3

Windows of opportunity for integrating community engagement throughout the doctoral career are offered in this chapter along with a description of the knowledge, skills, and value orientations needed for future faculty to become engaged scholars.

Graduate Education and Community Engagement

KerryAnn O'Meara

When graduate students are forming their ideas about research and scholarship and developing their professional identities, it is important that they take a broad view of scholarship. They must see the intellectual value of connecting ideas across academic disciplines, applying abstract ideas to real-world problems, and gaining theoretical insights from practice (Gaff, 2005).

Much has been written about preparing future faculty for involvement in multiple forms of scholarship and for multiple roles in various types of institutions (Austin, 2002; Austin and Barnes, 2005; Austin and McDaniels, 2006b; Pruitt-Logan and Gaff, 2004; Rice, 1996). Much has also been done to promote the development of graduate students as teachers such as the AACU's Preparing Future Faculty Program (Gaff, 2005). But there have been no national efforts to prepare and socialize early-career faculty for community engagement.

The lack of national attention to preparing future faculty for their roles as citizen-scholars represents a significant missed opportunity. Whereas graduate student involvement in engaged teaching and research, such as service-learning or community-based research, likely has immediate benefits for retention and learning, this chapter focuses on the impact of engagement during doctoral study on later community engagement when those doctoral students become faculty members. Graduate students who are not encouraged to see the relevance of their disciplines to local schools, governments, business, and the public are significantly less likely as faculty to

become engaged scholars (Tierney, 1997). Community engagement offers multiple avenues for integration of teaching, research, and outreach, an integration that many faculty yearn for but do not feel they have the skills to create (Bloomgarden and O'Meara, 2007; Colbeck, 1998). Therefore, understanding barriers to and facilitators of community engagement has implications for the institutionalization of community engagement in graduate programs, the quality of faculty work and satisfaction, and the fulfillment of college service missions.

Faculty who do not become involved in engagement cite such reasons as lack of fit between their discipline and engagement projects or disproportionate rewards for research and external funding rather than engagement (Abes, Jackson, and Jones, 2002; Colbeck and Michael, 2006). Further, in institutional environments focused on gaining prestige, it is difficult to create a reward system that sustains engagement (Colbeck and Michael, 2006; O'Meara, 2002; 2007). However, evidence from campus service-learning programs and research about service-learning across the disciplines (Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont, and Stephens, 2003; Hollander and Hartley, 2000; Zlotkowski, 2000) show that faculty in all fields have designed careers that merge teaching, research, and service in ways that add to their disciplines, receive accolades, and enhance the education of their students. Lynton Award nominees (http://www.nerche.org) and Ehrlich Award winners (http://www.campuscompact.org) provide illustrations of the disciplinary diversity represented among faculty engaged in community work.

Certainly, concerns about prestige cultures, structural support, fit between faculty interests and community needs, and overloaded plates thwart faculty engagement. Reward systems in particular pose serious barriers to faculty engagement (Colbeck and Michael, 2006; O'Meara, 2002a, 2007; Ward, 2003). Reward systems, however, are made up in large part by faculty who are socialized in graduate school toward specific notions of what is and is not appropriate disciplinary scholarship.

The greatest barriers to future faculty community engagement may therefore be lack of imagination about how to connect disciplinary scholarship to public purposes; how to integrate teaching, research, and outreach toward meeting community needs; and how to fashion long-term careers as engaged scholars. What we need are the dispositions, orientations, investment, and commitment of professionals socialized toward engagement while in graduate school. This chapter interweaves literature and theory on graduate education with literature on engagement to envision how future faculty across disciplines might be prepared more intentionally to pursue engaged scholarship.

By "community engagement," I refer to work that engages faculty members' professional expertise to solve real-world problems in ways that fulfill institutional missions and are public, not proprietary (Driscoll and Lynton, 1999; Elman and Smock, 1985). This definition does not include work for which corporations or other organizations pay or if the results are privately owned. Like all scholarship, community engagement involves systematic

inquiry, wherein the process and results are open to peer critique and disseminated (Hutchings and Shulman, 1999). The term *engagement* includes professional service and outreach, such as service-learning, community-based research, and applied research, that engage professional or academic expertise in partnership with local expertise to address real-world issues (Driscoll and Lynton, 1999). Engagement may involve teaching, research, or extension programs, and high-quality engagement will often be integrative, drawing on more than one type of faculty work. For example, research on exemplary engaged faculty shows that they have often developed long-term partnerships with community organizations involving service-learning opportunities for students and community-based research projects (O'Meara, 2006).

