The Engaged University, Community Development, and Public Scholarship

Jeffrey C. Bridger, Theodore R. Alter

Abstract

America's universities are facing unprecedented scrutiny and criticism. As pressure for institutional change has mounted, universities have taken steps to more effectively respond to the needs of their stakeholders. All of these activities are part of a broad movement to develop new and productive connections between the university and its publics. In this article, we draw on the interactional approach to community to give direction and purpose to the engagement agenda. We also develop a model of engagement and describe how it is related to the practice of community development. We conclude by suggesting how a new conception of scholarship—one that links academic excellence with civic participation—can facilitate community development.

Introduction

America's universities—especially our public universities—are facing unprecedented scrutiny and criticism. Faculty are faulted for pursuing research at the expense of teaching, for conducting research that is disconnected from real-world problems, and for worrying more about personal advancement than service to the community. Administrators are also under fire: legislators, students, and parents complain about rising costs, limited access, large class sizes, and lack of accountability. Other observers argue that institutions of higher learning are losing their sense of civic purpose and becoming commercial enterprises that differ only in name from their counterparts in the business world *(Bok 2003)*. These and other criticisms are rooted in the perception that universities are out of touch and out of date, and that they are not addressing important societal issues. Bender *(1993, 141)* captures the prevailing mood well when he notes that

> Our universities are experiencing a serious, if not unprecedented crisis that is not only financial but also social, intellectual, and even moral. They seem to be losing the confidence of the public. And there is widespread and growing worry that we lack the energy, the

ideas, and the institutional means to resolve our manifold problems in a political way.

As pressure for institutional change has mounted, universities across the nation have taken steps to more effectively respond to the needs of their stakeholders. Innovative programs have been designed to help students develop the civic skills necessary to maintain a democratic society *(Boyte and Kari 1996)*; universities are reevaluating faculty roles and rewards to encourage scholarship that meets both professional and public needs *(Boyer 1990; Hyman et al. 2001–2002)*; and there is growing interest in creating research agendas and outreach efforts that address critical social, economic, political, and environmental issues *(Ansley and Gaventa 1997)*.

Each of these activities is part of a broader movement to develop new and productive connections between the university and its publics. In place of traditional forms of extension and outreach, which are dominated by a one-way transfer of knowledge from the university to stakeholders, there is a growing emphasis on the development of interactive and mutually beneficial relationships. The Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities, in a report titled *The Engaged Institution: Returning to Our Roots,* urges universities to reconfigure teaching, research, extension, and service activities and become "more sympathetically and productively involved with their communities, however community may be defined" *(1999, 9)*.

From our perspective, community is central to this definition. Unfortunately, community, as the quote from the Kellogg Commission indicates, is a notoriously vague concept. In the absence of a clear definition, efforts to create new relationships are likely to be unfocused and therefore less effective than they might otherwise be. Hence, our first objective in this essay is to define community and community development in a way that gives direction and purpose to the engagement agenda. Following this, we put forth a tentative model of engagement and describe how it is related to the practice of community development. We conclude by suggesting how a new conception of scholarship—one that links academic excellence with civic involvement—can facilitate both university engagement and community development.

What Is Community?

The term *community* can be, and is, applied to all manner of entities. To cite just a few examples, we refer to ethnic communities, the community of scientists, the community of nations, and even virtual communities. In trying to be more precise, sociologists *(Hillery 1955; Bender 1978; Wilkinson 1991)* have conventionally defined community in terms of three elements: (1) a physical place, (2) a local society, and (3) collective actions. According to this line of reasoning, a community is a physically bounded territory where people meet most of their daily needs, interact with others in a variety of organizations, and express common interests through various actions and activities.

