University Leaders' Use of Episodic Power to Support Faculty Community Engagement

KerryAnn O'Meara
University of Maryland College Park

Andrew Lounder
University of Maryland College Park

Aleece Hodges
Michigan State University

This study explores faculty perceptions of the actions taken by organizational leaders to support the faculty's community engagement. We draw upon Lawrence's (2008) theory of power and agency in organizations to name these strategic actions as episodic power and consider how and why each act taken by organizational leaders mattered to these community-engaged faculty.

Each year university leaders attend conferences and trainings where they learn strategies to encourage and enable faculty community engagement at their respective institutions, such as instituting faculty development programs, providing infrastructure support, and offering seed grants for engaged teaching and research projects. Similarly, organizational leaders are encouraged to signal their support of faculty community engagement by helping make it visible, acknowledging it within academic reward systems, and making it central to campus mission, strategy, and general education reform. Each of these organizational support strategies is recommended by scholars and academic leaders to institutionalize community engagement (Furco & Holland, 2004; Hinck & Brandell, 2000; Holland, 1997; Hollander, Saltmarsh, & Zlotkowski, 2001; Sandmann, Thornton, & Jaeger, 2009). Often organizational leaders return in subsequent years to the same conferences to report on the practices they put in place to create a more engaged campus.

Missing in this picture are the experiences of the end-users of these reforms. That is, few studies have examined the experiences of faculty receiving these various forms of support. In fact, we know little about how community-engaged faculty experience support from their organizational leaders. What forms do faculty see that support taking? What influence does such support have on a faculty member's sense that they can accomplish their community engagement goals? Research has established that faculty experience many barriers to involvement in community engagement across institutional settings (Abes, Jackson, & Jones, 2002; Bloomgarden, 2008;

O'Meara, 2002, 2011; Vogelgesang, Denson, & Jayakumar, 2010). Given these barriers, do the actions organizational leaders take mitigate or overcome structures and cultures that discourage community engagement? Which kinds of support are most important to faculty and why? Understanding the answers to these questions is important for colleges and universities seeking to encourage faculty engagement with communities.

Exploring these questions also requires awareness of key contexts. First, not all faculty are equally invested in community engagement. Members of organizations are more likely to notice cues and signals from organizational leaders if they prioritize this work and have some part of their identity invested in it (Weick, 1995). Thus, faculty who are most involved in community engagement are likely to be the most aware of signals and specific acts of support by their organizational leaders. Second, community-engaged faculty do not experience actions on the part of organizational leaders in a vacuum but nested in specific institutional contexts and fields (Bloomgarden, 2008; Braxton, 1986; Clark, 1987; Mundy, 2004). Also, community-engaged faculty experience supports as individuals in different career stages, in different disciplines, and with various other social identities and motivations (O'Meara & Niehaus, 2009; O'Meara, Terosky, & Neumann, 2008). As such, it is important to explore how contexts surrounding these acts of support influence how faculty experience them. Third, whenever an organizational leader works to support one activity or discourage another within an organizational hierarchy, they employ a source of power (Barbalet, 1985;

Lawrence, 2008; Powell & Dimaggio, 1991). Thus, it is important to have a framework that takes into account how actions taken by organizational leaders are experienced as sources and exchanges of power.

To understand how community-engaged faculty perceive actions on the part of organizational leaders to support community engagement, we draw upon Lawrence's (2008) theory of power and agency in organizations. We interviewed exemplar community-engaged faculty to understand the kinds of signals and supports they perceived were employed by organizational leaders on their behalf. In each case, community-engaged faculty acknowledged that their institution and the field of higher education more generally have routine and dominant practices inimical to faculty community engagement. Yet, they also described specific strategic actions taken by organizational leaders as well as university-wide policies and procedures put in place by organizational leaders that supported their community engagement and enhanced their sense of agency in this work. We use Lawrence's (2008) theory of power and agency within organizations and fields to name these strategic actions as episodic power enacted by organizational leaders. We further consider how and why each act of episodic power mattered to faculty as individuals nested in institutions and fields not always hospitable to this work. In the next section we situate this study within traditions of neo-institutionalism (NI) and then present Lawrence's (2008) theory of power and agency within organizations and its relevance to understanding faculty perceptions of support marshaled on their behalf.

Theoretical Framework: Power, Agency, and Institutional Control

Background Context

Our framing of support for community-engaged faculty and their work was influenced by traditions of neo-institutionalism (NI), which focuses the researcher on common interactions in the organizational setting while recognizing that those micro interactions are connected to structural and cultural realities constructed in a larger field (Gonzales, 2012; Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Phillips & Malhotra, 2008; Powell & Colyvas, 2008; Powell & DiMaggio, 1991; Scott, 1991). Such a positioning acknowledges the powerful role of structure in framing individuals' professional choices but also acknowledges that organizational leaders, as with faculty, have agency (Archer, 2009; Baez, 2000; Gonzales, 2012; Huckaby, 2008; Marshall, 2000; Neumann, Terosky, & Schnell, 2006). Such agency involves, as Sen (1985) observed, "the ability to act on behalf of goals that matter to [oneself]" (p. 203). Thus, while negoti-

ating power-bound organizational settings and institutional fields, individual faculty and administrators can assume agency and make creative choices, some of which work to maintain and advance the status quo and some of which push toward transformation. For example, when a department chair diverts funds usually used to support research to seed a service-learning project, s/he has made a choice that asserts agency in support of the faculty member.

Thus our starting point is situated in NI theory and studies of organizational leaders and faculty who have agency in organizational institutions and fields. Each organizational leader supporting the participants in this study engages in power relations within a milieu of established academic expectations and norms (Archer, 2009; Gonzales, 2012; Phillips & Malhotra, 2008). To understand the exercise of agency amid power relations and the resistance experienced in this milieu, we draw on Lawrence's (2008) model, which considers the interplay of institutional controls, resistance to controls, the use of power, and the exercise of agency.

Institutional Controls

Lawrence (2008) used the term "institutional controls" to describe the daily practices, assumptions, policies, and programs shaping organizational member behaviors and beliefs toward organizational goals and field patterns and practices. While each college and university has its respective set of institutionalized practices, procedures, priorities, and values, community engagement is rarely a major priority within any university culture, regardless of type. In most four-year colleges and universities, traditional forms of research and teaching receive greater recognition and reward than community engagement (Fairweather, 1996, 2002, 2005; O'Meara, 2002, 2011; Ward, 2003). For example, hiring practices, promotion and tenure standards, distribution of faculty awards, release time, and resource distribution decisions tend to favor research in research and doctoral universities, a mixture of teaching and research in comprehensive universities, and teaching in community colleges and liberal arts colleges (Ward, 2003). But how do organizations maintain priorities? Which institutional controls maintain the status quo, precluding community engagement as a priority?

The literature about the support of community engagement reveals many spaces or sites of institutional control and encourages advocates of community engagement to target them for transformation; for example, integrating faculty community engagement into mission, vision, and strategic plans (Bringle & Hatcher, 2000; Driscoll, 2008; Holland, 1997; Hollander et al., 2001) allows institutions to articulate priorities and goals as a form of institu-

tional control. The literature on institutionalizing community engagement points to the importance of leadership from presidents, provosts, deans, and department chairs (Driscoll; Furco & Holland, 2004; Hollander et al., 2001); enlisting community engagement staff to support the work (Bringle & Hatcher; Furco & Holland, 2004; 2009; Hollander et al.); offering faculty development opportunities (Austin & Beck, 2010; Bloomgarden & O'Meara, 2007; Furco, 2003); integration into campus faculty roles and rewards systems (Abes et al., 2002; Furco, 2002; Morton & Troppe, 1996; Mundy, 2004; O'Meara, 2002, 2004; O'Meara & Rice, 2005; Saltmarsh, Giles, O'Meara, Sandmann, Ward, & Buglione, 2009); integration into curricular requirements and signature programs (Butin, 2010; Zlotkowski, 1999); marketing (Morton & Troppe, 1996; Holland, 1997); and integration into campus research and assessment (Bringle & Hatcher; Driscoll). Researchers often describe these targets for institutionalization as structural and cultural sectors of the university. But they also are political sites, where power is employed to support specific views and practices. These loci of institutional control anchor and shape the contexts within which community-engaged faculty work. Because institutional controls frame and maintain dominant conceptions of legitimate faculty activity (Gonzales, 2012), faculty who decide to undertake community engagement work and organizational leaders who do or do not support them do so in organizational contexts with established institutional controls impacting how and in what ways organizational leaders and faculty assume agency.