Graduate Education and Community Engagement: Why Now?

This is an ideal time to envision graduate education for engagement for several reasons. First, because significant numbers of faculty who began their careers in the 1960s and 1970s will be retiring (Austin, 2002), there is a special focus on preparing the generation of faculty who will begin their careers over the next five to ten years. Second, intense national attention on doctoral education through such projects such as the Responsive Ph.D. (Weisbuch, 2004), the Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate (Golde and Walker, 2006; see also Chapter Two in this volume), and the Center for the Integration of Research, Teaching, and Learning (CIRTL) (see Chapter Six) demonstrate commitment among foundations, national associations, graduate deans, and researchers to improve graduate education so that it is more relevant to future careers and equitable for all groups (Austin and McDaniels, 2006a; Golde and Walker, 2006). Third, graduate students across disciplines have said that they want to be prepared for work that connects their intellectual passions with the needs of society but feel unprepared to do so (Austin and McDaniels, 2006a; Golde and Dore, 2001; Rice, Sorcinelli, and Austin, 2000). Fourth, many campus centers and undergraduate departments that have embedded service-learning in their programs for as long as two decades are poised to act as bridges to graduate student civic engagement. As Stanton and Wagner observe in their work on graduate education and civic engagement, "Many students experience the transition to graduate study as a withdrawal from public and community service that was a vital part of their undergraduate years" (2006, p. 2). Therefore, this is an ideal time to examine where to embed community engagement when socializing doctoral students for faculty careers.

Graduate Education and Socialization Theory

During the process of socialization, a person takes on characteristics, values, and attitudes, as well as knowledge and skills, that contribute to a new professional self (Austin and McDaniels, 2006a). Socialization theory posits

that graduate education influences how students understand their work, what work is considered important and desirable, and how one goes about it as a professional. Because graduate education occurs mainly within disciplinary departments, effective socialization for community engagement must be embedded within the courses, programs of study, and dissertation experience of specific departments and disciplines (Austin and McDaniels, 2006b).

Weidman, Twale, and Stein (2001) apply Thornton and Nardi's framework for role acquisition (1975) to the socialization of graduate and professional students. In doing so, Weidman, Twale, and Stein (2001) identify four overlapping stages of graduate student development: the *anticipatory stage,* the *formal stage,* the *informal stage,* and the *personal stage.* During these stages, three core elements of socialization—*knowledge acquisition, investment,* and *involvement*—lead to identification with and commitment to a professional role (Thornton and Nardi, 1975). Austin and McDaniels (2006a) suggest that throughout the stages and elements of socialization, doctoral students should be intentionally mentored toward specific sets of knowledge, skills, and professional attitudes and habits and the cultivation of professional networks.

This chapter focuses on specific knowledge, understandings, skills, professional orientations, and values that future faculty might acquire during preparation to become engaged scholars. Different phases of a doctoral career suggest "windows of opportunity" where critical experiences may foster their interest in and commitment to engagement. Clearly, graduate education differs considerably for doctoral students in philosophy, computer science, or education. However, all doctoral students acquire professional and academic skill sets as they are inducted into their professional or disciplinary communities. Furthermore, because engagement involves teaching through service-learning or community-based research (or both), graduate students who learn to become engaged scholars simultaneously learn to become integrated professionals who connect different aspects of their work.

A Doctoral Program in Four Phases

Community engagement can be incorporated into doctoral study at various points. I use Weidman, Twale, and Stein's four stages of socialization, three core elements of socialization, and related theory and research on the socialization process (see Table 3.1) to organize incorporation of engagement. Aspects of each of the Weidman, Twale, and Stein stages and core elements, as well as critical experiences described, may occur throughout all four phases, however, and the time it takes to complete doctoral programs and the ways in which students advance from novice to expert vary widely. While many experiences, both structured and informal, will be discussed in this section, there is no substitute for engaged faculty scholars who intentionally open doors to engaged ways of knowing, learning, teaching, and discovering and show their protégés how to open such doors themselves.

Phase One: Orientation: Marketing Programs and Recruiting Students. Prospective students want to see their passions and interests represented at the institutions they wish to attend. For example, when selecting an undergraduate institution, I attended a college tour. There a senior described helping build a library and classrooms for an orphanage in Tijuana, Mexico, as part of a college project. Almost immediately, my choice was made, as I could see myself beside community members, students, and faculty engaged in this work. This college attracted students with similar interests to participate in significant service-learning and community partnerships. Similarly, socializing graduate students for roles as engaged scholars begins with who and how programs recruit. Programs can communicate to thousands of prospective students who engaged in service-learning as undergraduates about opportunities to continue such work during doctoral study. Marketing materials and informational sessions can highlight assistantships with service-learning or community-based research projects and include quotes from students, faculty, and community partners who are engaged in university-community partnerships. By creating intentional bridges for engaged undergraduate majors, prospective graduate students will know that doctoral education in their chosen fields will involve them in work that they believe is worthwhile.

