

David Cooper Transcript

So are you ready, Burt? Well good morning everybody I'm Hi Fitzgerald, the Associate Provost for Outreach and Engagement and University Distinguished Professor, Department of Psychology. I have to say what it tells me I have to say up there. Here at Outreach and Engagement, as probably most of you know in the room, is a unit of the Provosts' Office that tries to encourage faculty in the campus to engage communities in scholarly ways across a full range of disciplines that are representative of our University. We differ from some other ways of engaging in that we stress heavily the evidence based practices; the evidence based impact that such engagements have on communities. And we encourage those partnerships to be appropriate in process between partner's knowledge of community and knowledge of faculty members and academic staff.

The National Collaborative for the Study of University Engagement is a unit within Outreach and Engagement and it focuses on the dimensions of that nationally and provides leadership, mostly across the research intensive universities that are similar to us. But they engage any university in this effort. The Collaborative seeks to advance greater understanding of the role of community engagement and faculty scholarship by studying the processes, relationships, and impacts of outreach work on engaged faculty, academics and communities. It does this through original research and publications, institutional studies, reflection, professional development programs, advocacy, and national collaboration.

So the event today is really a partnership and is lead by Dr. Ann Austin in the College of Education, Professor of Higher Adult and Lifelong Education and director of the MSU Global Institute for Higher Education. The Global Institute for Higher Education builds upon the relationship between vision and action, research, practice, and local and global issues affecting higher education and institutions. And for quite a few years has been a key partner with Outreach and Engagement as we try to advance our joint missions.

Hi, thank you so much. It's great to see lots of people here today. I have the pleasure of being the person who will introduce Dr. David Cooper, our visitor from South Africa. I have known Dr. Cooper over the last dozen years. My family and I had a Fulbright for a year in South Africa a dozen years ago and one of the very nice professional and personal connections that we were able to make is with David Cooper. And we've interacted at different points over the last couple, over the last decade really, at various scholarly meetings. So it was just a delight when he was in contact with some of us here saying that he would love to come to Michigan State, especially because of our reputation here led so much with Hi's work around engaged scholarship and outreach. So it's been a real pleasure to have David Cooper with us over the last week. He's met with a number of people in this room. He's had a bicycle so he's zipped around our campus; he says that was a real highlight. I kept saying "Do you have a helmet on?" because as a parent I'm used to saying that a lot. But I think he's had a very nice time both in an intellectual way and also a bit of exercise too while he's been here.

Let me just tell you a little bit about our colleague, Dr. David Cooper. He's a sociologist and I think you'll hear that as he shares his insights with us today. For some time he's been at the University of Cape Town in South Africa where he's been serving as the head of the sociology department. What's particularly—I think—brought him to the United States over the last year and to other places around the world is that he holds, he's one of the Fulbright New Century Scholars which I'm sure many of you know is a very prestigious fellowship through the Fulbright Association. And the theme of the work in which he and others have been engaged this year in the Fulbright New Century Program is the University as Innovation Driver and Knowledge Center. So I think you can hear in that theme why he's such a wonderful visitor for us and fits so well in this special series today. Dr. Cooper has a background, originally a Bachelor's Degree in electrical engineering from the University of Cape Town. And then he did his doctoral work in sociology at the University of Birmingham in the UK where he also tutored and conducted research.

Also in his background is time as a high school physics teacher and then he spent time, also, in Botswana leading a nation-wide migration study. In more recent years during his tenure the last several decades as a sociologist in Cape Town, he's been studying issues especially around the sociology of higher education. He's studied research groups—and I think we may hear some aspects of that today—research groups in South Africa. He's studied issues around faculty, student and staff trends. We heard another very interesting talk last week about some of his research, very interesting research concerning enrollment changes in South Africa. He also is a scholar of labor issues and has engaged in comparative research in South Africa and in Western Europe concerning Labor Union movements and I know he's had a number of conversations around that topic while he's been here this last week, also.