Over the past several decades, this definition of community has come under heavy criticism. The economic, social, cultural, and technological changes that have reshaped local life led many scholars to question whether place-based communities persist as a meaningful unit of social organization *(Bridger, Luloff, and Krannich 2002)*. Roland Warren *(1978)*, who is probably the most well-known and persuasive spokesperson for this position, argues that communities have become engulfed by extralocal forces over which they have little control. According to this line of thought, control over local issues has been placed in the hands of outside interests. As a result, the community has become little more than a stage where a variety of groups, organizations, and firms go about their business with little concern for the impact their actions have on local life. While decisions and policies must still conform in some respects to local norms and regulations, many are now formulated outside the community and are "guided more by their relations to extracommunity systems than by their relations to other parts of the community" *(Warren 1972, 52)*. The net result of this "Great Change" is a decrease in the importance of community as a social unit; individuals and organizations have become more and more oriented to happenings beyond the immediate locality.

Like most theories, the Great Change thesis contains some kernels of truth. Vertical integration has increased, and many of the functions once performed by local organizations and people have been taken over by extralocal entities. However, the extent to which these changes are a radical departure from an earlier way of life has been overstated. Since at least the early eighteenth century, extensive vertical ties have been an important part of

community life in America. In fact, many early towns were planned by entrepreneurs from urban areas to facilitate the transport of coal, lumber, and other raw materials *(Strauss 1961)*. Control over these industries and local economic life was often located hundreds or even thousands of miles away *(Cronon 1991)*. The notion that there was once a golden era of community autonomy squares better with the myth of rugged individualism than it does with available historical evidence.

Another strand in the community demise argument asserts that the advances in transportation and communication that accompanied and made possible vertical integration have made local forms of community less relevant. According to this line of reasoning, community is now best conceptualized simply as a network of social relations that has those characteristics we associate with community, such as feelings of belongingness and solidarity *(Wellman 1979)*. And there is no reason why these networks must be linked to a specific place. They might be coterminous with a locality, but there are no longer physical or technological barriers that place geographic limits on community.

Although new technologies have reduced the social cost of space and made it possible to maintain widely dispersed relationships, it does not necessarily follow that local ties are less important. Increased access to the outside world broadens the potential range of relationships available, but there is no compelling evidence that local ties have been replaced by more distant ones *(Bridger, Luloff, and Krannich 2002)*.

In short, theories predicting the death of the local community have not been empirically accurate. In fact, when it comes to giving purpose and direction to the engagement agenda, space-free definitions of community can actually be a barrier to action. If we divorce community from place, not only is it difficult to decide where and to whom our efforts should be directed, it is not even clear what a term like "community engagement" means.

The Interactional Approach to Community

In our view, if the concept of engagement is to retain a critical force and address concerns about the social responsibility of the university, it must be firmly tied to the issues and problems that affect people in the places they live. Bender *(1993)* captures this line of reasoning well in his discussion of how intellectuals can once again make an important contribution to our common

life. He argues *(1993, 144)* that "[t]here is no better place to begin than in one's local community. One need not—ought not—be too proud to bring one's knowledge into the city where one lives and works."

This approach to engagement, however, requires a realistic conception of the community. Given the many changes communities have undergone, this is not a simple task. Community boundaries are not clear, extralocal forces often dominate aspects of community life, collective actions often express private rather than public interests, and identities are often tied more to special interests than to the local community. In short, the contemporary community is complex and confusing. It is "an arena of both turbulence and cohesion, of order and disarray, of self-seeking and community-oriented interaction; and it manifests these dualities simultaneously" *(Wilkinson 1991, 7)*.

Despite the many changes communities have experienced, people who share a common territory inevitably interact with one another regardless of the extent to which they also participate in extralocal structures. Social interaction is the most essential, pervasive, and persistent feature of community:

> Social interaction delineates a territory as the community locale; it provides the associations that comprise the local society; it gives structure and direction to processes of collective action; and it is the source of community identity . . . the substance of community is social interaction. *(Wilkinson 1991, 13)*

From this perspective, social interaction gives form and structure to local life as people organize to accomplish specific tasks and pursue various interests. Community depends on interaction—all kinds of interaction. Thus, there is a potential for community to emerge in almost any setting, no matter how turbulent and dynamic it may be.