Research suggests that early personal and professional experiences with engagement influence faculty adoption of this type of scholarship and that women and faculty of color self-report more involvement in community engagement than their white male counterparts (Colbeck and Michael, 2006). Many prospective graduate students will be women and people of color, two groups who have experienced problems establishing themselves during the initial period of graduate work, in part because they often find two activities that attracted them to graduate school, teaching and service, less valued than research (Aguirre, 2000; Antonio, Astin, and Cress, 2000; Tierney and Bensimon, 1996). Therefore, establishing a pipeline for engagement involves assertively recruiting women, students of color, and students who have shown prior interest in this work.

During the *anticipatory stage* of graduate education, students have preconceived notions of what it means to be a doctoral student and a professor, gathered from the media, undergraduate experiences, and other interactions (Weidman, Twale, and Stein, 2001). As new students interact with current students and faculty, they learn about program requirements and attempt to understand what this new life will be like. They observe faculty and advanced students to "learn what is valued, what work is done, and what the role of a faculty member involves" (Austin and McDaniels, 2006a, p. 12). New students find peers with whom to associate, find a faculty mentor, and seek financial support (Braxton and Baird, 2001). Each of these activities could be linked more intentionally with community engagement.

Introductory seminars could present students with multiple options for scholarship. Traditional research paradigms and methods and basic and

Table 3.1. Embedding Community Engagement in the Socialization and Preparation of Future Faculty

Time Period	Related Socialization Concepts	Understandings and Skills	Critical Experiences
Orientation to the program: recruitment and first six months	Anticipatory stage	Understanding engagement as a way of learning and teaching within a discipline.	Recruiting students who have been involved in engagement; showcasing the work Connecting engaged faculty mentors and student protégés Securing community engagement related graduate assistant positions
Taking core courses: first three years	Formal stage and knowledge acquisition	Understanding of history of engagement in the discipline Skills in designing and facilitating high-quality service-learning Skills in framing research questions toward public purposes Learning research methods appropriate for engaged work in the discipline Skills in communicating results to multiple venues Appreciation for ethical behavior and a sense of responsiveness to community partners Interpersonal skills in dialogue, teamwork, and collaboration.	Embedding engagement in coursework Exposure to philosophical background ground of experiential education and social theories of education Experience as a teaching assistant for a course where service-learning is integrated Courses, concentration, and certificate cate programs in participatory action research Course assignments such as mock grant proposals, news releases, newsletter accounts, grant reporting, and presentations before boards Opportunities to work with community partners on grant projects, designing the questions and activities collaboratively

Developing mastery (finishing coursework, taking comprehensive exams, working on dissertation)	Informal stage and involvement	Institutional savvy and management skills Understanding of reward systems and how colleges work Entrepreneurial spirit and ability to garner resources Finding, creating, and participating in professional communities within and outside academe Integrative skills	Role modeling and personal conversations Serving on university committees on outreach Exposure to human resource challenges of managing a staff, practice developing budgets, grant-writing, and advocating for projects to campus and to external stakeholders Invitations to co-present at disciplinary and engagement conferences, introduction to other engaged scholars
Making commitments (last six to twelve months, finishing dissertation, job searching, and beginning new faculty role)	Personal stage and investment	Understanding how engagement fits into the student's life as a scholar	Active participation in professional communities Sharing one's dissertation with other engaged scholars Making connections between personal, political, and social commitments and engagement Assistance by faculty mentor in researching different institutional types and the implications for engaged work Mentorship in finding a faculty position and in orientation to early career

purely theoretical work will remain staples of graduate education in every discipline. However, presentation of alternative forms of scholarship (such as public history projects wherein students and faculty collect and analyze oral histories and archival documents to help communities preserve their history) will show doctoral students that multiple forms of scholarship in their fields are legitimate, rigorous, and desirable. Many future scholars may decide that community engagement does not fit their teaching or research interests. Later, however, when sitting on a promotion and tenure committee for someone who does community engagement, prior exposure may make them more appreciative of its contributions.

