999). Factors and strategies that influence faculty involvement in public service. *Journal of Public Service & Outreach, 4*(1), 37-43.
Holland, B. (2000). Institutional impacts and organizational issues related to service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *Special Issue*(1), 52-60.
Holland, B. (2005). Institutional differences in pursuing the public good. In A. Kezar, T. Chambers & J. Burkhardt (Eds.), *Higher Education for the Public Good* (pp. 146-165). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
Holland, B., & Gelmon, S. (1998). *The state of the "engaged campus": What have we learned about building and sustaining university-community partnerships.* Retrieved from http://westmont.edu/_offices/provost/documents/Curriculum/GE/Workshops/2007%20Service%20Learning%20Workshop/S-L%20Workshop-Engaged%20Campus.pdf
Holland, B., Powell, D., Eng, E., & Drew, G. (2010). Models of engaged scholarship: An interdisciplinary discussion. *Collaborative Anthropologies, 3*, 1-36.
Jackson, E. (2010). University capital, community engagement, and continuing education: Blending professional development and social change. *Canadian Journal of University Continuing Education, 36*(2), 1-13.

Jones, G. A. (Ed.). (2012). *Higher education in Canada: Different systems, different perspectives.* New York, NY: Routledge.
Jordon, C. (Ed.). (2007). *Community-engaged scholarship review, promotion & tenure package*. Retrieved from www.depts.washington.edu/ccph/pdf_files/CES_RPT_Package.pdf
Kajner, T. (1997). *Finding Antigone's voice: Woman and the dialectic* (Un published Master's Thesis). Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.mcmaster.ca/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=9867&context=opendissertations
Kasworm, C., & Abdrahim, N. A. (2014). Scholarship of engagement and engaged scholars: Through the eyes of exemplars. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 18*(2), 121-148.
Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land Grant Universities. (1997). *Returning to our roots: The student experience*. Retrieved from http://www.aplu.org/page.aspx?pid=305
Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land Grant Universities. (1998). *Returning to our roots: Student access.* Retrieved from http://www.aplu.org/page.aspx?pid=305
Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land Grant Universities. (1999a). *Returning to our roots: The engaged institution.* Retrieved from http://www.aplu.org/page.aspx?pid=305
Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land Grant Universities. (1999b). *Returning to our roots: A learning society.* Retrieved from http://www.aplu.org/page.aspx?pid=305
Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land Grant Universities. (2000a). *Returning to our roots: Toward a coherent campus culture.* Retrieved from http://www.aplu.org/page.aspx?pid=305
Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land Grant Universities. (2000b). *Renewing the covenant: Learning, discovery, and engagement in a new age and different world.* Retrieved from http://www.aplu.org/page.aspx?pid=305
Kelly. K. & Cuputo, T. (2011). *Community: A contemporary analysis of policies, programs, and practices.* Toronto, Ontario, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
Kiely, R., Sandmann, L., & Bracken, S., (2006). Overcoming marginalization and disengagement in adult education: Adult educators' contributions to the scholarship of engagement. *Proceedings of the 47th Annual Adult Education Research Conference* (pp. 540-546). Minneapolis-St. Paul, MD: University of Minnesota Press.
Kincheloe, J. (2003). *Teachers as researchers: Qualitative inquiry as a path to empowerment*. New York, NY: Routledge-Falmer.
Kirby, D. (2012). Marketizing Canadian higher education: An examination of recent access policy reforms. In H. Schuetz, G. Mendiola, & D. Conrad (Eds.), *State and market in higher education reforms: Trends, policies and experiences in comparative perspective* (pp. 43-55). Rotterdam, NL: Sense Publishers.
Kojeve, A. (1969). *An introduction to the reading of Hegel: Lectures on the phenomenology of spirit.* London, England: Cornell University Press.