Agency and Resistance

When individuals assume agency to support an activity or position they "mobilize resources, engage in institutional contests over meanings and practices, develop, support or attack forms of discourse and practice—all involving discrete, strategic acts of mobilization" (Lawrence, 2008, p. 174). In the case of assuming agency to support faculty community engagement, organizational leaders most often would do so in resistance to powerful institutional controls prioritizing other forms of faculty work. Lawrence adopted Barbalet's (1985) position that "resistance imposes limits on power" (p. 531) that is enacted through institutional controls. For example, if a department chair makes a point of amending departmental criteria for merit pay and evaluation to also include reports, grant applications, and other products that may result from community-engaged scholarship, s/he disrupts the system of rewards that prioritizes peer-reviewed articles over other forms of faculty scholarship. S/he also is limiting the power of the field norm that likewise prioritizes peer-reviewed

scholarship over other forms—though it still is at play in the overall system of influences. As another example, in institutions where teaching is the dominant faculty responsibility, such as with community colleges, rewarding community-engaged research would be disruptive of that system.

Power

When individuals within an organization assume agency, whether to maintain, limit, or resist norms, they enact power. Power and agency are intimately connected in organizational theory (Giddens, 1984; Lawrence, 2008). Lawrence observed: "Power is the property of relationships such that the beliefs or behaviors of an actor are affected by another actor or system. Thus, power is a relational phenomenon, rather than a commodity…an effect of social relations (p. 174)." With regard to the present study, the use of power is central to how organizational leaders support faculty community engagement. Department chairs, deans, provosts, and senior colleagues can assume agency by using power to achieve community engagement goals.

Lawrence (2008) outlined two types of power—episodic and systemic. Episodic power is defined as "relatively discrete, strategic acts of mobilization initiated by self-interested actors" (p. 174). Two forms of episodic power are influence and force. Organizational leaders tend to use influence rather than force to accomplish their organizational goals. Leadership and political studies are rife with examples of influence that focus on one actor persuading another to do something s/he would not otherwise do (Clegg, 1989). Actors do this in many ways, including negotiation, moral persuasion, exchange, framing problems, and using one's positional influence. Fligstein (1997) noted influence is a form of "skilled social action" dependent in part on social skills. Lawrence observed that force, on the other hand, involves directly "overcoming" the actions or intentions of another, such as when protesters block a building entrance (p. 183); firing individuals and slashing budgets without notice are additional examples of the use of force. However, the kind of power most typically enacted by organizational leaders is influence.

Systemic power, on the other hand, "works through routine, ongoing practices to advantage particular groups without those groups necessarily establishing or maintaining those practices" (Lawrence, 2008, p. 174). Faculty socialization processes, university accreditation, and ranking systems all operate to exert control through systemic power. For example, if faculty who have received large grants are routinely the only ones acknowledged at an annual faculty awards luncheon, this both socializes individuals toward seeking large grants and reinforces the grant-

seeking status quo; the ritual shapes attendees' professional self-image and exerts control on his/her behavior. Such everyday practices discipline the individual by constructing an image of "the normal" (Lawrence, 2008, p. 178). Another form of systemic power is domination, which Lawrence argued "works by altering the range of options available to actors" (p. 178). Such limitation of options can be overt or subtle. Senior colleagues advising junior faculty not to engage with the community until after achieving tenure because doing so may jeopardize being promoted creates a discourse of domination—a limiting of options based on one representation of reality. In contrast, a sense of agency is enhanced when faculty feel there are multiple options for ways to achieve a goal (O'Meara, Campbell, & Terosky, 2011).

Individuals may take actions or have views that work against some mechanisms of institutional control but maintain and reinforce others. Whereas episodic power tends to be enacted by individuals, systemic power tends to be embedded in values and norms of organizations (Lawrence, 2008). We use Lawrence's framework as a way to consider how organizational leaders displayed different kinds of episodic power to overcome institutional controls that delegitimize faculty community engagement. Research questions guiding this study included:

- How did community-engaged faculty perceive organizational leaders' support of their community engagement?

- Which institutional controls were disrupted, limited, and/or transformed by organizational leaders?

- How did organizational leaders' strategic actions influence the sense of agency community-engaged faculty experienced toward their work?

Methods

The underlying premise beneath NI and Lawrence's (2008) model is social construction of reality. We were interested in the experiences of faculty involved in community engagement as they described them. We also were interested in the cultural and structural elements of the organizational setting surrounding those experiences. Our primary data-gathering technique was interviewing. Interviews have been found to be an ideal method to uncover faculty perceptions and experiences within work environments and to understand how actors make meaning of cultures and structures, including interactions (Kuh & Whitt, 1988; Schein, 1993; Yin, 1994). We focused on highly involved community-engaged faculty because we deemed them to be more likely to be aware of support marshaled for and institutional controls limiting community engagement by

virtue of having professional identities and interests in this area.

Thirty-four faculty were contacted, 30 agreeing to be interviewed, and all were past winners and nominees of major national and international community engagement awards (i.e., Ernest Lynton Award for the Scholarship of Engagement, Thomas Ehrlich Civically Engaged Faculty Award, and the International Association for Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement's Distinguished Research Award). Participants were identified through snowball sampling (Merriam, 1998), which was made possible by the first author's participation on these award committees as well as through participation in national civic engagement conferences.

The interviews, conducted by the first or second author, in person or over the phone, ran 60-75 minutes. They were semi-structured—all faculty were asked the same questions and allowed to further explore thoughts emerging from the inquiry. Interview questions focused on: (a) those actions taken by organizational leaders to support faculty community engagement, (b) the kinds of barriers faculty faced and the degree to which organizational leaders' actions helped mitigate them, and (c) how faculty felt about their work as a result of such support. Participants included: 13 men and 17 women; 4 faculty of color and 26 White faculty. Within the sample there were faculty representing 15 disciplines. Of the 30, 8 were early-career, 7 were mid-career, and 15 were late-career. All but one were tenured or tenure track. Institutional types included 20 research and doctoral universities, 7 comprehensive universities, 2 liberal arts colleges, and 1 community college. Table 1 describes contextual and demographic data for faculty participants such that anonymity, promised to the participants, would be assured. Participant details related to career stage, demographics, and institutional type are identified in the findings only when they were important for how episodic power and institutional controls were perceived and experienced by participants.

Consistent with methodological norms of qualitative inquiry, data analysis began with the reading and rereading of the interview transcripts and accompanying materials (see below) to identify key emerging themes (Merriam, 1998; Miles & Huberman, 1994). Using a "constant comparative" method (Merriam), we analyzed each interview for critical interactions between the faculty, key organizational leaders, and the support structures organizational leaders put in place related to community engagement. We also analyzed each interview for whether and how interactions contributed to faculty sense of agency in community engagement. The data analysis process was both concept- and data-driven (Kvale &

Table 1
Participant Information.