Finally I wanted to highlight that he has a very exciting new book forthcoming that I'm sure we're all going to be very eager to look at called the University in Development: The Role of Use-Inspired Research. I think that's a tremendous title and I am looking forward to seeing that. Today as you know, Dr. Cooper is going to be talking with us about issues of engaged scholarship in South Africa. And he will be particularly directing his comments, I believe, toward university and civil society research relationships. It has been a great pleasure for those of us, for many of us, who have interacted with him over the last week. We are going to be sending him off very early tomorrow morning to wend his way back home again, but we're certainly delighted to have him with us and we appreciate that you could spend time during this last busy week to be here today, too. Thanks so much for coming, and David thank you for being with us.

Thank you, Ann, for the comprehensive biography. You'll probably be able to place some of it more closely because on one level my talk is going to be semi-biographical as well; I'm going to go through some of the things I've been working on over the last few decades. As you can see I'm Chair—you call it Chair—we call it Heir of Sociology. I'm overjoyed to be not Chair this year, I'm on a year sabbatical which is why—there are two reasons—why I'm smiling. The one is because I'm on sabbatical and the other is because I'm loving riding a bicycle on your

flat ground. I've just ridden two miles and I didn't even feel it. I haven't cycled since 1991, I think, so it's been great and a real pleasure.

As you can see my focus, I see myself as a sociologist of higher education. I'm also historically linked with labor studies; I've been sharing that with John. And one third of my talk is going to be about my old labor studies. I think I was an engaged scholar then, I'm now enrolled in the scholarship of engagement and I'm glad Michigan has shown me there is a difference, on their website, between an engaged scholar and a scholarship of engagement. I see myself mainly as a scholar of engagement at the moment. But I will, for a third of my talk at the end, talk about some interesting issues I think to share with you about issues of being an engaged scholar in South Africa in a city civil war. And I'd be interested in your discussion around that.

I'm here in Michigan for a week because of the concept of engaged scholarship. As Ann said, I'm a New Century Scholar with this very flashy title. We're a group of thirty from all over the world, ten Americans and twenty non-Americans. And the theme since last May we've just finished, in fact I'm feeling quite sad, today is my last New Century day. I'm back to South Africa and my passport; I'm excluded from the US on the thirty first of May. Although I have a J-2 Visa that will let me in as a visitor. But this is coming to an end. We had a meeting in Washington a week ago and we all presented some of our research and the focus was on Knowledge Center and Innovation Driver, whatever that means. I'm going to talk around that today; I think it's quite a big topic. And I'm going to focus on case studies of university research groups with a South African focus.

I just wanted to thank people for inviting me. Both the Hi and Burt and all the people that have given me time to be—I've done an hour of interview often with people—and also with Ann and John and the whole Global Studies; Chris, who's taken me around. I don't want to mention, waste your time because there are about fifteen people I really need to thank. But this talk hasn't been easy to prepare, I must say I'm intimidated looking at such a large group. I'm intimidated because it's not simple to know how to approach the topics. And when I'm in doubt what I always do is return to where I'm at. So I'm going to talk from a South African situation. Some of my findings and some of my perspectives are the same as yours, some are different. So you're going to have to connect. I am probably going to talk close to—I have quite a lot to say I realized—so I'm going to talk for three quarters to an hour and then open it up to questions. And I'll be very interested in your response—particularly the last third I've actually never presented to a South African audience or anybody—the last third about my labor studies engagement. So I'll be very interested in the issues and how you pick up on it.