Learmonth, M., Locket, A., & Dowd, K. (2012). Promoting scholarship that matters: The uselessness of useful research and the usefulness of useless research. *British Journal of Management, 23*, 35-44.
Lövbrand, E. (2011). Co-producing European climate science and policy: A cautionary note on the making of useful knowledge. *Science and Public Policy, 38*(3), 225-236.
Lorenz, C. (2012). If you're so smart, why are you under surveillance? Universities, neoliberalism and new public management. *Critical Inquiry, 38*, 599- 629.
Lynton, E. (1995). *Making the case for professional service*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
Malpas, J. (2014, Winter). Hans Georg Gadamer. In E. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy*. Retrieved from plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2014/entries/gadamer/
Martin, S. (2010). Co-production of social research: strategies for engaged scholarship. *Public Money and Management, 30*(4), 211-218.
McDowell, G. (2003). Engaged universities: Lessons from the land-grant universities and extension. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 585*(1), 31-50.
McBride, K. D. (2005). *Collective dreams: Political imagination and community.* University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.
McLean, S., Thompson, G., & Jonker, P. (2006). The rising tide of outreach and engagement in state and land-grant universities in the United States: What are the implications for university continuing education units in Canada? *Canadian Journal of University Continuing Education, 32*(1), 83-108.
Mignolo, W. (2013). Geopolitics of sensing and knowing: On (de)coloniality, border thinking, and epistemic disobedience. *Confero, 1*(1), 129-150.
Mohanty, C. T. (2013). Transnational Feminist Crossings: On Neoliberalism and Radical Critique. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 38*(4), 967-991.
Moore, T., & Ward, K. (2008). Documenting engagement: Faculty perspectives on self-representation for promotion and tenure. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach & Engagement, 12*(4), 5-27.
Morton, S. (2003). *Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak.* New York, NY: Routledge.
Mullins, P. (2011). Practicing anthropology and the politics of engagement: 2010 year in review. *American Anthroplogist, 113*(2), 235-245.
National Review Board for the Scholarship of Engagement. (n.d.). *The Scholarship of Engagement.* Retrieved from http://schoe.coe.uga.edu/about/FAQs.html
Noel, J. (2011). Striving for authentic engagement: A process model for urban teacher education. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 51*(1), 31-52.
Nyden, P., Hossfeld, L., & Nyden, G. (2012). *Public sociology: research, action, and change.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
Oliphant, A. (2009). *Re-conceptualizing the tenure and promotion process: A literature review.* Retrieved from http://www.theresearchshop.ca/Resources
Olssen, M., & Peters, M. (2005). Neoliberalism, higher education and the knowledge economy: From the free market to knowledge capitalism. *Journal of Education Policy, 20*(3), 313-345.
O'Meara, K. (2000). *Scholarship unbound: Assessing service as scholarship for promotion and tenure*. New York, NY: Routledge.

O'Meara, K. (2005). Principles of good practice: Encouraging multiple forms of scholarship in policy and practice. In K. O'Meara & E. Rice (Eds.). *Faculty priorities reconsidered: Rewarding multiple forms of scholarship (pp.* 290-302). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

O'Neill, B. (2008). Promotion, tenure, and merit-based pay: 15 keys to success. *Journal of Extension, 46*(4). Retrieved from http://www.joe.org/joe/2008august/tt2.php

Oxford Dictionary Online, (n.d.). *Privilege.* Retrieved from http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/privilege

Peters, M. (2013). Managerialism and the neoliberal university: Prospects for new forms of "open management" in higher education. *Contemporary Readings in Law and Social Justice, 5*(1), 11-26.

Pollock, D. (2010). Doorjambs and the promise of engaged scholarship. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 96*(4), 462-468.

Polster, C. (2007). The nature and implications of the growing importance of research grants to Canadian universities and academics. *Higher Education, 53*, 599–622.

Ramaley, J. (1997). Shared consequences: Recent experiences with outreach and community-based learning. *Journal of Public Service and Outreach, 2*(1), 19-25.

Ramaley, J. (2001). Why do we engage in engagement? *Metropolitan Universities, 12*(3), 13-19.

Rice, E. (2002). Beyond *Scholarship Reconsidered*: Toward an enlarged vision of the scholarly work of faculty members. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning,* 2002*(90),* 7-17.

Robertson, S. (2014). Untangling theories and hegemonic projects in researching education and the knowledge economy. In A. Reid, E. Hart, & M. Peters (Eds.), *A companion to research in education* (pp. 267-276). Dordrecht: Springer.

Rubin, V. (2000). Evaluating university-community partnerships: An examination of the evolution of questions and approaches. *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research, 5*(1), 219-230.