Pseudonym	Gender	Race	Discipline	Type	Rank
Jonah	M	W	Institute/Center	RU/H	Lecturer
Abby	F	L	Professional	RU/H	Associate
Sarah	F	W	Social Science	RU/H	Full
Jennifer	F	W	STEM	RU/VH	Assistant
Kaela	F	W	Professional	RU/VH	Assistant
Allison	F	L	STEM	RU/VH	Full
Jan	F	W	Humanities	RU/H	Associate
Ted	M	W	Professional	Master's L	Full
Daniel	M	W	Social Science	RU/VH	Emeritus
Tiffany	F	W	Humanities	RU/H	Associate
Eve	F	W	Social Science	Master's L	Assistant
John	M	W	Social Science	Master's L	Full
Kelly	F	W	Natural Science	RU/VH	Full
Tom	M	W	Social Science	Bac/Diverse	Full
Charlotte	F	A	Humanities	Assoc/Pub-U-MC	Full
Brian	M	W	Social Science	DRU	Assistant
Tricia	F	W	Humanities	DRU	Associate
Luis	M	L	Social Science	Bac/A&S	Full
Diane	F	W	Humanities	Master's M	Associate
Greg	F	W	Humanities	RU/VH	Assistant
William	M	W	Professional	RU/VH	Assistant
Eric	M	W	Social Science	Master's L	Assistant
Ashley	F	W	Social Science	RU/H	Asst.
Joslyn	F	W	Humanities	RU/VH	Full
Mariah	F	W	Humanities	RU/VH	Full
Simon	M	W	Natural Science	RU/VH	Full
Lynn	F	W	Professional	RU/VH	Emeritus
Fred	M	W	Professional	RU/H	Full
Martin	M	W	Humanities	Master's L	Full
Russell	M	W	Social Science	Master's L.	Full

Notes: M = male, F = female; W = White, L = Latina/o, A = Asian-American; disciplines were grouped into five broad categories: professional, social science, humanities, natural science, and STEM; Carnegie classifications used to categorize institutional types may be found at http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/descriptions/basic.php; ranks included lecturer, assistant professor, associate professor, full professor, and emeritus (recently retired as full professor with further distinction of emeritus).

Brinkman, 2009). Concept-driven coding involves the use of pre-determined codes from the literature to guide analysis of the data, whereas data-driven coding allows key codes or themes to emerge from the findings (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Furthermore, we followed Creswell's (2008) suggestion to identify the prevalence of each type of support in presenting qualitative findings.

Overall trustworthiness was strengthened by collecting data from multiple sources (Lincoln & Guba, 2000), i.e. interviews and documents. These documents (e.g., grant applications, personnel narratives, descriptions of projects, award nomination materials, and respective university reward system policies) helped to create a fuller picture of participants' work environments and triangulate findings. A report of initial findings was shared with 10 participants chosen randomly, and their feedback was incorporated as a form of member checking.

Internal validity was strengthened by each of the

authors analyzing the transcripts separately to develop themes and then compare conclusions. This was done through "thematic memoing" (Rossman & Rallis, 2003, p. 291-292) and then joint conceptualization of final themes and findings.

As with all qualitative inquiry, positionality is an important feature of this study. The first author has been involved in the study and support of faculty community engagement for many years and this experience undoubtedly influenced her analysis of the data. While such experience is not a weakness of the study, it was advantageous to have two co-authors with less direct involvement in community engagement controlling for potential predisposing by the first author.

Limitations

This study is subject to several limitations. Given that we interviewed community-engaged faculty rather than organizational leaders, our findings are

limited to faculty participant experiences of episodic power to support their work and systemic power and institutional controls at play in their environments. Also, although it was important to study support from the perspective of those exemplary engaged faculty who have much at stake in gaining this support, findings would no doubt be different among those faculty moderately and tangentially involved, who had had less external recognition and success in this work. At the same time, much of the literature on support of community engagement is written from the perspective of university administration. Given that such acts of support are intended to positively impact faculty sense of agency, the perspectives of engaged faculty themselves on this issue are valuable and relevant for policy and practice purposes. In addition, faculty perceptions of work environments have been found to be central to key outcomes such as turnover, productivity, satisfaction, and professional growth (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995; Bolin, 2000; Daly & Dee, 2006; Gappa, Austin, & Trice, 2007; Hagedorn, 2000; Johnsrud & Rosser, 2002; Lindholm, 2003; O'Meara et al., 2008; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006).

Results

There were six ways faculty perceived how episodic power was employed by organizational leaders to support their community engagement: (a) raising the community engagement profile on campus, (b) offering encouragement and advocacy (c) providing new funding and acting flexibly with use of existing funds, (d) creating and maintaining centers for community engagement and human resources, (e) reforming promotion, tenure, and merit pay criteria, and (f) shaping academic spaces that offered faculty autonomy and feedback. Community-engaged faculty reported that these specific strategic acts by organizational leaders influenced the agency the faculty experienced to do their work.

In most cases the use of episodic power by organizational leaders was an act of resistance to institutional controls, both at the specific university and within academia at large. At the same time, organizational leaders sought to institutionalize many of these episodic actions so that in the future they would become systemic. In each of the next six sections we unpack faculty perceptions of the uses of episodic power by organizational leaders in support of them and their engagement. We also explore the institutional controls working against faculty community engagement and how the actions taken by organizational leaders interacted with those barriers. Finally, in each section we explore how the actions of organizational leaders influenced faculty agency in community engagement.

Raising the Community Engagement Profile on Campus

Seven faculty (23%) said organizational leaders had elevated the profile and status of community engagement through campus speeches, interviews in campus publications, and campus marketing materials. As a result, the importance and legitimacy of community engagement had risen on their campuses in recent years. Common phrases used to describe this phenomenon included: community engagement had "taken hold," received "more play," "had more cachet," and had "support in the mission and vision." As a result, these faculty felt greater agency because they could see how their engagement work fit into a larger tapestry of others' efforts across their respective campuses. Because of the elevated profile, faculty understood community engagement work as a form of cultural and social capital. In other words, if organizational leaders kept signaling that this work mattered, these signals influenced how their work was perceived, recognized, and valued within the organization.

These signals raised the perceived legitimacy of community engagement on campus. Faculty said that organizational leaders mentioned community engagement in public discussions of organizational identity and policy-making and said good things about their projects within influential faculty circles and reward systems. These were expressions of episodic power. For example, one participant observed that because his provost had been lauding community engagement on campus, the promotion and tenure committee asked a faculty member to make sure this work was incorporated in her tenure portfolio:

> She had excluded all this work from her tenure stuff because we kind of thought maybe we need to keep it separate, and one of the folks on her tenure committee said, 'Where's all this work related to [your community engagement]? You need to include all this in your tenure stuff.' So, I thought that was an instance of someone recognizing that this work does have academic value, and what we're doing does relate to the academy.

Another community-engaged faculty member's experience in promotion and tenure illustrates how organizational leaders' actions to legitimize and raise the profile of community engagement mattered to faculty. This faculty member described having a difficult tenure process during a time when her campus had not yet embraced a community engagement agenda. Yet, she observed that when she went up for full professor (years later) the profile of engagement work on the campus had grown considerably, and this had helped her case. Specifically, there were more organizational leaders voicing support of the work in

public ways and providing resources to support it. She observed that the "higher profile" of community engagement coupled with broader faculty interest facilitated her promotion. Similarly another participant observed that although her dean admonished community-engaged faculty to also pursue "real work" (i.e., traditional scholarship), this faculty member also had found "pockets of people that are supportive of this work" because of its recent status among organizational leaders on the campus.