Moreover, doctoral students have the opportunity to "reframe" the group they are considering or have joined (Tierney and Rhoads, 1994). Simply by asking questions about community engagement during initial interviews, bringing engaged interests and skills to assistantships, and challenging established ways of knowing and priorities for the field, graduate students can encourage their new departments to become more open to engagement.

Phase Two: Taking Core Courses. In discussing in this section the knowledge, understandings, and skills learned throughout the first three years of graduate study, I build on the work of Austin and McDaniels (2006a, 2006b) and the Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate (Golde and Walker, 2006). Whereas each provides holistic pictures of doctoral student development, I focus here on understandings and skills necessary for development of engaged scholars.

Understandings and Skills. During the coursework phase, most graduate students attempt to gain foundational and specialized knowledge. During this period, which overlaps with the *formal stage* of Weidman, Twale, and Stein (2001), students "receive formal instruction in the knowledge upon which future professional authority will be based" (p. 13), and they engage in *knowledge acquisition* that shifts from general to more specialized and complex knowledge. Students learn normative role expectations and "interpret their environment, establish their professional goals, and seek positive feedback and modification in their continued growth and development" (p. 13). By assuming roles as teaching or research assistants, by learning about exemplary scholars, and by learning the history and accomplishments of their disciplines, doctoral students begin to form professional identities.

Not only must engagement scholars gain a generic history of scholarship in their discipline (Austin and McDaniels, 2006a, 2006b), but they must also learn about the intellectual history and "heroes" of applied work. Formally, in courses and seminars, faculty might highlight as role models the work of engaged scholars at their own institutions or those for whom national disciplinary service awards are named (such as the Solon T. Kimball Award for Public and Applied Anthropology or the Margaret Mead Award given by the American Anthropological Association). Doctoral students can learn how their disciplines have benefited from the theoretical and practical contributions of these scholars. Informally, faculty mentors can

share their own understanding of contributions from community engage-ment to their discipline. Doctoral students can serve on selection commit-tees for community engagement awards. Doctoral students should also learn their institution's history of community engagement, including mistakes, such as exploitation of community members.

Doctoral students should also be exposed early to engaged teaching skills, such as constructing syllabi, setting learning goals for classes (Aus-tin and Barnes, 2005), merging learning goals with community partner needs, and embedding service opportunities in curricular planning. As teaching assistants, graduate students can prepare undergraduates for service experi-ences, fostering awareness of differences in social capital between community and university partners. Reflection about how students' identities (in terms of race and ethnicity, income, education, and language) compare to those of their community partners will help all be more successful in embracing and tran-scending similarities and differences. Deep conversations about pedagogy should include consideration of philosophies behind experiential education (such as those of Kolb, 1984, and Dewey, 1916), which posit that the most effective learning takes place when reflection and action are combined. Eyler and Giles's work on the "learning behind service-learning" (1999) describes the qualities of "high-quality placements" and "well-integrated experiences" that engage students in meaningful service experiences with community members. Such reflection will help budding engaged scholars create as-signments that help undergraduates make analytical connections between course material and service-learning experiences (Eyler and Giles, 1999; Strand and others, 2003). Faculty mentors might collaborate with doctoral students on classroom research to assess undergraduate outcomes of service-learning, from personal development to disciplinary learning (Strand and oth-ers, 2003), and submit findings for presentation or publication.

In doctoral study, students learn criteria for excellence in their disci-pline, including how scholars ask questions and pursue answers (Austin, 2002). Engaged scholars should also develop understandings and skills in research methods appropriate to engaged work in their discipline, including strategies and ethics related to participatory action and community-based research (Austin and Barnes, 2005; Austin and McDaniels, 2006b). For example, compared to traditional research, community-based research tends to involve more collaboration between academic researchers and community members, makes use of multiple methods of discovery and dissemination, and has social change as an explicit goal (Strand and others, 2003). For some disciplines, community-based research methods are not very different from the research methods for other work; challenges arise in framing research questions and projects in ways that have immediate application to real-world problems. Faculty might provide opportunities for doctoral students to prac-tice such skills in classroom assignments and grant applications.

Research on assessment of engaged work as scholarship suggests that fac-ulty who have successful careers in engagement produce multiple products

from each engaged project, such as a peer-reviewed journal article, a presentation, a community organization report, products related to pedagogy, and press releases (O'Meara, 2002). It is critical both for faculty careers and for enhancing the visibility of engaged work that future faculty communicate results clearly and in a variety of ways to reach multiple audiences. Programs can have doctoral students practice such skills by preparing their final class projects as mock grant proposals, news releases, newsletter accounts, or journal articles. In addition, students can communicate project results to community partners and help partners disseminate information about projects to grant agencies and trustees of nonprofits.