So let's go. What I'm going to do is focus on three areas and spend equal time on each. Sorry am I in the way here? I'm going to look—I mentioned I'm trying to finish a book, and actually the publishers made me cut it by a third. So the one hassle in my sabbatical is actually reducing a four hundred page book by a third. But it'll come out eventually I just see it as; I just do three hours a day, that's the only way to do it. But I'm going to share my ideas. Just after I met Ann I started a study of eleven research groups in South Africa. So I'm very interested in research centers, including the structure of the National Center for University Engagement. So I

study centers. But it's taken a long time, partly because I was running a Master's in Higher Education Study for four years. And then those of you who have been a Chair or a head of a department, it's not easy to do research. So it's taken me eight years. But what I have done is I studied the eleven research centers in 2000, I revisited them in 2005 and then I went back to them again in 2007. Each time I went back I had to change my ideas completely because they weren't developing the way I expected. So I did what I call a historical sociology of the eleven groups and I'm going to talk to you about some of that.

I am then going to go on to my current Fulbright research. I mean the reason why I'm here is just a fluke. The Fulbright required us to spend two months in the US and I spent seven of the eight weeks in California with mainly a person involved in Service Learning at Monterey Bay. We needed an invitation and I knew he was at the University of Cape Town and invited me to Monterey Bay with him. And I traveled; I wasn't mainly involved in service learning because I think student engagement is different to faculty engagement. Sometimes they're the same, but I am interested in faculty engagement or what we call academic staff engagement. But I've traveled around and I'll tell you what I found in the months from September to November.

But I returned in December and we each—all thirty of us—had to write a midterm report. And this Russian woman on our group sent me, sent us all; we all sent each other the midterm report. And she said she visited Michigan State University to look at agriculture extension because she's an agriculturalist in the middle of Siberia. So I thought, extension I know, let me look at what's going on with extension. So I clicked extension and I hit your center and I thought, "Wow, there's a National Center for the Study of University Engagement". So I shouted to my wife, "don't bother me for two days, I'm clicking". And I clicked, I read as much as I could, it's very easy in Cape Town to now read, I mean I probably know more about some of your things than you do. And then I wrote to Ann and said, "Look I'm going to spend after the last Washington meeting coming here". And it's been incredibly valuable, interviewing people. Your general outlook of higher education, outlook of engaged scholarship is not available yet on the website so I photocopied a thick, for all of Saturday. I'm now carrying—and Burt has given me another thick lot so I'm carrying back gold as well as talking to people. So for me it's been incredibly valuable.

My last third I'm going to share with you the problems I had with community engagement. Often one thinks the problem is the universities. The problems I had were with the university but I also had problems with the community, whatever that means. And we did these worker education books and I want to talk to you about—actually I've written an article which I'll give you. But I don't know whether anyone has read the articles in this book, and I'm going to share this article with you. I've had no feedback, it was writing twenty five years later. And I want to share some of the issues of trying to do scholarly engagement in the civil war situation. And I think actually, if one is looking at a crisis situation some of the lessons I think you need to talk about so you can see them more starkly in a crisis situation. So I don't think they're irrelevant to what you facing, they're just sharper.

So I'll start with the theoretical perspective. All of these ideas are in my book and if you want to not wait for the book I've written some of it up in this, and I think the slide show will be available. The Sociology Association is not so organized, the 2009 article is only just coming out, I think it's just came out this month. But some of what I'm saying is there. I've also written four campus compacts, your United States Campus Compact which is mainly student service learning, but also faculty engagement; I've written some of it up there.

So I want to throw you into these ideas. I'm sure they are going to be controversial to you and I'm deliberately giving you a controversial idea. I think we are actually facing an academic revolution since 1970, something really big is changing. So I go with Henry Etzkowitz if I even think, I take it more seriously. He says we had a first academic revolution which began with German professors in the 1800s then spread to America, particularly in the 1880s with the rise of your research university. I think before that you were university colleges. I never understood why American students would say "I'm going to college" when they were really going to an undergraduate college. Post graduate education is a post 1880s, and I think you had this first academic revolution in the 1880s.