Faculty described institutionalized scripts on their campuses and in their fields—perceptibly derived from dominant interests in academia (Powell & DiMaggio, 1991) that delegitimized and devalued the importance of community engagement. In most cases faculty disciplinary fields and universities privileged research over teaching as 20 of the 30 participants were from research and doctoral universities. In the remaining 10 cases (community college, comprehensive, and liberal arts college) academic norms privileged teaching over research and/or treated community engagement as positive but discretionary. These institutional controls acted as a backdrop in the academic lives of community-engaged faculty. Organizational leaders resisted this backdrop by injecting discourse that made community engagement seem a more every day, legitimate, and desirable activity. Organizational leaders positioned community engagement as excellent teaching and scholarship. This framing and positioning enabled faculty to experience greater agency by increasing the legitimacy of their choice to be involved in community engagement.

Offering Encouragement and Advocacy

Consistent with Lawrence's (2008) observation that power is enacted through social interaction, all 30 (100%) of the community-engaged faculty noted the influence of key organizational leaders—usually department chairs, senior colleagues, provosts, or presidents—with whom they had a strong personal and professional relationship. These organizational leaders almost always held positions of power within hierarchical (administrative) or cultural (faculty) structures; they controlled resources and held influence in reward systems. However, a key way they exerted influence had little to do with financial resources. Rather, it mattered to faculty that these individuals were knowledgeable about their projects and expressed enthusiasm for them. These organizational leaders demonstrated "skilled social action" (Fligstein, 1997) by inviting community-engaged faculty to become involved in specific projects and connecting them to other faculty and groups involved in the same kind of work.

Terms participants used to describe the organizational leaders with whom faculty had relationships included "supportive," "encouraging," and "knowledgeable." Participants often mentioned that these organizational leaders had "created opportunities," "opened doors," "got the big picture," and "set the table" for the work to occur.

Some participants had exceptional relationships with university leaders, which greatly facilitated their work. For example, one participant noted his community engagement work was "in direct personal relationship to the provost and president." This faculty member explained that he was able to adjust the course approval process to better integrate course offerings with the time-sensitive needs of the community, and without the support of university leaders he would not have been able to accomplish his community engagement goals. Another participant credited her dean with her success in community engagement; he had gone out of his way to pull her into an initial community engagement project despite the fact that she had never thought of herself as "a public person."

Other community-engaged faculty benefitted from episodic enactments of power further down the administrative hierarchy. One participant's description of a supportive department chair was illustrative of many such experiences. She said:

> The chair of my department has been 100% supportive of me and the things I ask permission to do, applying for grants and trying new classes, and like I told you, I piloted a course. It takes a chair who is willing to take that risk, and she's been more than willing. I started small in the beginning, and I proved successful in some of the things I did, so each time I sort of ask for a little bit more. But my chair has been supportive.

This example holds two notable contributions with regard to institutional control. First, this faculty member noted in other parts of her interview, and hinted here, that the kind of support she received from her department chair was unusual at her university. Because this faculty member was pre-tenure she was particularly attentive to what her department chair signaled as "good risks" to take. The daily practices and culture of the university acted as institutional controls by discouraging faculty from trying new or nontraditional work, especially pre-tenure. But this community-engaged faculty member's department chair used her power to hold those forces at bay and did so incrementally to greater effect with each episode. In Barbalet's (1985) terms, the department chair's resistance to institutional controls limited their power. Second, the faculty member became a little more agentic each time she returned to her department chair, thereby exhibiting her own incremental resistance to institutional controls.

Participants primarily spoke of the power enacted

by executive leadership. Even subtle influence from these leaders was described as very important. Yet participants also mentioned senior faculty or colleagues from other disciplines who enacted forms of episodic power on their behalf. One participant described working with a colleague on campus who "had a lot of credibility inside his department and inside his college at the university." They began working together in a community engagement project that would become a prolific partnership resulting in publications and external funding. She noted that "ratcheting each other up" by trading challenges was instrumental to her agency in community engagement. In all cases, encouragement and advocacy from legitimate leaders with credibility and sway made engaged faculty feel protected, challenged, and confirmed. This, in turn, made them feel that they could accomplish their community engagement goals. This kind of episodic power illustrates Lawrence's (2008) theory of power as influence embedded in social relations—as it was the nature of the relationship and what happened in it that influenced faculty agency.

Providing New Resources and
Flexible Use of Existing Resources

Because there are limited resources to reward faculty and support their work in most colleges and universities, the circumstances of where, when, and how resources are expended send powerful messages to faculty about organizational values (Birnbaum, 1988; Gappa et al., 2005; Hagedorn, 2000). Twenty-three (77%) of the community-engaged faculty in this study experienced decisions made by organizational leaders to provide new resources for community engagement or to allow reallocation of existing resources. Most often, decisions about how to spend resources were made by academic administrators, though university senates and some small committees occasionally had control. When organizational leaders reallocated resources and allowed resources to be used flexibly for community engagement, it was against a backdrop of "institutional controls" that made these decisions seem counternormative.

These interventions by organizational leaders to push rules aside or provide new resources were very important. For example, one participant described an experience that illustrates some of the institutional controls encountered by community-engaged faculty when seeking support for their work. While she experienced help from staff, she was not able to get upper-level buy-in to support her project. Her story begins at the writing of a grant to support a community engagement project with both teaching and research components, which required the purchase of some building materials for public structures. She met with resistance on several fronts and observed:

> I struggle mightily with liability issues and with proposal funding issues, and I think it's because the university is set up for normal, typical teaching and research work, where you write grants, and you get overhead, and you ask for money for students and equipment and materials and supplies, and everyone knows how that works. But if you write a grant, at least from my institution, and you write for equipment, all equipment is tagged with the university stamp. They don't want to own equipment, because they don't want to be liable for it. So, I'm not allowed to write for equipment. I have to write for [other kinds of] materials and supplies. I have to jump through 50 hoops, because of liability.

This participant continued to note that she spent valuable time on a proposal to support this specific project. Yet, organizational leaders would not sign off because she could not secure overhead in the amounts they wanted. Eventually, she appealed to an upper level organizational leader and was turned down. The participant observed:

> So, I spend a lot of time being told no and figuring out how to address the no. Usually I can, because most people at [institution] are very willing to serve, and the staff are very willing to work with you. So, on one hand you've got the chancellor, the president, the provost all really publicly in favor of service-learning. But then, at the same time, you've got this other, ingrained culture at [institution], when it comes to fiscal stuff and funding that just does not support service-learning research.

This story captures both a strong sense of institutional controls working against a community-engaged faculty member and a missed opportunity for the organizational leader to intervene with episodic power on her behalf. There were, nevertheless, many examples where affirmative responses were provided by organizational leaders (e.g., stipends to support community engagement).

Five (17%) of the faculty in this study were awarded stipends by organizational leaders ranging from $1,000 to $5,000 to support community-engaged teaching or research. These stipends most often represented new line-item monies that organizational leaders set aside to support faculty involved in this work. One community-engaged faculty member noted that this made her feel extremely fortunate to work in her university and demonstrated alignment between administrative rhetoric and reality: "I'm at this [university] where they don't just say they believe in stuff, they actually give money to it." This faculty member's comment underscores her understanding that this expenditure was a unique and powerful act. Although

new monies were most often mentioned regarding fellowship programs or teaching or research support for community engagement, funds were similarly provided for transportation to and from sites, support personnel, and faculty release time.

Equally as important to new monies, though, was the flexibility of organizational leaders to divert existing resources toward community engagement. This reallocation often occurred at the request of the faculty member. One participant recalled:

> When I applied for the grant I met with the chair and asked if I could use a portion of the funding to buy out my time, and he was fine with that, so for example there were a couple of semesters where I wasn't required to teach a class, but it was understood that I'd be doing lots of other things.