Saltmarsh, J., & Hartley, M. (Eds.). (2012). *"To serve a larger purpose": Engagement for democracy and the transformation of higher education.* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Saltmarsh, J., Giles, D., O'Meara, K., & Sandmann, L. (2009). Community engagement and institutional culture in higher education: An investigation of faculty reward policies at engaged campuses. In B. Moely, S. Billig & B. Holland, (Eds.), *Creating our identities in service-learning and community engagement* (pp. 3-30). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing Inc.

Saltmarsh, J., Giles, D., Ward, E., & Buglione, S. (2009). Rewarding community-engaged scholarship. *New Directions for Higher Education, 2009*(147), 25-35.

Saltmarsh, J., Hartley, M., & Clayton, P. (2009). *Democratic engagement white paper*. Boston, MA: New England Resource Centre for Higher Education.

Sandmann, L. (2007). Conceptualization of the scholarship of engagement in higher education: A ten year retrospective. In L. Servage & T. Fenwick (Eds.), *Proceedings of the joint international conference of the Adult Education Research Conference and the Canadian Association for the Study of Adult Education* (pp. 547-553). Halifax, NS: Mount St. Vincent University.

Sandmann, L. (2008). Conceptualization of the scholarship of engagement in higher education: A strategic review, 1996-2006. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 12*(1), 91-104.
Sandmann L., Foster-Fishman P., Lloyd J., Rauhe W., & Rosaen C. (2000). Managing critical tensions. *Change, 3*(1), 45-52.
Sandmann, L., Kliewer, B., Kim, J., & Omerikwa, A. (2010). Towards understanding reciprocity in community-university partnerships: An analysis of select theories of power. In J. Keshen, B. Holland, & B. Moely (Eds.), *Research for What? Making engaged scholarship matter* (pp. 3-24). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing Inc.
Sandmann, L., Saltmarsh, J., & O'Meara, K. (2008). An integrated model for advancing the scholarship of engagement: Creating academic homes for the engaged scholar. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 12*(1), 47-6.
Sandmann, L., & Weerts, D. (2006). *Engagement in higher education: Building a federation for action*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia, College of Education.
Sandmann, L., & Weerts, D. (2008). Building a two-way street: Challenges and opportunities for community engagement at research universities. *The Review of Higher Education, 32*(1), 73-106.
Schaefer, M., & Rivera, L. (2013). The prickly embrace of engaged scholarship: What it means to do research in an urban secondary (6-12) school. *Tamara: Journal for Critical Organizational Inquiry, 11*(4), 67-78.
Schön, D. (1995). Knowing-in-action: The new scholarship requires a new epistemology. *Change, 27*(6), 26–35.
Schuetze, H., & Mendiola, G. (2012). In H. Schuetz, G. Mendiola, & D. Conrad (Eds.), *State and market in higher education reforms: Trends, policies and experiences in comparative perspective* (pp. 1-5). Rotterdam, NL: Sense Publishers.
Seifer, S. (2000). Engaging colleges and universities as partners in healthy communities initiatives. *Public Health Reports, 115*(2-3), 234-237.
Seifer, S. (2003). Documenting and assessing community based scholarship: Resources for faculty. In M. Minkler and N. Wallerstein (Eds.), *Community-Based participatory research for health.* San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.
Seifer, S. (2006). Building and sustaining community-institutional partnerships for prevention research: Findings from a national collaborative. *Journal of Urban Health*, 83(6), 989-1003.
Shizha, E., & Kariwo, M. T. (2011). Neoliberalism and Policy Reversals in Education. In *Education and Development in Zimbabwe* (pp. 43-57). SensePublishers.
Shaffer, T. J. (2013). Saltmarsh, J., & Hartley, M. (Eds.). (2011). *To Serve a Larger Purpose: Engagement for Democracy and the Transformation of Higher Education.* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press. Review by Timothy J. Shaffer. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 17*(1), 127-129.
Shulman, L. (2004). Visions of the possible: Models of campus support of the scholarship of teaching and learning. In W. Becker & M. Andrews (Eds.), *The scholarship of teaching and learning in higher education: Contributions of research universities*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
Shultz, L. (2013). Engaged scholarship in a time of the corporatization of the university and distrust of the public sphere: A decolonizing response. In L. Shultz & T. Kajner (Eds.),