Basically I joined the second mission of research and I would stress their basic research; research for its own sake joined to teaching. Before that universities were mainly teaching institution. So I think we really had a revolution. I think if I look at Michigan State University, I think it's still steeped in the first academic revolution: departments, academics, publications, national associations, journal. My university is even more steeped in that; I think you are trying to move out of it. But of many of the problems I found in the research groups I was studying are, I think, problems due to them trying to move into a second academic revolution. I think we're seeing a second academic revolution not just in the US but I think it's globally. It's starting to hit my university.

I think we're adding what Etzkowitz calls a third mission. I think we're adding, he says we're adding economic development as the third mission. I would add socio-economic, and especially after speaking with the other David Cooper, I'd say socio-economic-cultural development. I think universities are involved in socio-economic and cultural development and that's really what engaged scholarship is about. So I think we need to understand engaged scholarship as part—not the whole part—but part of the second academic revolution. And I have no doubt this revolution is going to take over, I'm fairly determinist. One of the reasons I think it's going to take over is because the industry is driving it. And I think industries' force is unstoppable, actually, at the moment. And those academics who want to remain in the first academic revolution are going to have to step aside, I think.

So I have quite an economic determinist position on this. When I looked at my eleven research groups I knew about Etzkowitz's idea of a triple helix, but this was absolutely dominant in nine of my eleven groups; all of them where university groups linking to industry with government playing some sort of role. The triple helix in my research book and those groups is alive and well. What I didn't find, I only found amongst one and maybe one and a half groups, an engagement with what I call civil society. So I call this the orphan. And I'm interested in

Michigan; you are pushing hard on the university engagement with what you call community. What's interesting is you don't talk much about—I was in an interesting interview yesterday and I asked the lady, “Do you see industry as part of community?” and we had an interesting theoretical discussion. I'm increasingly thinking we need to think about all four working together in tandem rather than just what I call the fourth helix, which is what I'm studying now. My focus of study is on university what I call civil society link. But I think we need to see it as four groups working together.

So that was the first idea and that's part, I think, of the second academic revolution. It's got a number of components. The first component is, I think, is being carried forward by the triple helix. The second, I found interviewing my groups when I began my research I had a concept of pure research. I had a concept of research, of a purest basic research and applied research. But I found that a lot of my groups were doing basic and applied and I began to say, I call them fundamental applied—because they were combining both—until I came across Stoke's idea of use inspired basic research. And I think many of us are doing what I call use inspired basic research. Pure applied research, PAR, I would say is dealing with a specific problem in context, the problem is defined. I think you could put my talk at the moment as use inspired basic research.

I don't know exactly how you will use these ideas, I don't even know, but I know you are going to use them. Then it's not just curiosity research. So I think this second academic revolution, and people who attack it often say the university is going to turn into an applied institution; not true. What I think is moving is to become a use inspired basic research institution. And I would see much of your evidence based as a combination of PAR and UIBR; you're probably doing both of those. Both of those are what I call, when Ann gave the title of my book, use inspired research. I see use inspired research as a combination of UIBR—use inspired basic research—and pure applied research; that's what we're doing with engagement. This group is curiosity oriented and oriented to publishing for their peers. But I would see engagement as this. But for me understanding use inspired basic research, I think that's what academic revolution is about. And I think industry needs use inspired basic research. There are industries turning to universities more for that I think than that, but I'll come to that.

I don't want to talk for a long time because a lot of my own research in the book is about what I call units and centers. I just want to throw these ideas, I'll go very quickly. I think the second academic revolution is changing the nature of organization in universities. From departments—it's not getting rid of departments—but it's adding, you can see by this diagram, it's adding units and centers as a new structure. And I think we have to see centers as a theoretical structure, a new structure in the second academic revolution, which is difficult to build. I think centers, my centers, rise and fall. Started with eleven, ten, no eight, eight centers. At least half of them don't exist anymore because they've been crushed by the first academic revolution. So I think we need new systems of value to nurture these.