Unlike most other theories of community organization, the interactional approach does not define community in terms of well-defined networks or systems of social and economic relations. Instead, local life is conceptualized in a much more dynamic way. Groups and organizations, for instance, are viewed as relatively unbounded fields of interaction. The community, in turn, is composed of several of these more or less distinct social fields that differ by membership and interest. Some are focused

on activities such as economic development or social services, while others are concerned with religious matters or education. The mechanism that links these special-interest fields to form a local society is the community field. In contrast to the more limited interests pursued by other interactional fields, the community field asserts a more general interest. In the process, it "combines the locality relevant aspects of the specialized interest fields, and integrates them into a generalized whole" *(Wilkinson 1991, 19)*. The actions that occur in the community field coordinate the more narrowly focused actions that characterize special-interest fields.

The Consequences of Social Interaction

At first blush, it might seem trivial to define community in terms of social interaction. Of course people interact, but one might reasonably ask why interaction should be central to a definition of community. The most important reason is that the local community, and the interaction that occurs there, affects individual and social well-being in important ways. First, the community is still the main point of contact between the individual and society. When we move beyond the local level, we experience society as an abstraction *(Konig 1968; Bridger, Luloff, and Krannich 2002)*. And our contacts with it "tend to be in component structures, such as specific organizations" *(Wilkinson 1991, 77–78)*. In the local community, by contrast, we experience society as contacts with real people that are tightly bound in time and space. In other words, the local community represents a tangible manifestation of the larger social order. It is at this mesostructural level that most people meet their daily needs, and it is at least partially through the interactions which occur there that we develop an understanding of how society operates.

Locality-based interaction is also important because it is fundamentally implicated in the development of the self. As Mead *(1934)* argued, the self does not exist as an entity lodged within the isolated individual; selves take on meaning only through the relationships in which we are embedded. According to this line of reasoning, the self first arises in interactions with specific others. Later, when we come into contact with a wider range of people, our concept of self is influenced by these interactions as well. Mead *(1934, 155)* calls this the generalized other and claims that this "social process influences the behavior of the individuals involved in it . . . for it is this form that the

social process or community enters as a determining factor into the individual's thinking." In the course of this process, we develop bonds with specific and generalized others, and, by taking the role of the other, we become aware of the role we play in social interaction and what it means to be a social being. Hence the self, arising as it does out of this interaction process, connects the individual with society by creating a bond of shared meanings between interacting individuals.

Of course, the development of the self depends most heavily on intimate relationships. Nevertheless, broader patterns of social interaction play an important role in how we understand and relate to others. The inability to meet lower-order needs for food and shelter is the most obvious barrier to healthy development. But people can also develop a distorted or truncated understanding of their relationships with others if the local society is riddled with violence and inequality. "Social conditions, therefore, play an important, if not an all-powerful role, in individual well-being. The most important social conditions for this purpose are those that minimize interferences with natural processes of individual and interindividual consciousness" *(Wilkinson, 1991, 69-70)*.

> *"Collective actions . . . can be viewed as an important component of well-being because they provide an opportunity to contribute to something larger than ourselves."*

Finally, the local community is still a setting in which people can work with others to accomplish various tasks. Collective actions, in turn, can be viewed as an important component of well-being because they provide an opportunity to contribute to something larger than ourselves. Although there is debate about the extent to which collective actions occur in many communities today, the available evidence suggests that community action, when it does occur, enhances individual and social well-being. In a study of four small communities in Pennsylvania, for instance, Claude, Bridger, and Luloff *(2000)* found that in localities characterized by high levels of activeness, residents rated community well-being higher than did residents in communities characterized by low levels of activeness. Interestingly, success was *not* the most important factor in residents' perceptions of

well-being. In fact, in those places characterized by high levels of activeness and low levels of success, residents were more likely to rank social well-being higher than their counterparts in communities characterized by low levels of activeness and high levels of success.