Engaged scholarship: The politics of engagement and disengagement, pp43-54. Rotterdam, NL: Sense Publishers.
Shultz, L. (2007). Educating for global citizenship: Conflicting agendas and understandings. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 53*(3), 248-258.
Small, S., & Uttal, L. (2005). Action-oriented research: Strategies for engaged scholarship. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 67*(4), 936-948.
Smith, D.G. (1991). Hermeneutic inquiry: The hermeneutic imagination and the pedagogic text. In E. C. Short (Ed.), *Forms of curriculum inquiry* (pp. 187-209). New York: SUNY Press.
Smith, D.G. (1999). *Pedagon: Interdisciplinary essays in the human sciences, pedagogy and culture*. NewYork, NY: Peter Lang.
Smith, D.G. (2002). Hermeneutic scholar. In M. Wolfe & C. Pryor (Eds.), *The mission of the scholar* (pp. 185-200). New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishers.
Smith, D.G. (2010). Hermeneutic Inquiry. In C. Kridel (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of curriculum studies vol. 1*, 432-436. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
Smythe, E., & Spence, D. (2012). Re-viewing literature in hermeneutic research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 11*(1), 12-25.
Spivak, G.C . (1985). The rani of sirmur: An essay in reading the archives. *History and Theory, 24*(3), 247-272.
Spivak, G.C . (1988). Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson and L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marixism and the interpretation of culture* (pp. 271-313). Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press.
Springer, S. (2012). Neoliberalism as discourse: Between Foucauldian political economy and Marxian Poststructuralism. *Critical Discourse Studies, 9*(2), 133-147.
Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. (n.d.). *Instrumental Rationality*. Retrieved from http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/rationality-instrumental
Stanton, T. (2007). *New times demand new scholarship II: Research universities and civic engagement: Opportunities and challenges.* Retrieved from http://www.google.ca/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=5&ved=0CEkQFjAE&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.epi.soe.vt.edu%2Fperspectives%2Fpolicy_news%2Fpdf%2FCivicEngagement.pdf&ei=e0jnT9ahKfH62AX7obDaCQ&usg=AFQjCNGlc-xttQkGQ5aDnPJQyOmVB_xG3w
Stanton, T. (2008). New times demand new scholarship: Opportunities and challenges for civic engagement at research universities. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice, 3*(1), 19-42.
Stephenson, M. (2011). Conceiving land grant university community engagement as adaptive leadership. *Higher Education, 61*(1), 95-108.
Strand, K., Marullo, S., Cutforth, N., Stoecker, R., & Donohue, P. (2003). Research practices in community based research. In: K. Strand, S. Marullo, N. Cutforth, R. Stoecker & P. Donohue (Eds.), *Community based research and higher education (*pp. 109-113). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
Strega, S. (2005). The view from the poststructural margins: Epistemology and methodology reconsidered. In L. Brown & S. Strega (Eds.), *Research as resistance: Critical, indigenous, & anti-oppressive approaches.* Toronto, ON, Canada: Canadian Scholar's Press.
Sunderland, N., Muirhead, B., Parsons, R., & Holtom, D. (2004). *Foundation paper.* St. Lucia,

QLD, Australia: The Australian consortium on higher education, community engagement and social responsibility. Retrieved from http://www.google.ca/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=4&ved=0CFUQFjAD&url=http%3A%2F%2Ftalloiresnetwork.tufts.edu%2Fwp-content%2Fuploads%2FAustralianConsortiumpaper.pdf&ei=90XnT9q7NY762AXcvOTZCQ&usg=AFQjCNGu_hfq1UXlOmabzHWsCiH6s8lPMg

Thompson, B. (2008). Use of the e-word: What exactly is "engagement"? *Proceedings of the Australian Universities Community Engagement Alliance* (pp. 42-50*).* University of the Sunshine Coast, Sippy Downs, Australia.

Tlostanova, M. V., & Mignolo, W. D. (2012). *Learning to unlearn: Decolonial reflections from Eurasia ad the Americas.* Columbus, OH: Ohio State University.

Van de Ven, A. (2007). *Engaged scholarship: A guide for organizational and social research*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Vernon, A., & Ward, K. (1999). Campus and community partnerships: Assessing impacts & strengthening connections. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 6*(1), 30-37.

Vogelgesang, L., Denson, N., & Jayakumar, U. (2010). What determines faculty-engaged scholarship? *The Review of Higher Education, 33*(4), 437-472.

Wallace, J. (2000). *En/countering resistance to gender equity policy in educational organizations.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

Ward, K. (2003). Faculty service roles and the scholarship of engagement. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, 29*(5), 1-192.