Basically what I'll give you is that the first academic revolution involved eight traditional small units, you call it the principal investigator. It's a PI with a few post graduates. The PI

doesn't even call himself or herself a unit but I think it's virtually unit, a little group. I think that under the second academic revolution, particularly under use inspired basic research but also pure applied research, I've argued that at least in my daytime seen three types of new structures. One is a small unit which looks a lot like this. Another is what I call a network of small units. And the other, the last one which I think is particularly valuable is a center. And I would argue Burt's national center and the one, that Center for Community and Economic Development; they are embryonic centers of the ones I'm talking about.

So let's look at this transformation. This transformation is fairly easy, I think in America it's the easiest and most people are becoming engaged scholars using this. Basically what you do is you simply stay with your old unit which is the PI, what I call a researcher and a lecturer because most of you are lecturing at the same time as researching. So you are a researcher lecturer, you have a small group of post graduates and a few post docs. The scientists tend to be in a lab, the social scientists say "I'm in my group", and you write for—in the old first academic revolution you write for your peers, it's journal articles and books. If you want to do engaged research, you keep the same structure. Still professor, researcher, lecturer, you keep your post graduates and a few post docs, you still work in your lab and a group but you link some of your work to industry or civil society. So you keep the same structure but you become engaged with that structure, it's very easy. And interestingly most, I think most American engaged scholars are using the old structure. And if you do that it's very easy, you don't have problems.

Another route I'm finding that I didn't theorize at first is what happens in a group of academics get together, so it's what I call a network or a cluster. So each of them is still a professor, researcher, lecturer so you have three or four academics—or faculty as you call them—and they form a network. They form a network around a research program; you might all be doing engagement about youth, problems of distressed youth. So you form a network, but you hold your own little group, your still a PI of your own structure. It's a network of PIs. And you're partly linked to other industry or civil society. And I think that; but it's larger, it's more functional, it gets more work done and I think it's more efficient than the lone professor.

But I still believe we have to form new larger centers and I'm not going to go into the reasons why, we can discuss it in questions. I think unless you form research centers, you're not going to get engagement work done properly. What I think a research center is, is it's headed by a director, so it's a much bigger and more organized structure. And under that director what I call three or four PIs. I interviewed Diane Doberneck, so within your center Burt is the director. And then I would argue that in order to be functional you need at least four Diane Dobernecks, senior researchers each with their own subgroups and their post graduates and post docs. You need a center administration info structure of administrators and technicians. And you need a research program and you need to link up with industry and civil society. I think that is an exceptionally efficient structure to undertake engagement. I think the university blocks that structure and sends you back to the department and says go back to the first academic revolution. It needs a new type of values and structures. But I think it, and it should be funded not by a non-recurrent funding, it

needs recurrent funding to be viable. And certainly my universities, they are collapsing, those centers rise and fall because they're not being; so those are a series of issues.

This is a real live structure they instituted in Wine Biotechnology where I got the idea of a new center. The person deliberately built a structure, he was the director, he had four seniors under him each with their own subgroups. He had post docs, five of them, four technicians. Another thing I think about a center is it should be involved in post graduate teaching. It should be running; in my society we only have a master's coursework and thesis supervision. Centers should be deeply embedded in Ph. D training, as he was. He had an administrative structure and assistance. He went off the year after I interviewed him to Australia, he immigrated. And these groups have collapsed. They have gone back to a department because they were too worried for a whole range of reasons. So they've retreated, partly, back into the first academic revolution. That's finding three, about the importance of networks and centers.

Finding four is, what I asked myself is if there's a real academic revolution. And I am a historical materialist; I don't believe that universities drive change, so I had to ask myself, "Well if there's such a fundamental second academic revolution, there must be something outside that is happening, that's driving this". Because I don't think these things are simply a cultural revolution. And what I've argued, and I'll just do it very briefly, is I think we're involved a third industrial revolution and I'm sure you believe that in Michigan. Everyone, you're involved in a complete industrial revolution. It's been going on since the seventies. I think the first industrial revolution—this is very schematic—the first one was four hundred years led by a small family firm. And you had industries like textiles, mine work and pottery. And what's important and what's crucial with technology—I call it technological regime—universities were irrelevant. They were driven by practical men outside mainly the university. I don't think science played hardly any role here.