Researchers are often guests in communities that are not their own. Future faculty should develop appreciation for ethical behavior and a sense of responsiveness to community partners. They should be prepared to consider ethical issues related to all forms of scholarship (Austin, 2002; Austin and McDaniels, 2006a; 2006b). In preparation for engaged scholarship, doctoral students should particularly reflect on issues of differential power and privilege between university actors and those with whom they work. The learning might include discussions about sharing resources, sharing credit for outcomes, and building community capacity through partnerships.

When faculty engage in successful campus community partnerships, they develop mutual trust and respect, communicate clearly and listen carefully, understand and empathize with each other, remain flexible, and share power (Strand and others, 2003). Because engaged work depends on trust and communication among diverse partners, graduate students should have opportunities to develop their interpersonal skills (Austin and Barnes, 2005), especially in dialogue, teamwork, and collaboration (Austin and McDaniels, 2006a). As the dean of a college of education said in one case study of an engaged campus, "It takes a special set of skills to work in the community, and not everyone [in a given faculty] has them" (O'Meara, 2002b, p. 125). This may mean listening to community partners' ideas for projects that have nothing to do with one's discipline, teaching, or scholarly interests and helping establish relationships with their colleagues.

Structured and informal suggestions for fostering development of these skills and understandings include modeling, personal conversations, professional seminars, internships, and certificates to develop knowledge and skills for multiple forms of scholarship, opportunities to concentrate in community-based research, and support for community-based master's and doctoral theses (Austin and McDaniels, 2006a; Strand and others, 2003). Doctoral students learn first and foremost about academic work, however, through observation of faculty (Austin, 2002). There are many opportunities for faculty to make informal impressions in the hallway, in the lab, or while traveling to a research site.

Professional Orientations and Values. As doctoral students work with engaged professors, their *involvement* will engender a *professional orientation* that encourages connecting knowledge with real-world problems. Dur-

ing the "middle period" of doctoral study, students most often identify their intellectual and professional interests and commit to a particular set of research questions and methods (Braxton and Baird, 2001). Students should be exposed to community-based research projects during coursework and have opportunities to shape these activities in their own departments.

Doctoral students should consider for themselves why they should become involved in community engagement. According to Strand and colleagues (2003), although there are clear benefits for institutions, students, disciplines, and faculty from involvement in community-based research, the answer to this question should emphasize democracy and helping community-based organizations access and use resources to enhance capacity for community development. Some graduate students' answer to this question may be based on how they think about knowledge or their epistemology. Colbeck and Michael (2006) observe that faculty who practice engaged work often display a solidarity approach to knowing, a concept developed by McAfee (2000) in her research on political ways of knowing, wherein knowledge is pursued through examination of contexts such as history, customs, experiences, and values. Likewise, engaged students and faculty may answer the question because of how they view the role of their discipline in the world.

Phase Three: Developing Mastery (Taking Exams, Working on the Dissertation). As students prepare for comprehensive exams, develop dissertation proposals, and engage in dissertation research, they continue to develop understandings, skills, and a professional orientation.

Understandings and Skills. Although doctoral students may not develop *institutional savvy and managerial skills* within the first years of graduate study, they could be developing such skills by their third or fourth year. These include developing a political understanding of how the institution and community partner organizations work, reaching out to other campus units, and making engagement programs visible on campus (Singleton, Burack, and Hirsch, 1997). Case study research on successful enclaves of public service in colleges and universities found that "the success of service-enclaves depends on how skillfully the people in them read their institutional cultures and locate points of convergence between their goals and the goals of the institution" (Singleton, Burack, and Hirsch, 1997, p. 22). Similarly, Walshok (1995) found that the most successful campus outreach programs enjoyed intellectual and political support of campus leadership.

Also, funded and institutionalized engagement projects often employ undergraduates and professional staff in the university and in the community, and faculty often supervise these staff. So doctoral students need exposure to the challenges of staff management (Austin and McDaniels, 2006a) that might come from being a staff member, developing organizational charts and plans for implementation of projects, collecting materials for fieldwork, supervising student staff, and helping with the logistics of transportation and publicity. Doctoral students should have opportunities to manage communication among stakeholders, including ensuring that funding agencies,

community partners, institutional allies, staff, and students are all informed of engagement activities.