To argue that community is rooted in territorially based social interaction does not in any way imply some utopian model of community in which interaction is based primarily on positive sentiments. Not only is this definition unrealistic, it so greatly narrows the range of relationships to which "community" can be applied that the concept becomes practically and analytically useless. Clearly, a less restrictive approach is needed, one that recognizes and allows for both conflictual and harmonious interaction. People interact with one another in all sorts of ways; what is important is the fact of interaction. When interaction is suppressed, community is limited. And when community is limited, conditions are not optimal for the realization of individual or social well-being *(Wilkinson 1991; Dewey 1954)*.

Toward a Model of University Engagement

Our definition of community suggests a unique model of university engagement: The engaged university works in partnership with local people to facilitate the broad range of community interaction that fosters individual and social well-being. It happens through "direct interaction with external constituencies and communities through mutually beneficial exchange, exploration, and application of knowledge, expertise and information. These interactions enrich and expand the learning and discovery functions of the academic institution while also enhancing community capacity" *(Holland 2001, 10)*.

To better understand this approach to engagement, it is important to distinguish development *of* community and development *in* the community *(Summers 1986)*. Development in the community refers to instrumental activities such as job creation, business retention, and workforce training initiatives. Development of community is a broader process and occurs as local residents interact with one another on projects and issues—especially those that build linkages across groups and interest lines. In other words, development of community involves purposive efforts to strengthen the community field *(Luloff and Bridger 2003)*. The most important aspect of these efforts is their emphasis on developing relationships and lines of

communication across interest groups. By creating these linkages, a generalized structure emerges—one that can be mobilized to address shared problems and concerns. Community development involves purposive attempts to build this structure and enhance local capacity to improve individual and social well-being of local residents *(Claude et al. 2000)*.

Traditionally, university outreach efforts have been directed mainly toward development in the community. In many instances, this is an appropriate strategy. Indeed, to paraphrase Kaufman *(1985)*, development that does not begin with jobs and income does not begin. The problem, however, is that an exclusive emphasis on economic development or other activities designed to enhance material well-being does not necessarily lead to improvements in individual and social well-being. Growth, for instance, while it can bring needed material resources, can also increase inequality and divisiveness *(Bridger 1996; Daniels 1999; Bridger and Luloff 1999)*. When this happens, the interaction upon which community depends can be suppressed. On the other hand, there is evidence to suggest that when growth promotion strategies reduce inequality and other barriers to interaction, they can contribute to the development of community *(Wilkinson 1991; Claude et al. 2000)*.

Ensuring that development in the community is not a threat to the development of community requires a three-pronged strategy. Obviously, it must first ensure that people have the resources to meet basic needs. But it must also encourage the development of services, institutions, groups, and facilities required to create a complete table of social organization. And it must foster equity and social justice *(Bridger et al. 2004)*.

Outside agencies and government policies can play a useful role in helping people meet basic needs, but implementing the other aspects of this strategy will require local action. This in turn requires the creation of what Korten calls enabling settings. Rather than having an organization or agency acting to meet peoples' needs, Korten *(1984, 302)* argues that we must "create an enabling setting within which people can be more effective in meeting those needs themselves."

Achieving this objective will not be easy, because, as Korten *(1984, 303)* observes:

> The creation of enabling settings calls for much more varied and sophisticated analysis than does dealing with

more conventional allocative planning decisions, which commonly involve little more than budgeting resources between existing bureaucracies and programs. The creation of enabling settings may require changes in the law, the restructuring of incentives, and the development of new local capacities. It almost invariably requires fundamental reorientation in the purposes, structures, and operations of government bureaucracies—away from direct service delivery or resource management to local capacity building and support.

Universities possess the intellectual resources and capabilities to help realize this vision. But university potential can be realized only if faculty embrace their role as citizen and expert simultaneously. This orientation requires that individual faculty see their work as contributing to the development of community by consciously focusing on civic renewal while also providing expert advice and assistance. To accomplish these often competing objectives, faculty must strive to develop a complementary relationship between scholarly achievement and the public good.