Warnke, G. (1987). *Gadamer: Hermeneutics, tradition, and reason.* Standford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Warnke, G. (2003). Hermeneutics and constructed identities. In L. Code (Ed.), *Feminist interpretations of Hans-Georg Gadamer* (pp. 57-80). University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Watson, D., Hollister, R., Stroud, S., & Babcock, E. (2011). *The engaged university: International perspectives on civic engagement.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Weerts, D. (2005). Toward the engaged institution: Rhetoric, practice, and validation. *Multidisciplinary Perspectives on Higher Education for the Public Good* (pp. 84-105). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.

Weerts, D., & Sandmann, L. (2008). Building a two-way street: Challenges and opportunities for community engagement at research Universities. *The Review of Higher Education, 32*(1), 73-106.

Weinrib, J., Jones, G., Metcalfe, A., Fisher, D., Gingras, Y., Rubenson, K., & Snee, I. (2013). Canadian university academics' perceptions of job satisfaction: "…The future is not what it used to be". In P. Bentley, H. Coates, R. Dobson, L, Geodegebuure & V. Meek (Eds.), *Job satisfaction around the academic world,* pp. 83-102. New York, NY: Springer.

Zlotkowski, E. (2005). The disciplines and the public good. In A. Kezar, T. Chambers & J. Burkhardt (Eds.), *Higher education for the public good* (pp. 146-165). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Appendix A: Initial Interview Guide

Living Well with Others: Exploring Engagement in Higher Education
Conversation Guide

Basic Information:

- What is your age?
- What is your gender?
- Which faculty do you work in?
- How would you describe the focus of your scholarship?

Study Question 1: How do scholars in Canada conceptualize community-engaged scholarship? (Make sense of their experiences/observations with concepts or abstractions/principles/theories)

Conversation Prompts:

- Tell me about your engagement work and what excites you about it?
- How did you become an "engaged" scholar?
- Explain or give some examples of how being engaged differs from a time when you were not engaged.
- Based on your understanding of CES, what does *good engagement* mean to you? How does this connect to poor engagement?
- How do you know, in your own practice, when you are engaged. Give a specific example.
- What is engagement for?
- Can you think of a time you were highly engaged and share it with me?
- Describe a time when you were pleased with the result of an engaged scholarship experience –why was it important?
- Why is engaging communities important to you?

Study Question 2: How do engaged scholars ontologically position themselves and Others in the engagement experience? (How they position each in terms of inter-subjective relations –– how is the Other theorized and thought about – what are the subject position possibilities for Self and Other)

Conversation Prompts:

- What does community in CES mean to you? Explain with examples from your own experience.
- How does community in CES differ from scholars? How are they the same?
- How would you describe your relationship with community partners in the engagement experience? Can you give a specific example?

- How have you changed, if at all, through engagement with community in CES? Was your CES partner(s) important to this change, if so, can you explain?
- Do you think your community partners have changed through their engagement with you? Can you give examples or explain?
- Who benefits from engagement and how do they benefit?

Study Question 3: How does the changing context of higher education interact with the growing interest in community-engaged scholarship in Canada? (Is it related to massification, corporatization, internationalization, changing labor practices, different ways of thinking about knowledge, etc.)

Conversation Prompts:

- What kinds of things impact your ability to engage with community partners?
- Have changes in HE over the past x years (years employed) affected your engagement? Explain.
- Why do you think CES is becoming so important/ popular now?
- Is the current situation of higher education in Canada a problem? Explain. Does CES contribute to or ameliorate this problem?
- How is CES different or related to traditional values and practices of scholarship in higher education, if at all?

Appendix B: Second Interview Discussion Topics

Living Well with Others: Community-engaged Scholarship and Canadian Higher Education Discussion Topics

Situatedness: There is a sense in which participants situate themselves "in community" or with communities. Community is where their heart is, where they feel their work comes from (i.e. issues based), or who they hope their work benefits.

- How is community understood and how is it enacted?
- How does this situatedness affect teaching?
- How does an affiliation with community come into play outside research?

Related to this is the interaction between engaged scholars and their academic colleagues. With the focus on critical scholarship that is evident in many institutions of higher education, which is often focused on unearthing hidden power relations and power motivations, pointing out the shortcomings of political and social actions, and other activities of deconstruction, engaged scholars recognized that they may be criticized for their work and that it may be misinterpreted by their colleagues.