Knowledge of *how reward systems work* in departments and universities will help doctoral students understand that values such as "scholarship consists of discovering theoretical knowledge that sets the scholar apart from others" and "true scholarship can be found in top-tier journals" can work against positive evaluations of their engaged work (O'Meara, 2002). Therefore, doctoral students should learn to *document the scholarly aspects* of their engagement (Driscoll and Lynton, 1999). They also develop a professional network of senior and midcareer scholars who will understand their work and be able to support their tenure or contract renewals.

Doctoral students might develop an *entrepreneurial spirit* and the *ability to garner resources* for engaged work (Singleton, Burack, and Hirsch, 1997) through practice in grant-writing, building and managing budgets for engagement projects, searching out new opportunities for collaborative projects, and gathering various stakeholders together to design projects. Faculty mentors can involve doctoral students in the financial aspects of engaged work to help them understand the staff positions and community projects that may be in jeopardy if support cannot be found for programs. Likewise, faculty mentors can explain how they align their projects with institutional priorities and opportunities and provide guidance about granting agencies and foundation relationships to cultivate as early professionals.

Future engaged scholars should be exposed to faculty mentors who model and talk about their integration of teaching, research, and engagement. Through this exposure, doctoral students may develop *integrative skills,* which involve perceiving and establishing linkages between teaching, research, and outreach (Colbeck, 1998). Faculty who can integrate their engagement with their other faculty roles are likely to experience numerous benefits, including improved teaching and research (Colbeck, 1998; Bloomgarden and O'Meara, 2007). Faculty role models who integrate their work make these connections visible to students and are able to discuss benefits and challenges of integration.

Finding and participating in *professional communities* related to engaged work will provide additional sources of practical and moral support. Austin and McDaniels (2006a) and Vicki Sweitzer (Chapter Four in this volume) discuss the importance of nurturing professional networks, including junior colleagues, contemporaries, and more senior peers from other institutions. Nationally, networks and journals have developed around engaged work, such as the annual conference on Teacher Education and Service-Learning in Engineering, and graduate students should be introduced to them.

Professional Orientation and Values. During the *informal stage,* students learn role expectations through interactions with others (Weidman, Twale, and Stein, 2001). As students move through the middle and final parts of their doctoral programs, they begin to feel more comfortable in their environments. They know the language and have begun to develop specialized

expertise. Students are embedded in a peer culture that shares information, provides support, and celebrates rites of passage (Austin and McDaniels, 2006a; Weidman, Twale, and Stein, 2001). At this stage, students are in an ideal position to reflect on the values and beliefs that guide scholarly work in their disciplines. Table 3.2 provides a description of values and beliefs that seem to guide engaged scholarship across disciplines. These values and beliefs are often learned through faculty role-modeling, conversations with students, and conversations with community partners.

Phase Four: Making Commitments: Completing the Dissertation and Becoming Faculty. In the final, personal stage of socialization discussed by Weidman, Twale, and Stein (2001), "individuals and social roles, personalities and social structures become fused" (Thornton and Nardi, 1975, p. 880). Students make decisions about whether to invest their time, self-esteem, social status, and reputation further in pursuit of faculty careers. Weidman, Twale, and Stein (2001, p. 36) observe that "the outcome of socialization is not the transfer of a social role, but identification with and commitment to a role that has been normatively and individually defined." During this final stage, faculty can reinforce doctoral students' professional identities as engaged scholars by nominating them for awards related to community engagement, by sharing positive recommendations of their engaged dissertation work, and by introducing them to colleagues with similar values at conferences.

Table 3.2. Values Guiding Engaged Scholarship

Values and Beliefs Regarding the Process of Scholarship

- Engaged scholars value the process used to make knowledge.
- Engaged scholars want the process to be as transformative, democratic, and inclusive as possible.
- Engaged scholars try to share power and space, knowledge, and resources with community partners.

Values and Beliefs Regarding the Products of Scholarship

- Engaged scholars value disseminating the products of their work in the places where it will have the most impact.
- Engaged scholars give credit to community partners for collaborative work.

Values and Beliefs Regarding the Location of Scholarship

- Engaged scholars are attentive to their own locations in higher education institutions and the social capital and resources therein.
- Engaged scholars respect indigenous knowledge in communities and have a heightened sensitivity to cultural literacy and relevance.

Sources: Strand and others, 2003; O'Meara, 2002a, 2002b

Faculty mentors can play a significant role as prospective engaged scholars search for academic positions. Because some methods used in engaged scholarship, including participatory action research, are not considered mainstream for dissertations in many fields, faculty advocates can help in preparing applications and by placing phone calls to colleagues to facilitate placement. Also, faculty should encourage students to consider the range of institutional missions when applying for faculty jobs (Austin and McDaniels, 2006b) because the mission, norms, and reward system of an institution will very much influence faculty capacity to be involved in engaged work (Colbeck and Michael, 2006). Thus faculty mentors should help their student protégés find institutional environments likely to provide organizational support to enhance their chances for success.