I think in the second industrial revolution—led by Germany and then very quickly America in the 1880s and 90s—I think with electricity, chemical steel and then later automobiles; I see automobiles as part of the second industrial revolution. And there's four shareholders, there's Ford, Creysler, National Shareholding Corporation. I think that science is becoming important, but not fundamental. I think a whole lot of other things are main drivers. I think in this third industrial revolution we use the word knowledge society. And you can see this, it's being driven by not yet truly transnational but large, companies which are becoming significantly transnational.

If you look at this, ICT Computers, Biotech, university science is absolutely fundamental. I haven't got my cell phone here, but I always pull it out because I am an electrical engineer. And as a physicist said to me as a hired electrical engineer, to understand how in a transistor—transistors are inside your cell phone—to understand how electrons move in a transistor, you need quantum physics. Without quantum physics you can't; quantum physics is the basis of your cell phone. The same, I see Michigan is now getting involved in biomass. Without genetic theory and DNA theory, all your biomass industry; so I would argue university science and industry knows this. I think since the 1970s they've been turning to your university, not to get applied

research but to get use inspired basic research. They want the quantum physics, they want the genetic theory and they are actually starting to work academics, not the pure applied people but the fundamental people. And for instance Stokes has argued that during the second world war the memoirs written by the physicians about the atomic bomb, they all said that was they applied work, not their real research; they're real research was quantum physics. But actually it was a denial because their real research was fundamentally linked to the application of the atomic bomb. It was use inspired basic research.

So I think what we're seeing is a second academic transformation which is symbiotically linked to this industrial revolution. It's joined like a cord. Whereas I think the first academic revolution you're research got joined to teaching, there were some links but not significant links. So that kind of first academic revolution, you can see I've put it in between. It's not really part of the first, and not really part of the second, because it's essential to neither. And what struck me as I began to develop this is I've actually done electrical engineering in the late 1960s and in my class we were culturally divided between an Elect A group and an Elect B group. I was Elect B's. The Elect A's were dealing with power supplies and motors, the elect A's were part of that old industrial revolution. They were practical guys, they did some theory, but they were more pure applied research. I was part of this Elect B group, we did physics, forth year physics and mathematics and it was much more scientific. And I would argue we were being groomed for this new and emerging third industrial revolution. We were a combination of physics and engineering and mathematics. So in my class itself, I think you could see the old second industrial revolution and the embryos of the third. So those are various thoughts, we can come back to that.

But it's all gearing very seriously for a second academic revolution which engaged scholarship is part of, linked to this new industrial revolution. I just want to now, talk fairly briefly because my research is still being done. I see my moment at the moment as doing theoretical research, theories, ideas about engaged scholarship. But I'm studying two research groups, and I'm looking at this, going back to that university civil society. I've defined for working purposes civil society as—and this we need to discuss in relation to America—but we have labor and community, not only groups, but social movements, what I call a social movement.

So I am interested to know how university groups link to social movement as well as social groups, labor and community. There are a whole range of other groups: women, environmental, youth, health. I put NGOs as also part of civil society. I'm seeing local and regional government say that Michigan State, I think it's easier to see it as part of civil society but we need to discuss that, it's a complication. But industry, I'm increasingly beginning to see as a powerful social movement. I think the way to theorize industry is also as a social movement. Whether it's in civil society I'm not sure, but I certainly think it's a social movement linking to university.