- Why then, in the face of such criticism do engaged scholars choose to continue against the grain of the institutional culture?
- Why do you, personally, in the face of criticism, choose to engage?
- What promise does engagement hold for you?

Alliance and Positioning Scholarship: Calls to recognize CES as legitimate scholarship and expand what academic institutions and peers deem as legitimate knowledge is in some ways similar to calls made by other subjugated knowledge holders, for example, calls by indigenous peoples or feminists to recognize different epistemological systems.

- In what way does your own engagement challenge conventional ideas of scholarship or knowledge, if at all?
- What is new or different about CES's call to expand legitimate knowledge?

Related to this is the idea that CES as an umbrella term holds something together or covers something diverse. Yet many scholars who are practicing CBPR or PAR in their research or CSL/ community-engaged teaching do not identify as community-engaged scholars. Others who do identify as community engaged scholars talk about engagement the same way they might talk about their more specific practice.

- What is different about framing your own work as engagement, if you do and if you do not, why not?
- If you took on the language of CES at some point in your academic career, what changed for you as a result of that?

Self-understanding: In many definitions of the term, CES involves reciprocal and mutually beneficial partnerships. Thus all partners are affected by CES.

- Has engaging others changed you? If so, can you give an example?

- How is engaging community in shared knowledge creation different from engaging colleagues in another discipline in shared knowledge creation, if at all?

Appendix C: First Contact Phone Script

Recruitment Phone Script

Good morning/afternoon.

My name is Tania Kajner and I am a graduate student in Educational Policy Studies at the University of Alberta. I am calling because you have been identified by (name of referring scholar) as someone who might be able to assist with identifying community-engaged scholars in Canada who may be suitable for a research study that I am conducting.

Would you have five minutes to talk? (If no, then arrange another time to phone)

Let me tell you a bit about the study. The purpose of this study is to explore community-engaged scholarship in Canada, which I am defining as scholarship that directly involves or affects communities outside the university. I am interested in how Canadian scholars are conceptualizing engagement, how they are positioning the other in an engagement encounter and how CES in Canada might interact with larger, overall changes to higher education.

As I said, you were identified as someone with a depth and breadth of experience in community-engaged scholarship. Have you been working with particular communities? When did you first gain interest in this kind of work?… (conversation will flow from here)

If the person is suitable for inclusion, then I will ask:

> *Would you be interested in participating in the study yourself? It only requires two one-hour conversations. I'd be happy to send you some written material on the study so that you can think about it.*

If the person does not seem suited to the study…

> *Would you be willing to share with me some names and institutional affiliations of people you think might be able to assist in this study, either by way of participating or recommending others?*

Thank-you for your time, it is much appreciated. If you think of anything else you'd like to share, you can reach me at (780) 271-1896 or by email at Tania.kajner@ualberta.ca

Goodbye.

Appendix D: First Contact E-mail Script

Dear (Scholar),

Thank you for expressing interest in the *Living Well with Others: Exploring Engagement in Higher Education* research study.

Study Description: The purpose of this interpretive research study is to explore community-engaged scholarship in Canada. I am interested in how Canadian scholars are conceptualizing engagement, how they are positioning the Other in an engagement encounter and how CES in Canada might interact with larger, overall changes in higher education.

I would like to have an open-ended conversation with you, about your work with community. This would involve two conversations, each one-hour in length. All information provided will also be kept confidential. **Participation in this study is strictly voluntary**.

If you would like to participate in the study, please contact me at (780) 271-1896 or at Tania.kajner@ualberta.ca

Thank you,

Tania Kajner
PhD Candidate
Educational Policy Studies
University of Alberta

Appendix E: Information Letter and Consent Form

INFORMATION LETTER and CONSENT FORM
Study Title: Living Well with Others: Exploring Engagement in Higher Education

Research Investigator
Tania Kajner
Educational Policy Studies
7-104 Education North
University of Alberta
Edmonton, AB, T6G 2G5
Tania.kajner@ualberta.ca
(780) 271-1896

Supervisor
Dr. Lynette Shultz
Educational Policy Studies
7-133M Education North
University of Alberta
Edmonton, AB, T6G 2G5
Lynette.shultz@ualberta.ca
(780) 492-4441

Background
You are being asked to be part of this study as a result of the depth and breadth of your experience with community-engaged scholarship in Canadian higher education. The results of this study will be used in support of my dissertation and for inclusion in community-based and academic publications, research reports, presentations, and curriculum development.