Public Scholarship

This is a daunting challenge. There are obvious institutional barriers such as tenure and promotion policies that emphasize research at the expense of teaching and engagement. Equally, if not more important, however, is a prevailing view of scholarship—especially in the social and natural sciences—that privileges facts over values *(Sullivan 1995)*. Problems are to be solved through the application of methical, objective procedures. The scientist approaches the world from a stance of detached objectivity. Objectivity, of course, has a place in scientific research. However, when objectivity becomes more of an ideology than simply a part of the scientific method, it is a powerful deterrent to the kind of research-based activities that are required if we hope to solve the many problems that are undermining communities across the country. Engagement cannot happen when strict adherence to objectivity prevents us from confronting the moral and ethical questions that inevitably accompany the application of knowledge in real-world settings.

As several observers have pointed out *(Sullivan 1995; Flyvbjerg 2001; Ansley and Gaventa 1997; Peters et al. 2003)*, the strict separation of facts and values is a fiction. And more to the point, our preoccupation with objectivity and precision has failed to produce the knowledge we need to create healthy communities. If we hope to conduct more relevant, socially useful research, we must fundamentally change the kinds of questions we ask *(Flyvbjerg 2001)*. In place of the value-neutral questions that guide traditional scholarship, Flyvbjerg *(2001, 63)* suggests that we confront explicitly value-laden issues: "Where are we going? Is it desirable? What should be done? And who gains and who loses; by which mechanisms of power?" Answering these questions requires a close connection between scholars and the people and issues they study. It also means that "researchers can see no neutral ground, no 'view from nowhere,' for their work" *(Flyvbjerg 2001, 61)*. From this perspective, research that informs public deliberation and praxis is just as important as research that is of interest mainly to other academics *(Sullivan 1995; Flyvbjerg 2001)*.

> *"[R]esearch that informs public deliberation and praxis is just as important as research that is of interest mainly to other academics."*

The rapidly growing public scholarship movement represents an innovative approach to bridging the divide between scholarly research and praxis. As with any new concept, there is much definitional ambiguity surrounding public scholarship. For some, it is synonymous with traditional forms of outreach and extension. For others, it refers to a form of scholarship that advances a particular ideological agenda *(Wood 2003)*. Still others define public scholarship as service to the community.

While all of these approaches to scholarship have merit, they are not what we mean when we talk about public scholarship. Public scholarship, as we use the term, is scholarship that addresses important civic issues while simultaneously producing knowledge that meets high academic standards. This is scholarship that brings academics "into public space and public relationships in order to facilitate knowledge discovery, learning, and action relevant to civic issues and problems" *(Peters et al.*

2003, 76). Moreover, as Peters *(2003, 186)* argues, public scholarship involves an explicit rejection of the politics associated with technocratic elitism, advocacy models of service delivery, and ideological protest. In their place, public scholarship embraces "a democratic politics that is highly interactive, reciprocal, and developmental" *(Peters 2003, 186)*. Although scholars bring unique skills to the public arena, they are first and foremost citizens engaged with other citizens in working to address issues that affect us all. And in the course of this interaction and engagement, academics and publics benefit in important ways:

> What the academic offers to his or her local culture is the intellectual power of theoretical abstraction that derives from an academic discipline. The locality, in return, offers to the academic the particularity, the concreteness, of lived experience in time and place. The language and thought of each, academic intellect and public life, would both be recognized and changed in a civic conversation. *(Bender 1993, 145)*

This vision of scholarship is innovative in that it promises to provide tangible benefits to both parties in a way that traditional approaches to scholarship and outreach cannot. To demonstrate how public scholarship can achieve these aims, Peters and colleagues *(2003)* and Peters and colleagues *(2005)* have developed a set of practitioner profiles of public scholars in the land-grant system. All of these individuals have developed integrated research and engagement strategies that have produced cutting-edge research across the social and natural sciences while addressing pressing social problems. Academic outcomes have ranged from increased understanding of the human dimensions of natural resource use to wildlife management to a new theory of urban poverty. And in each case, engagement has built community capacity to address local problems in ways that foster individual and social well-being.