What is evident in this story and many others was a willingness of supportive organizational leaders to be flexible with resources they controlled, such as reallocation of grant dollars and workload adjustments.

As a counterpoint to the experience of institutional controls that prevented one faculty member from accessing grant support, another faculty member discussed organizational leaders thinking creatively to circumvent red tape. His outreach work was expanding rapidly and required additional funds to grow. Executive leadership helped him create a separate nonprofit structure adjacent to, but not part of, his university, which allowed him to raise his own funds. He said:

> If I didn't have this separate 501(c)3, I think it would be much harder for me to raise money for these efforts, because everything would have to go through the advancement office. You know, I'm not allowed to go to [corporation] and ask for $20,000 for the Center, because the [institution] is in the process of asking them for $1,000,000. I'm just an annoyance to their university fundraising efforts. But because I have that separate nonprofit, I can raise money from whoever I want for that. It's just housed at the university.

Another way organizational leaders reallocated existing resources in flexible ways was the reshaping of faculty appointment types and workloads. One faculty member observed:

> So, in order to align some of the work I was doing with my appointment, my appointment was actually switched [by department chair and dean]. So, now I am 50% teaching, about 25% research, and then about 25% teaching research. I'm very free to do essentially whatever I would like to do in that 25% teaching research.

Other faculty described how organizational leaders

helped them fashion joint faculty and administrative appointments and use sabbaticals to focus on community engagement.

Faculty participants experienced the allocation of resources as a source of influence marshaled on their behalf. They noted that resources were often scarce and people noticed when and how they were allocated. Faculty interpreted being given resources and organizational structures that allowed them to use those resources in flexible ways as affirmations that they were doing work organizational leaders considered central to institutional mission and priorities. They experienced this kind of support as unusual and important. It buoyed their sense of agency in the work.

Creating Bridge Centers and Human Resource Support

Twenty (67%) of the participants in this study mentioned the support they received from directors and centers of community engagement (bridge personnel). Center staff assisted engaged faculty with practical issues, such as transportation for students, disseminating information about funding opportunities, and connecting them to national service-learning and engagement networks. There were differences by career stage in the kinds of support that faculty observed as most helpful. For example, one assistant professor observed that the community engagement director on her campus had been helpful in getting started:

> [She was] very useful to me in guiding me and offering me advice on doing the work I wanted to do. We also have—the college of arts and sciences—has a community engagement person. She comes out of the [name] department, and she's offered me a lot of advice and direction, as well. There's no funding there, but there's a support person who knows the university and knows the structure and knows what it takes to make these things happen at our university. So, she's been very useful.

For one associate professor, the director was helpful in other ways, such as publicizing the work and generally being an advocate.

> I would say what has been supporting it tremendously at [university] has been our center. [Name of Director] runs that shop and has for years, and I always say I need to start paying her publicity fees. She is absolutely a tremendous supporter of me, of many people around the campus. I feel like service-learning has really taken hold at the university, in large part because of her efforts over the past dozen years or so. So, in terms of facilitation, that's very helpful.

Directors of community engagement became

involved in many other kinds of formal and informal recognition of faculty work. For example, one faculty member described how community engagement staff in his institution wrote or facilitated getting letters of support for community-engaged faculty on his campus. He said:

> Since we've been there, the ones that are interested in it are really grateful for our help and for the acknowledgement, and we help facilitate letters from the president and the provost to all the faculty that are doing this cool stuff and help them personalize letters. It sounds sort of cheesy and small, but it makes a big difference.

This faculty member worked at a research university where institutional controls such as hiring, promotion and tenure processes, and awards privileged research over other forms of work. However, by supporting community engagement centers and sending letters from executive leadership to praise this kind of work, directors of community engagement engaged in periodic resistance or opposition to these controls.

In sum, when organizational leaders created bridge centers with director positions and funded their growth they enacted episodic power on behalf of community-engaged faculty. Faculty experienced advocacy and advice from organizational leaders as everyday practices that moved their work forward and made them feel more able to accomplish their engagement goals. These generative uses of episodic power symbolized legitimacy and value for community engagement by the university. Such enclaves also facilitated faculty assuming agency by helping them align with a constituency group, or a group of allies, to support each other in pursuing community engagement interests.

Reforming Promotion and Tenure and Merit Pay

Academic reward systems are typically considered major barriers to faculty community engagement (Bloomgarden, 2008; O'Meara, 2002, 2011; Saltmarsh et al., 2009). Recent research shows that promotion and tenure reform to better recognize community engagement is one of the weakest areas of even the most engaged universities (Saltmarsh et al.). Indeed, in this study, reward system policies and incentives played a minor role—in five (17%) of the cases—in supporting faculty agency in community engagement. However, in those cases where this policy-based support was evident it mattered greatly to the respective faculty. It acted as cultural armor, and sent a signal that the work was valued academically.

Some organizational leaders integrated reward of community engagement into promotion and tenure policies. On these campuses, organizational leaders had worked to define community-engaged scholarship and service-learning and develop criteria for assessment. Consequently, a few campuses had policies that allowed faculty to develop and submit public scholarship portfolios. Some universities created tenure lines for new positions with job descriptions that focused on community engagement. One campus had instituted a $5,000 base salary raise for faculty excelling in service-learning. One faculty member explained, "My provost created, a few years ago, an award called [name of award], which is a $5,000 base raise, and I mean, they've financially incentivized it. […] Every five years you're eligible. That's humungous." In this case the president and provost who enacted this policy seemed to be attempting more than episodic resistance to institutional controls. At the time of this interview faculty experienced the act as episodic because it was new and no one knew if it would outlast the leaders who put it in place and become a central part of the everyday reward system. Yet implementing the $5,000 base raise as a permanent policy may someday on this campus be perceived as a systemic act of power with potential for long-term, systemic impact.

Shaping Academic Spaces that Offered Autonomy and Connections

Twenty three (77%) of the participants in our study spoke about the relative autonomy they experienced in their academic positions as a form of support for their community engagement work. Words used repeatedly to describe this sense of autonomy were "liberty," "choice," "freedom," "flexibility," and "open." Participants observed that this aspect of their work environments enabled and enhanced their sense that they could commit time and energy toward community engagement. Importantly, almost all participants noted that this autonomy had fashioned space for them where they could "create," "develop," and "build" community engagement programs, classes, research projects, and partnerships. Faculty did not discuss this autonomy as inherent in their positions; rather, they perceived that this autonomy had been granted to them by organizational leaders and senior faculty colleagues with whom they worked.

For example, one participant observed that her department chair had given her the liberty to choose and design her classes, which created options for how she went about connecting her work to that of community partners. Another participant observed that he had the "luxury" of being trusted with new ideas by high-level administrators. Still others, like the following participant, discussed his autonomy in terms of being able to integrate his research and community engagement agenda because of organizational leaders who trusted how he went about his work:

Here's what I can tell you about our provost. He knew that we were going to be gone a lot. And so, I was walking the halls of the capital. Here is what my Provost said: "You are paid by the citizens of (name of state). Go do great things.' That's a person who sees the big picture, right? I am an employee of the state of X, go do great things for X.

Participants noted that although their universities were not able to support community engagement as extensively as they would have liked, organizational leaders had created environments that provided autonomy. One participant reflected that while he did not get the funding or release time that he wanted, his dean and department chair "left us alone," which "wasn't so bad." All but one of the participants in this study were tenure-track, so appointment type and seniority also played a role in experiences of autonomy.