Conclusion

Several assumptions underlie the strategies for embedding community engagement in graduate education outlined in this chapter. One assumption is that there are concrete ways to connect graduate study to societal needs. A second is that doing so revitalizes graduate education while contributing significantly to society. A third assumption is that isolating doctoral programs from society limits the creativity, sense of responsibility, knowledge and skill development of future scholars. A fourth assumption is that the knowledge, skills, and values that graduate students acquire while becoming engaged scholars will also help them grow as professionals who find satisfaction in integrating different kinds of faculty work.

Tierney (1997) recommends that organizations use socialization processes as opportunities to re-create rather than simply replicate their cultures. In that spirit, this chapter suggests that graduate education needs to be "disrupted," "re-created," and "renewed" to include community engagement as an attractive way of learning, knowing, and doing within disciplines. Transforming who is recruited to graduate school and how students learn while there means infusing the academy and disciplines with new values regarding the process, products, and locations of scholarly work. Embedding engagement in graduate education will attract students who are eager to envision careers that open doors between universities, disciplines, and the world.

References

Abes, E., Jackson, G., and Jones, S. "Factors That Motivate and Deter Faculty Use of Service-Learning." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning,* 2002, *9,* 5–17.

Aguirre, A. *Women and Minority Faculty in the Academic Workplace.* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report 27, no. 6. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2000.

Antonio, A. L., Astin, H. S., and Cress, C. M. "Community Service in Higher Education: A Look at the Nation's Faculty." *Review of Higher Education,* 2000, *23,* 373–398.

Austin, A. E. "Preparing the Next Generation of Faculty: Graduate School as Socialization to the Academic Career." *Journal of Higher Education,* 2002, *73,* 94–122.

Austin, A., and Barnes, B. "Preparing Doctoral Students for Faculty Careers That Contribute to the Public Good." In A. Kezar, T. Chambers, J. Burkhardt, and Associates. *Higher Education for the Public Good: Emerging Voices from a National Movement.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2005.

Austin, A. E., and McDaniels, M. "Preparing the Professoriate of the Future: Graduate Student Socialization for Faculty Roles." In J. C. Smart (ed.), *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research,* Vol. 21. New York: Springer, 2006a.

Austin, A. E., and McDaniels, M. "Using Doctoral Education to Prepare Faculty to Work Within Boyer's Four Domains of Scholarship." In J. M. Braxton (ed.), *Delving Further into Boyer's Perspectives on Scholarship.* New Directions for Institutional Research, no. 129. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2006b.

Bloomgarden, A., and O'Meara, K. "Faculty Role Integration and Community Engagement: Harmony or Cacophony?" *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning,* 2007, *13*(2), 5–18.

Braxton, J. M., and Baird, L. L. "Preparation for Professional Self-Regulation." *Science and Engineering Ethics,* 2001, *7,* 593–610.

Colbeck, C. L. "Merging in a Seamless Blend: How Faculty Integrate Teaching and Research." *Journal of Higher Education,* 1998, *69,* 647–671.

Colbeck, C. L., and Michael, P. "Individual and Organizational Influences on Faculty Members' Engagement in Public Scholarship." In R. A. Eberly and J. R. Cohen (eds.), *Public Scholarship.* New Directions for Teaching and Learning, no. 105. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2006.

Colby, A., Ehrlich, T., Beaumont, E., and Stephens, J. *Educating Citizens: Preparing Americas Undergraduates for Lives of Moral and Civic Responsibility.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2003.

Dewey, J. *Democracy and Education.* New York: Macmillan, 1916.

Driscoll, A., and Lynton, E. (eds.). *Making Outreach Visible: A Workbook on Documenting Professional Service and Outreach.* Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1999.

Elman, S. E., and Smock, S. M. *Professional Service and Faculty Rewards: Toward an Integrated Structure.* Washington, D.C.: National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, 1985.

Eyler, J., and Giles, D. E. *Where's the Learning in Service-Learning?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1999.

Gaff, J. G. "Preparing Future Faculty and Multiple Forms of Scholarship." In K. O'Meara and R. E. Rice (eds.), *Faculty Priorities Reconsidered: Rewarding Multiple Forms of Scholarship.* San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 2005.