Purpose
The purpose of this interpretive research study is to explore community-engaged scholarship in Canada. I am interested in how Canadian scholars are conceptualizing engagement, how they are positioning the Other in an engagement encounter and how CES in Canada might interact with larger, overall changes in higher education. Given the lack of clarity about CES in Canadian higher education, the results of this study will help inform a deeper understanding of CES, provide an interpretation based on Canadian practices, and initiate critical dialogue on the benefits of engagement for scholars, institutions, and communities.

Study Procedures
You are being asked to participate in **two** conversations with the researcher. Each conversation will be one-hour in length. After the first conversation, a summary of emerging themes and issues will be written up in a short document. This document will be shared with you prior to our second conversation and will be used to prompt further discussion of both emerging themes and points of disagreement.

Where possible, conversations will take place in person. Where an in-person conversation is not possible, the conversation will be hosted over Skype as a first choice, and over the phone as a second choice.

Benefits
You will benefit from participation in this study by having an opportunity to reflect on your scholarship, your partnerships, and on higher education. You will have the opportunity to make sense of your work, and dialogue about its importance.

It is my hope that the results of this study will help to clarify some of the ambiguities surrounding community-engaged scholarship in Canada and inform organizational and policy change.

There is not cost to you to participate in this research. You will not be reimbursed for your participation.

Risk
There is a small risk that you may experience fatigue as a result of participation in two conversations.

Voluntary Participation
Participation in this study is strictly voluntary. If you agree to participate, you are free to stop the conversation at any time, should you feel uncomfortable. Even if you agree to participate in this study you have the right to withdraw from the study without penalty. In the event of a withdrawal before the end of the first interview, your data will be removed from the study. If you withdraw after the summary document of the first interview has been written, it will be difficult to separate out your specific contributions.

Confidentiality & Anonymity
This research will be used in support of my dissertation and as partial fulfillment of the requirements for my doctoral program in Educational Policy Studies at the University of Alberta. The results of this research will also be used in community-based and academic publications, research reports, presentations, and curriculum development.

Your contribution will be kept confidential. You will not be personally identified in the research. Information about your gender, age, the province or territory in which you work, the faculty in which you work, your experience, and your general research area may be shared. Given the number of community-engaged scholars in Canada, the number of potential participants is large and it will be difficult for anyone to identify you.

Data will be kept confidential, with access only granted to the researcher (myself) and my supervisor (Dr. Lynette Shultz). Data will be kept in a locked storage cabinet or in password protected electronic files at my home residence. The data will be kept for 5 years after completion of the study and then destroyed.

A copy of the research findings will be shared if requested.

Further Information
The plan for this study has been reviewed for its adherence to ethical guidelines by a Research Ethics Board at the University of Alberta. For questions regarding participant rights and ethical conduct of research, contact the Research Ethics Office at (780) 492-2615.

If you have any questions or would like to provide further input, you can contact Tania Kajner at (780) 271-1896 or at Tania.kajner@ualberta.ca or, you can contact my graduate supervisor, Dr. Lynette Shultz at (780) 492-4441 or lynette.shultz@ualberta.ca

Living Well with Others: Exploring Engagement in Higher Education
Consent Form

I am providing two copies of this consent form. One is to be signed and returned and one is for you to keep for your records.

I hereby consent to participation in the Living Well with Others: Exploring Engagement in Higher Education study. I have read and understood the information sheet provided and understand that I can withdraw from the study any time up to the beginning of the data analysis phase.

Name_____

Signature_____

Date_____

I hereby consent to audit recording of the two one-hour conversations conducted as a part of this research study.

Name_____

Signature_____

Date_____

Appendix F: Examples of Community-Engaged Scholarship

In my review of the literature on community-engaged scholarship in Chapter Three I focused on publications that sought to conceptualize engagement, identifying three overlapping frames for understanding CES. As stated, I purposely excluded articles that did not offer a broad conceptualization of the field. However, given the ambiguity of CES referenced throughout this thesis, I recognize that some examples of CES case studies and project stories may be helpful to the reader. Here I provide a few examples from the engagement literature in order to provide a more concrete sense of the kinds of CES activities undertaken.