Much research on faculty careers, especially faculty who are tenure-track at selective institutions, has chronicled faculty dissatisfaction when feeling constrained by their local academic environments. Everyday practices, assumptions, and actions by colleagues that emphasize research over teaching and certain kinds of research over others, can cause faculty to feel dissuaded from community engagement (O'Meara et al., 2008). Relatedly and more overtly, faculty often are counseled not to participate in community engagement until after tenure, if at all. Such advice, while intended to be well-meaning, can be received as a source of influence limiting options. However, in our study, participants described organizational leaders interacting with them in ways that enhanced their sense of choice related to community engagement. They knew they could experiment in courses, spend time in the community, and work in interdisciplinary ways and still retain the respect and confidence of these leaders.

Organizational leaders also enhanced faculty sense of choice by mobilizing connections to colleagues and networks that then provided support and feedback. This was most commonly evinced when organizational leaders made connections between and amongst community-engaged faculty. These interactions were fairly common for the study's participants and came in the form of emails introducing them to other faculty involved in community engagement (or to potential community partners). It also came as invitations to brown-bag lunches where other faculty would be present to discuss community engagement. One faculty member observed:

In a sense one gets connected into the culture of public scholarship by being invited to these lunches, and [the administrator who sets them up] has been pretty instrumental in bringing faculty together. That's how I got into it initially.

He's brought us together and [this] enables people to get to know one another.

Although most of these spaces were created on campus, some organizational leaders employed episodic power by supporting faculty travel to related conferences. One faculty member explained:

I've been really grateful for that [travel support] because I know it's helped me to grow in ways that, if I were left to my own and just sort of working on this by myself, I don't see how I could have made the same kind of progress because I wouldn't have had the same kind of exposure.

Similarly, another participant observed that because it was her dean that asked her to become involved in a community engagement project she took it more seriously. This invitation provided her with a new community that changed how she viewed her academic identity.

Yeah, I was asked by my dean to think about outreach. It seemed like an interesting opportunity, and I ended up being involved with [that project] for 10 years, which I didn't expect. But it was really at the invitation of the administrator. It wasn't really a self…I didn't come up with the idea. It wasn't something I thought of myself doing. I had been pretty much a scholar to scholar before then, basically addressing other scholars in my work and involved in fairly rarefied conversations.

A less common, but equally important, example of connection and feedback took place inside a department. One participant's department implemented a process for faculty to present a work plan of annual goals (related to teaching, research, and engagement) and receive feedback from colleagues. This faculty member explained:

One of the things that we have is developing at the beginning of each year a work plan that kind of lays out how I'm going to focus my teaching, my research, my engagement work, putting it forward to the department people and getting feedback on it. It's a very public way to discuss your work as a scholar. It's a different way of thinking about the roles and rewards of faculty and saying we have to develop as scholars, whether you're a tenure track position or not. We are creating a public culture where people discuss the work that you're doing instead of it being privatized and give feedback and ask questions. That is an important part of the culture here.

In this example, an informal process developed by senior faculty in a department created a venue to jumpstart mutual involvement and support for each other's work. This kind of connection reinforced this

faculty member's sense of agency in his work. This example and others above illustrate Lawrence's (2008) theory of episodic power as influence employed by organizational leaders. Such acts occurred within everyday realities on their campuses. Engaged faculty almost always found such actions surprising. They also found them empowering.

Discussion

> I argue that the time has come for institutional scholars to adopt a more balanced approach to their descriptions of institutional phenomenon, demonstrating both institutional control and the ability of actors to escape that control, and documenting strategies for institutional agency as well as the ways in which other individuals and organizations push back or deflect the impacts of those strategies. (Lawrence, 2008, p.189)

This quotation highlights a key context underscoring our findings. We studied interactions between organizational leaders and community-engaged faculty within their institutions. In these spaces, no one person, collection of people, or set of norms and rules were completely in control. The interactions we described occurred in spaces where organizational leaders and faculty had a strong sense of norms and common practices, both within their university and within academia (Gonzales, 2012; Gonzales & Rincones, 2011; Rhoades, Kiyama, McCormick, & Quiroz, 2008). In these highly professionalized organizational settings, faculty searched for signals from their leaders about the kinds of work that mattered. They looked to academic leaders for tangible support for community engagement and symbolic expressions from organizational leaders of the legitimacy of community engagement, which, in turn, legitimized work important to these faculty.

Within these spaces we found six ways faculty perceived organizational leaders assumed agency and mobilized resistance to institutional controls. We position each of these strategies as acts of episodic power. Each strategy had the effect of imposing limitations on the power of institutional controls to discourage community engagement. Each strategy was episodic in that faculty experienced these actions as occasional, unusual, irregular, and thus temporary against a backdrop of everyday practices and expectations that was ambivalent toward or unsupportive of community engagement. This backdrop is similar to the one experienced by interdisciplinary scholars in STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math) fields (Gonzales & Rincones, 2011) and faculty involvement in race-related service and scholarship (Baez, 2000).

Four of the strategies enacted by organizational leaders might be considered standard, as they have

been discussed and repeatedly advocated by those in favor of community engagement in the literature: creating bridge centers and human resource support, reforming promotion and tenure, providing resources, and raising the profile of community engagement on campus (Bringle & Hatcher, 2000; Furco & Holland, 2004). The remaining two—encouragement and shaping a work environment that offers both autonomy and connection to colleagues—underscore the relational and influential aspects of power described by Lawrence (2008).

In every case where organizational leaders enacted episodic power they contested dominant practices and cultures that either ignored or rejected community engagement as legitimate academic work. Because 20 of the 30 participants were in research or doctoral institutions, institutional controls tended to favor traditional research. However, even in the other 10 cases where teaching had greater importance in institutional controls, faculty faced systemic forces that did not prioritize teaching models that involved students in the community, i.e., service-learning. Nevertheless, regardless of institutional type, organizational leaders made community engagement seem like "insider" rather than fringe or "outsider" work. Each time organizational leaders enacted a supportive policy, or paved the way for a new course to go through without red tape, they signaled to the campus that the work of the community-engaged faculty member should not be considered marginal or illegitimate, but central and valued. Organizational leaders worked to recreate the "normal" at their institution and within the larger milieu of established academic expectations and norms.

The spaces where episodic power was enacted mattered. The episodic displays of power that mattered the most to community-engaged faculty were those displayed most organizationally proximate to them, that is, those in their departments or colleges where they engaged daily in power relations. University-wide strategies, such as the profile of community engagement on campus, merit pay, and presidential leadership, mattered to the degree that they reached into faculty departments and affected faculty community engagement and its relative value there.

Three commonly discussed ways in which faculty in this study faced systemic opposition included: (a) the distribution of scarce resources toward traditional research (in most institutions), (b) established assumptions of what faculty work merited recognition, and (c) operational constraints in how community engagement work was defined, organized, and funded. Institutional controls in these areas were powerful because they enjoyed legitimacy as established priorities across academia, including in the most prestigious departments, colleges, and universi-

ties. In other words, any one of them easily could be justified by saying, "well that is how they do it at [insert prestigious university, disciplinary association or national academy]." Although our participants told stories of organizational leaders disrupting the status quo in supporting community engagement, there was always the danger that the outcomes of these discrete, episodic expressions of power could be reversed by new leadership, or if some circumstance demanded the elimination of certain practices. There was also the potential that some of these acts, such as changes in merit pay, could become systematized and reduce the friction between institutional controls and community engagement work.