Conclusion

When scholars participate in the kind of civic conversation envisioned by Bender, they can make an important contribution to community development by creating the enabling settings that foster the collective interaction upon which community and

individual and social well-being depend. To be effective in this realm, however, public scholars must develop a unique set of skills and associated value commitments *(Peters et al. 2003)*. First, and most obviously, they must be skilled in conducting research that is both applied and theoretical. To do this effectively, they must be actively involved in those public arenas where issues are being debated and discussed. In that context, they must to translate these issues into theoretical terms, then translate theoretical framing of issues back into the language and practices that usefully inform public debate and problem solving.

Public scholarship also requires a strong set of civic and interpersonal skills. One of the key skills is the ability to identify and negotiate between the interests of diverse, sometimes hostile, groups. This involves a combination of respect and a willingness to pose difficult and uncomfortable questions when necessary. Another important skill is the ability to listen closely to the motives and interests of different groups and individuals and facilitate dialogue and debate in ways that help to create those enabling settings that encourage people to meaningfully participate in the decisions that affect them and their communities.

Behind these skills lies a set of value-based commitments that facilitate the combination of scholarly and civic missions. These include a commitment to the belief that a healthy civil society depends on healthy communities, and that healthy communities in turn require open dialogue, leadership development, environmental stewardship and sustainability, fairness, and social justice. Above all, public scholarship is rooted in a firm belief that the search for a better life demands an active, grassroots democratic process—a process in which scholarly expertise is just one of many vital voices.

As Benjamin Barber *(1998)* reminds us, civil society depends on civil talk. At its best, the practice of public scholarship can help restore civility to the discourse that is central to the search for solutions to the issues affecting our communities. It does this by modeling the democratic process, which in turn fosters the activeness and community interaction upon which individual and social well-being depend. Public scholarship can play a vital role in encouraging interaction "among people with different interests, perspectives, and opinions—an encounter in which they mutually revise opinions and interests, both individual and common" *(Pitkin and Shumer 1982, 47)*.

The encounters that public scholarship requires always involve some degree of conflict and are based on imperfect

knowledge, but they are essential to community action. The important point is that they are grounded in genuine discourse; the values and skills associated with public scholarship facilitate this kind of communication. The key challenges for universities are to broaden the engagement agenda to complement development in the community with development of community, and to create the institutional platforms and supports that encourage public scholarship.

References

Ansley, F., and J. Gaventa. 1997. Researching for democracy and democratizing research. *Change 29*(1):46–54.

Barber, B. R. 1998. *A place for US: How to make society civil and democracy strong.* New York: Hill and Wang.

Bender, T. 1978. *Community and social change in America.* New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.

Bender, T. 1993. *Intellect and public life.* Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Bok, D. 2003. *Universities in the marketplace.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Boyer, E. L. 1990. *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate.* New York: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Boyte, H. C., and N. N. Kari. 1996. *The democratic promise of public work.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Bridger, J. C. 1996. Community imagery and the built environment. *Sociological Quarterly 37*(3): 353–74.

Bridger, J. C., and A. E. Luloff. 1999. Toward an interactional approach to sustainable community development. *Journal of Rural Studies 15*(4): 377–87.

Bridger, J. C., T. R. Alter, S. Sager, J. Schement, W. Shuffstall, and M. Tate. 2004. Sustainable rural community development in the information age. Paper presented at the Fourth Goddard Forum: Developing Sustainable Communities, 12 May, Harrisburg, Pa.

Bridger, J. C., A. E. Luloff, and R. S. Krannich. 2002. Community change and community theory. In *Persistence and change in rural communities: A 50-year follow-up to six classic studies,* edited by A. E. Luloff and R. S. Krannich, 9–22. New York: CABI Publishing.

Claude, L. P., J. C. Bridger, and A. E. Luloff. 2000. Community well-being and local activeness. In *Small town and rural economic development: A case studies approach,* edited by P. V. Schaeffer and S. Loveridge, 39–45. Westport, Conn.: Praeger.

Cronon, W. 1991. *Nature's metropolis: Chicago and the Great West.* New York: Norton.