Bowen, G., Richmond, W., Lockwood, F., & Hensley, G. (2012). Canton connections: A university-community partnership for post-disaster revitalization. *Journal of Community Engagement and Scholarship, 5*(1), 24-32.

This article explores the case of a university-community partnership between Western Carolina University and the town government of Canton. The article traces the partnership's evolution and the various specific projects that were established under the partnership. The authors conclude that the partnership was appropriately based on a transactional relationship, designed to be instrumental and focus on the social and economic revival of the community along with student learning outcomes. They share lessons learned in partnership development between organizations of this kind.

Driscall, D., & Kitchens, M. (2014). Engaging in communities of practice: Supplementing community-based service-learning with online reflection in a peer tutoring course. In Scott Crabill and Dan Butin (Eds.), *Community engagement 2.0? Dialogues on the future of the civic in the disrupted university*, pp. 41-55. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

This book chapter explores a community-service learning experience embedded in two sections of a Peer Tutoring course that incorporated online reflective practice. Using the concept of communities of practice, the authors argue that online learning can effectively supplement community-based service-learning in positive ways. They suggest that a sense of community developed as a result of the shared service-learning experience and the online opportunity for reflection, the course activities enabled students to articulate their growing professional identities, on-line reflection led to a deeper understanding of practice, and meaning making based on the service-learning experience was facilitated by

the development of on-line portfolios. The authors also share lessons learned in this case, concluding that on-line interactions and reflective activity do not take away from community service work, but rather can be of benefit.

Jurkowski, J., Green Mills, L., Lawson, H., Bovenzi, M., Quartimon, R., & Davison, K. (2013). Engaging Low-Income Parents in Childhood Obesity Prevention from Start to Finish: A Case Study. *Journal of Community Health, 38*(1), 1-11. DOI 10.1007/s10900-012-9573-9

This article presents a case study of *Communities for Healthy Living*, a project that sought to engage parents in a childhood obesity prevention research project. Parents were engaged throughout the entire research process with the aim of fostering parent empowerment and encouraging co-learning on the part of all stakeholders. In this case, parents were engaged as co-researchers in the design, implementation and evaluation of an intervention for low-income families with a child enrolled in Head Start. The article explores the mechanisms and innovative strategies employed to engage parents throughout the research project, documenting benefits and challenges of this level of engagement in health research.

Mitchell, M., Guilfoyle, D., Doc Reynolds, R., & Morgan, C. (2013). Towards sustainable community heritage management and the role of archeology: A case study from Western Australia. *Heritage & Society, 6*(1), 24-45.

Framed by calls for restructuring the power relations that underpin the post-colonial approach to heritage management in Australia, this paper examines how the Gabbie Kylie Foundation worked with indigenous communities to centre the perspectives and worldviews of Traditional Owners in the heritage planning process. They delineate the model of engagement employed and its links to the cultural aspirations and responsibilities of Traditional Owners, noting challenges and best practices. The authors emphasize the interrelatedness of engagement goals and processes, suggesting that the most fundamental tenant of their model is that it shifts power and control of heritage management to the Traditional owners.

Prohaska, A. (2012). "Beyond my imagination": Learning the sociology of poverty through service after the Tuscaloosa tornado. *Journal of Community Engagement and Scholarship, 6*(1), 19-27.

This paper explores the learning of 14 students enrolled in a community service-learning course entitled Gender and Poverty. Students volunteered with an organization that provided assistance to tornado survivors. The author lays out the sociological theories students were exposed to, course particulars, community service-learning placement details, research methods to evaluate the experience, and research findings. The author suggests that students in the course moved from an individual-level explanation of poverty to understanding a structural analysis, and students were emotionally transformed through the development of empathy for storm survivors.

Wittman, A., & Crews, T. (2012). *Engaged learning economies: Aligning civic engagement and economic development in community-campus partnerships*. Boston, MA: Campus Compact.

Citing the importance of attending to economic development, the authors argue that through the mechanism of strategic community and civic engagement, aligned with economic development, institutions of higher education can create engaged learning economies. These economies are premised on the idea that civic engagement is the means by which economic outreach/development and democratic education are connected. Thus an engaged learning economy leads to positive economic and civic change because it harnesses the perspectives and knowledge of everyone involved for the purposes of economic problem solving.