Implications

Many studies have observed that colleges and universities are highly value-laden organizations (Birnbaum, 1988; Kuh & Whitt, 1988; Rhoades, Kiyama, McCormick, & Quiroz, 2008). As such, when faculty become involved in community engagement they do so nested in departments and colleges which are nested in institutions which are set in the larger field of higher education (Gonzales, 2012). Faculty highly invested in community engagement as a form of academic work look to their organizational leaders for support. Vogelgesang, Denson, and Jayakumar (2010) found that faculty perception of university support for community engagement has a unique effect on their involvement. These authors suggested that quantitative studies such as theirs be "complemented with qualitative work that examines the contacts through which faculty are engaged and takes a more in-depth look at the impact of various measures of [university] support" (p. 467). Our qualitative study confirmed the importance of organizational leader "contacts," and showed how they enhance faculty agency. Furthermore, we examined organizational leader actions as a kind of agency in its own, set against a backdrop of established practices and norms typically unsupportive of community engagement. Here we consider implications for organizational leaders and for future research.

The first implication for organizational leaders is that most displays of episodic power that really mattered to faculty were resource neutral. Whether it was raising the visibility of community engagement in marketing materials and campus speeches, advocating for individual projects in influential circles, helping remove red tape for course approval, or introducing community-engaged faculty to others so inclined, faculty were powerfully moved by seemingly small acts of support and influence from organizational leaders. At the same time, the second implication for organizational leaders is that offering significant salary awards, working hard to reform promotion and

tenure guidelines, creating separate financial structures for projects, and lowering overhead costs for community-engaged projects, while costing more have a better chance of effecting systemic change. As many scholars studying organizational change toward community engagement have suggested (Furco & Holland, 2004; Saltmarsh et al., 2009; Sandmann et al., 2009), it is not an either/or proposition. Rather, organizational leaders must effect episodic and systemic strategies to facilitate and encourage faculty community engagement. In this study we found that highly engaged faculty suggest that organizational leaders not underestimate the power of influence and "skilled social action" to sway faculty action and campus discourse toward community engagement.

The third implication for organizational leaders relates to seeing the playing field in full view so as to be strategic about episodic and systematic efforts on their campuses. One of the advantages of NI theory and Lawrence's (2008) framework are that they help create a view of a larger field. In this larger field, actions taken by organizational leaders to support faculty community engagement are connected to structural and cultural realities in the larger realm of higher education and the type of institution to which a campus belongs, as well as departmental and institutional level norms and expectations. The president and provost who decided to create a $5,000 pay premium for exemplary service-learning no doubt knew they could not change higher education faculty norms that privilege research over teaching and service. However, they could change the playing field at their institution [somewhat] by altering the "market" for what faculty work was valued and rewarding work less acknowledged in the field but critical to their institutional goals. Determining where and how organizational leaders can act in immediate episodic ways to influence higher education and disciplinary norms (such as in hiring and graduate student socialization) is important for the future of organizational leadership for community engagement.

We believe this study makes an important contribution by revealing those actions taken by organizational leaders that really mattered to community-engaged faculty. However, we were limited to the perspectives of community-engaged faculty. Future studies might interview community-engaged faculty with their organizational leaders and colleagues to understand how such actions were interpreted and understood from multiple vantage points. It would be especially interesting to hear from faculty uninvolved in community engagement. Understanding the perceptions and views of this group will be critical to advancing faculty community engagement.

Also, there have been many exemplary engaged

institutions, most of which received the elective Carnegie community engaged institution classification (Sandmann et al., 2009). There have been a number of college and university presidents, provosts, and deans at these institutions who were there for a period of time engaging in what we would frame as both episodic as well as systemic actions to support faculty community engagement. Future research might explore what happens when these organizational leaders leave from the perspective of the engaged faculty. Which community engagement supportive strategies ended upon those leaders' departure? Which strategies became permanent parts of institutional structures and cultures? Another study might look at what these institutional leaders who embrace faculty involvement in community engagement do when they land at another institution.

There are many ways organizational leaders can facilitate, encourage, and enable faculty community engagement. Faculty in this study identified how organizational leaders mobilized resources, shaped discourse, developed relationships, and used their positions to legitimize community engagement despite barriers the faculty experienced in the everyday practices of their institution and academia at large. These acts of episodic power commensurately enhanced faculty agency in their community engagement work.

Note

Data for this report were collected as part of a collaborative research project with the Kettering Foundation.

References

Abes, E., Jackson, G., & Jones, S. (2002). Factors that motivate and deter faculty use of service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *9*(1), 5-17.

Archer, L. (2009). The neoliberal subjects? Young/er academics' construction of professional identity. *Journal of Educational Policy*, *23*(3), 265-285.

Austin, A. E., & Beck, J. P. (2011). Integration outreach and engagement into faculty work. In H. E. Fitzgerald, C. Burack, & S. D. Seifer (Eds.), *Handbook of engaged scholarship: Contemporary landscapes, future directions: Vol. 1. Institutional change* (pp. 235–250). East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.

Baez, B. (2000). Race-related service and faculty of color: Conceptualizing critical agency in academe. *Higher Education*, *39*(3), 363-391.

Barbalet, J. M. (1985). Power and resistance. *British Journal of Sociology*, *36*(4), 531-548.

Birnbaum, R. (1988). *How colleges work: The cybernetics of academic organization and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Blackburn, R. T., & Lawrence, J. H. (1995). *Faculty at work: Motivation, expectation, satisfaction*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Bolin, M. K. (2000). The collegial environment and the functional organization. *Journal of Library Administration*, *29*(2), 49-61.

Bloomgarden, A. H. (2008). Prestige culture and community-based faculty work (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations/AAI3336986

Bloomgarden, A., & O'Meara, K. (2007). Harmony or cacophony? Faculty role integration and community engagement. *Michigan Journal of Community Service-learning*, *13*(2), 5-18.

Braxton, J. (1986). The normative structure of science: Social control in the academic profession. In J. C. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research: Vol. 2.* (pp. 309-357). New York: Agathon Press.

Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (2000). Institutionalization of service learning in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education*, *71*(3), 273-290.

Butin, D. W. (2010). *Service-learning in theory and practice: The future of community engagement in higher education*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Clark, B. R. (1987). *The academic life: Small worlds, different worlds*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Clegg, S. R. (1989). *Frameworks of power*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Daly, C. J., & Dee, J. R. (2006). Greener pastures. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *77*, 776-803.

DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, *48*(2), 147-160.

Driscoll, A. (2008). Carnegie's community-engagement classification: Intentions and insights. *Change*, *40*(1), 38-41.

Fairweather, J. (2002). The ultimate faculty evaluation: Promotion and tenure decisions. *New directions for institutional research*, *114*, 97-108.

Fairweather, J. S. (1993). *Teaching, research and faculty rewards*. University Park, PA: National Center on Postsecondary Teaching, Learning, and Assessment.

Fairweather, J. S. (1996). *Faculty work and public trust: Restoring the value of teaching and public service in American academic life*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Fairweather, J. S. (2005). Beyond the rhetoric: Trends in the relative value of teaching and research in faculty salaries. *Journal of Higher Education*, *76*(4), 401–422.

Fligstein, N. (1997). Social skill and institutional theory. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *40*(4), 197-405.

Furco, A. (2003). *Self assessment rubric for the institutionalization of service learning in higher education*. Providence, RI: Campus Compact.

Furco, A., & Holland, B. (2004). Institutionalizing service-learning in higher education: Issues and strategies for chief academic officers. In M. Langseth, W. M. Plater, & S. Dillon (Eds.), *Public work and the academy*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company.

Gappa, J., Austin, A. & Trice, A. (2005). Rethinking academic work and workplaces. *Change*, *37*(6), 32–39.

Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society: Outline of a theory of structuration*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.

Glaser, B. G. & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Gonzales, L. D. (2012). Responding to mission creep: Faculty members as cosmopolitan agents. *Higher Education*, *61*(1), 1-17.

Gonzales, L. D. & Rincones, R. (2011). Interdisciplinary scholars: Negotiating legitimacy at the core and from the margins. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, *36*(4), 495-518.