Daniels, T. 1999. *When city and country collide: Managing growth in the metropolitan fringe.* Washington, D.C.: Island Press.

Dewey, J. 1954. *The public and its problems.* Athens, Ohio: Swallow Press.

Flyvbjerg, B. 2001. *Making social science matter: Why social inquiry fails and how it can succeed again.* Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Hillery, G. A., Jr. 1955. Definitions of community: Areas of agreement. *Rural Sociology 20*(2): 111–23.

Holland, B. 2001. Exploring the challenge of documenting and measuring civic engagement endeavors of colleges and universities. Paper presented at the Campus Compact, Advanced Institute on Classifications For Civic Engagement, 23 March. Available at http://www.compact.org/advancedtoolkit/measuring.html.

Hyman, D., E. Gurgevich, T. R. Alter, J. Ayers, E. Cash, D. Fahnline, D. Gold, R. Herrman, P. Jurs, D. Roth, J. Swisher, M. S. Whittington, and H. Wright. 2001–2002. Beyond Boyer: The UniSCOPE model of scholarship for the 21st century. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach And Engagement 7*(1&2): 41–66.

Kaufman, H. F. 1985. An action approach to community development. In *Focus on community,* edited by F. A. Fear and H. K. Schwarzweller, 53–65. Volume 2 of *Research in rural sociology and development.* Greenwich, Conn.: JAI Press.

Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities. 1999. *Returning to our roots: The engaged institution.* Washington, D.C.: National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.

Konig, R. 1968. *The community.* Translated by E. Fitzgerald. New York: Schocken Books.

Korten, D. C. 1984 People-centered development: Toward a framework. In *People-centered development: Contributions toward theory and planning frameworks,* edited by D. C. Korten and R. Klauss, 299–333. West Hartford, Conn.: Kumarian Press.

Luloff, A. E., and J. C. Bridger. 2003. Community agency and local development. In *Challenges for rural America in the 21st century,* edited by D. L. Brown and L. E. Swanson, 203–13. University Park, Pa.: Penn State University Press.

Mead, G. H. 1934. *Mind, self, and society: From the standpoint of a social behaviorist.* Edited by C. W. Morris. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Peters, S. J. 2003. Reconstructing civic professionalism in academic life: A response to Mark Wood's paper, "From service to solidarity." *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement 8*(2): 183–98.

Peters, S. J., N. R. Jordan, M. Adamek, and T. R. Alter. 2005. *Engaging campus and community: The practice of public scholarship in the state and land-grant university system.* Dayton, Ohio: Kettering Foundation Press.

Peters, S. J., N. R. Jordan, T. R. Alter, and J. C Bridger. 2003. The craft of public scholarship in land-grant education. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement 8*(1): 75–86.

Pitkin, H. S., and S. M. Shumer. 1982. On participation. *Democracy 2*: 43–54.

Strauss, A. 1961. *Images of the American city.* New York: Free Press of Glencoe.

Sullivan, W. M. 1995. *Work and integrity: The crisis and promise of professionalism in America.* New York: HarperBusiness.

Summers, G. F. 1986. Rural community development. *Annual Review of Sociology 12*: 341–71.

Warren, R. L. 1978. *The community in America.* 3rd ed. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Wellman, B. 1979. The community question: The intimate ties of East Yorkers. *American Journal of Sociology 84*: 363–90.

Wilkinson, K. P. 1991. *The community in rural America.* Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press.

Wood, M. 2003. From service to solidarity: Engaged education and democratic globalization. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement 8*(2): 165–82.

About the Authors

• Jeffrey C. Bridger is senior research associate in the Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology at Penn State University. His research focuses on sustainable community development in rural America. As part of this agenda, he is currently conducting an analysis of the relationship between social capital and economic development in rural communities.

• Theodore R. Alter is professor of agricultural, environmental, and regional economics in the Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology at Penn State University. His research and extension programs have focused on rural and community economic development, public sector economics, and comparative rural development policy.