Golde, C. M., and Dore, T. M. *At Cross Purposes: What the Experiences of Doctoral Students Reveal About Doctoral Education.* Philadelphia: Pew Charitable Trusts, 2001. http://www.phd-survey.org/report.htm. Accessed Nov. 30, 2007.

Golde, C. M., and Walker, G. E. (eds.). *Envisioning the Future of Doctoral Education: Preparing Stewards of the Discipline.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2006.

Hollander, E., and Hartley, M. "Civic Renewal in Higher Education: The State of the Movement and the Need for a Natural Network." In T. Ehrlich (ed.), *Higher Education and Civic Responsibility.* Phoenix: Oryx Press, 2000.

Hutchings, P., and Shulman, L. S. "The Scholarship of Teaching: New Elaborations, New Developments." *Change,* May 1999, pp. 11–15.

Kolb, D. *Experiential Learning: Experience as a Source of Learning and Development.* Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1984.

McAfee, N. *Habermas, Kristeva, and Citizenship.* Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2000.

O'Meara, K. "Uncovering the Values in Faculty Evaluation of Service as Scholarship." *Review of Higher Education,* 2002a, *26,* 57–80.

O'Meara, K. "Scholarship Unbound." In Phillip Altbach (series ed.), *Studies in Higher Education Dissertation Series.* New York: RoutledgeFalmer, 2002b.

O'Meara, K. "Faculty Motivation for Engagement: Listening to Exemplars." Paper presented at the Association for the Study of Higher Education community meeting, Anaheim, Calif., Nov. 4, 2006.

O'Meara, K. "Striving for What? Exploring the Pursuit of Prestige." In J. C. Smart (ed.), *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research,* Vol. 22. New York: Springer, 2007.

Pruitt-Logan, A. S., and Gaff, J. G. "Preparing Future Faculty: Changing the Culture of Doctoral Education." In D. H. Wulff, A. E. Austin, and Associates, *Paths to the Professoriate: Strategies for Enriching the Preparation of Future Faculty.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2004.

Rice, R. E. *Making a Place for the New American Scholar.* New Pathways Inquiry, no. 1. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1996.

Rice, R. E., Sorcinelli, M. D., and Austin, A. E. *Heeding New Voices: Academic Careers for a New Generation.* New Pathways Working Papers, no. 7. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 2000.

Singleton, S., Burack, C., and Hirsch, D. "Organizational Structures for Community Engagement." Working Paper no. 21. Boston: New England Resource Center for Higher Education, 1997.

Stanton, T. K., and Wagner, J. W. "Educating for Democratic Citizenship: Renewing the Civic Mission of Graduate and Professional Education at Research Universities." 2006. http://la.ucla.edu/Events/CCL%20grad%20conference/position%20paper.pdf. Accessed Nov. 30, 2007.

Strand, K., and others. *Community-Based Research and Higher Education: Principles and Practices.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2003.

Thornton, R., and Nardi, P. M. "The Dynamics of Role Acquisition." *American Journal of Sociology,* 1975, *80,* 870–885.

Tierney, W. G. "Organizational Socialization in Higher Education." *Journal of Higher Education,* 1997*, 68,* 1–16.

Tierney, W. G., and Bensimon, E. M. *Promotion and Tenure: Community and Socialization in Academe.* Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996.

Tierney, W. G., and Rhoads, R. A. *Enhancing Promotion, Tenure and Beyond: Faculty Socialization as a Cultural Process.* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, no. 6. Washington, D.C.: George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development, 1994.

Walshok, M. L. *Knowledge Without Boundaries: What American Research Universities Can Do for the Economy, the Workplace, and the Community.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1995.

Ward, K. *Faculty Service Roles and the Scholarship of Engagement.* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, no. 29. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2003.

Weidman, J. C., Twale, D. J., and Stein, E. L. *Socialization of Graduate and Professional Students in Higher Education: A Perilous Passage?* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, no. 28. Washington, D.C.: George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development, 2001.

Weisbuch, R. "Toward a Responsive Ph.D.: New Partnerships, Paradigms, Practices, and People." In D. H. Wulff, A. E. Austin, and Associates, *Paths to the Professorate: Strategies for Enriching the Preparation of Future Faculty*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2004.

Zlotkowski, E. "Service-Learning in the Disciplines." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning,* 2000, 61–67 (special issue).

KERRYANN O'MEARA is associate professor of higher education at the University of Maryland at College Park. Her research focuses on the ways in which we socialize, reward, and support the growth of faculty so that they can make distinct contributions to the goals of higher education.