Hagedorn, L. S. (2000). Conceptualizing faculty job satisfaction: Components, theories, and outcomes. *New directions for institutional research*, *105*, 5-20.

Hinck, S. S., & Brandell, M. E. (2000). The relationship between institutional support and campus acceptance of academic service learning. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *43*(5), 868-881.

Holland, B. A. (1997). Analyzing institutional commitment to service: A model of key organizational factors. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *4*(1), 30-41.

Hollander, E., Saltmarsh, J., & Zlotkowski, E. (2001). Indicators of engagement. In L. A. Simon, M. Kenny, & R. M. Lerner (Eds.), *Learning to serve: Promoting civil society through service-learning* (pp. 31-50). Norwell, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Huckaby, M. F. (2008). Making use of Foucault in a study of specific parrhesiastic scholars. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *40*(6), 770-788.

Johnsrud, L. K., & Rosser, V. J. (2002). Faculty members' morale and their intention to leave: A multilevel explanation. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *73*(4), 518-542.

Kezar, A. & Lester, J. (2009). Supporting faculty grassroots leadership. *Research in Higher Education*, *50*(7), 715-740.

Kuh, G. D., & Whitt, E. J. (1988). The invisible tapestry: Culture in American colleges and universities [Monograph]. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Research Report*, *17*(1). Washington, DC: The George Washington University Graduate School of Education and Human Development.

Kuh, G. D. (2008). *High-impact educational practices: What they are, who has access to them, and why they matter*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Kvale, S., & Brinkman, S. (2009). *InterViews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lawrence, T. B. (2008). Power, institutions and organizations. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin, & R. Suddaby (Eds.) *Sage handbook of organizational institutionalism* (pp. 170-197). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (2000). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.), pp. 163-188. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lindholm, J. A. (2003). Perceived organizational fit: Nurturing the minds, hearts, and personal ambitions of university faculty. *Review of Higher Education*, *27*(1), 125-149.

Marshall, V. (2000). *Agency, structure, and the life course in the era of reflexive modernization*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, Washington, D.C.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Meyer, J. W, & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, *83*, 340-363.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Morton, K., & Troppe, M. (1996). From the margin to the mainstream: Campus Compact's project on integrating service with academic study. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *15*, 21-32.

Mundy, M. (2004). Faculty engagement in service-learning: Individual and organizational factors at distinct institutions. In M. Welch, & S. Billig (Eds.), *New perspectives in service-learning: Research to advance the field* (pp. 169-194). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Neumann, A. (2009). *Professing to learn: Creating tenured lives and careers in the American research university*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Neumann, A., Terosky, A. L., & Schnell, J. (2006). Agents of learning: Strategies for assuming agency, for learning, in tenured faculty careers. In S. J. Bracken, J. K. Allen, & D. R. Dean (Eds.), *The balancing act: Gendered perspectives in faculty roles and work lives* (pp. 91-120). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

O'Meara, K. (2002). Uncovering the values in faculty evaluation of service as scholarship. *Review of Higher Education*, *26*(1), 57-80.

O'Meara, K. (2004). Reframing incentives and rewards for community service-learning and academic outreach. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, *8*(2), 201–220.

O'Meara, K. (2011). Faculty civic engagement: New training, assumptions, and markets needed for the engaged American scholar. In J. Saltmarsh, & M. Hartley (Eds), *"To serve a larger purpose:" Engagement for Democracy and the Transformation of Higher Education* (pp. 177-198). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

O'Meara, K., & Bloomgarden, A. (2010). Prestige at what cost: Examining the consequences of striving for faculty work-life, reward systems, and satisfaction. *Journal of the Professoriate*, *4*(1), 40-74.

O'Meara, K., Campbell, C. M., & Terosky, A. (2011). *Living agency in the academy: A conceptual framework for research and action*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Charlotte, NC.

O'Meara, K. & Niehaus, E. (2009). Service-learning is…: How faculty explain their practice. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *16*(1), 1-16.

O'Meara, K., & Rice, R. E. (2005). *Faculty priorities reconsidered: Rewarding multiple forms of scholarship*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

O'Meara, K., Terosky, A. L. & Neumann, A. (2008). Faculty careers and work lives: A professional growth perspective. *ASHE Higher Education Report*, *34*(3). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Phillips, N., & Malhotra, N. (2008). Taking social construction seriously: Extending the discursive approach in institutional theory. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of organizational institutionalism* (pp. 702-720). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Powell, W. W., & Colyvas, J. A. (2008). Microfoundations of institutional theory. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin, & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of organizational institutionalism* (pp. 276-323). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Powell, W. W., & DiMaggio, P. (Eds.) (1991). *The institutionalism in organizational analysis*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Rossman, G. B., & Rallis, S. F. (2003). *Learning in the field* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Rhoades, G., Kiyama, J., McCormick, R., & Quiroz, M. (2008). Local cosmopolitans and cosmopolitan locals: New models of professionals in the academy. *The Review of Higher Education*, *31*(2), 209-35.

Sandmann, L. R., Thornton, C. H., & Jaeger, A. J. (Eds.) (2009). Institutionalizing community engagement in higher education: The first wave of Carnegie classified institutions. *New directions for higher education*, *147*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass/Wiley Publishing.

Saltmarsh, J., Giles, G., O'Meara, K., Sandmann, L. R., Ward, E., & Buglione, S. M. (2009). Community engagement and institutional culture in higher education: An investigation of faculty reward policies at engaged campuses. In B. E. Moely, S. H. Billig, & B. A. Holland (Eds.), *Advances in service-learning research: Creating our identities in service-learning and community engagement* (pp. 3-29). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing Inc.

Schuster, J. H., & Finkelstein, M. J. (2006). *The American faculty: The restructuring of academic work and careers*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Schein, E. (1993). On dialogue, culture, and organizational learning. *Organizational dynamics*, *21*(3), 40-51.

Scott, W. R. (1991). Unpacking institutional arguments. In W. Powell, & P. DiMaggio (Eds.), *The New institutionalism in organizational analysis* (pp. 164-182). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Sen, A. K. (1985). Well-being, agency and freedom: The Dewey lectures, 1984. *Journal of Philosophy*, *82*(4), 169-221.

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

Ward, K. (2003). Faculty service roles and the scholarship of engagement. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report*, *29*(5), San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Weick, K. E. (1995). *Sensemaking in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Yin, R. (1994). *Case study research: Design and method*s (2nd ed.). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Zlotkowski, E. (1999). Pedagogy and engagement. In R. G. Bringle, R. Games, & E. A. Malloy (Eds.), *Colleges and universities as citizens* (pp. 96-120). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Authors

KERRYANN O'MEARA (komeara@umd.edu) is an associate professor of Higher Education at the University of Maryland and Co-Director and Co-PI of the University of Maryland's National Science Foundation-funded ADVANCE grant. Her research explores faculty community engagement, faculty professional growth and careers, and academic reward systems. O'Meara's current research focuses on agency as expressed in action and perspective and the organizational conditions that engender and constrain it.

ANDREW LOUNDER (alounder@umd.edu) is a doctoral student at the University of Maryland. His dissertation will focus on growth in contingent faculty workforces from a decision-making perspective. Lounder received his B.A. from Wheaton College in Massachusetts and his M.A. in Higher Education from the University of Pennsylvania. He currently serves as a research assistant for the University of Maryland ADVANCE Program.

ALEECE HODGES (sissona2@msu.edu) is a doctoral student at Michigan State University. Her dissertation will focus on the economic impact of rural community colleges. Aleece received her Bachelor's Degree from Albion College and a Master's Degree in Higher Education Administration at the University of Maryland. She currently serves as an academic advisor at Kirtland Community College.