I've mentioned how I came to, I stumbled on engaged scholarship during December. But I gained very valuable ideas about engaged scholarship without using that term. While I was in

California I began to see that in some sense engaged scholarship is being driven strongest by the health people with their idea of transnational research. I think they are real pioneers in how they are pushing that forward. I was excited to find the sort of work health people and interviewed one of them, too. I think the urban studies people are also quite far ahead in pushing this. My own discipline, sociology; some of you might have come across the idea of public sociology. But I'm also interested in what I call organic public sociology, which I'll touch on because a lot of my research in my case study is looking at organic public sociology, which is an interesting concept which I'll come to.

I think the service learning movement I would hypothesize is much stronger in America than your faculty engagement. I expect you've created a real student service movement which in relation to a faculty or an academic staff movement of engagement is still stronger, I think, relatively. I then stumbled on the Carnegie classification, which for me was very valuable but I also noticed, and we can discuss, that most of your leading research universities are not asking for classification. I don't see Harvard there, I don't see Princeton, I didn't even visit Stanford, although I was quite close. I asked, "Which faculty are linking up with the labor movement and community movements"? I couldn't get a center that was doing that strongly. Industry, yes, with Silicon Valley. But then I stumbled, and I think it was very valuable I don't need to talk to you, Boyer's idea. And then into the Michigan Engaged Scholarship.

But why it was so valuable for me to come to your concept of engaged scholarship, I think is really rich. So my view, your Michigan University 1993 study and then the subsequent of the concept of engaged scholarship is a real breakthrough. I mean I think as an outsider I can stress that. I think it is a real theoretical breakthrough which you should; and I think engaged scholarship is different than the scholarship of engagement, also a useful distinction. Why it's so useful for me is in South Africa last year as I read the documents and being involved, it's such a confusing set of terms. People talk about community engagement, community service, civic social response, outreach. It's a whole baggage of concepts, none of which really mean engaged scholarship. And then politically you've got what I call a fight between the community populous and the academic conservative. And community populous is strong in South Africa; I don't know how strong they are here. Community populous often outside the university, but interestingly some academics within the university, I would argue, are community populists. They argue in being engaged, but they don't say being engaged in scholarship. So they talk about engagement and the universities must get engaged and I think they lose the couplet engaged scholarship.

At the University of Cape Town conservatives are incredibly powerful. I think industry's going to push them aside. They talk about scholarship, peer review, publications, forget about engagement. And this group still drives my university strongly. I want to just mention, you know your definitions, I'm sure all of you know. But when I come to my work in this International Labor and Research and Information Group, I'm going to apply your definitions because it actually helped me understand quite a lot of the issues I was being faced with. So an important thing, I think, in your; because I think to talk about engagement you first need a concept of scholarship, which your 1993 document stresses. I think the scholarship of discovery, synthesis,

transformation, and application in your concept, and I think what's interesting in the concept there is it's based on methods and ideas of existing disciplines, professions, interdisciplinary review. So it's part of the academic organization of a university; the centers, the units the departments. It has to be linked to that. I think it's often just a full aspect of Boyer, but the concept of scholarship in your definition, out of your 1993, says it's based on the ideas and methods. And I think those two lines are important and I'll come back to that in terms of my labor group.

This I think is also important, and again I'll come back to it or I won't be able to flip back to this. But what qualifies a scholarship, and I've summarized, is scholarship based on an accumulation of ideas and knowledge. If you're doing scholarship, it's based on a history of ideas in that area. So if I'm doing labor studies, it's linked to a history of ideas and methods of a body of knowledge; important. It involves best practice work, so you must be doing cutting edge work, not sloppy work, and I'll come back to that with the group. And I would argue it mentions a recognized, it's based on ideas that are here with intelligent openness to new information. I think it involves a critical perspective. So scholarship has to be critical, you can't just accept the existing idea. So I'll come back, it's based on an accumulation of ideas, best practice, and critical perspective.

Again, your definition I found, of outreach, you all know. But I think the last line is not often stressed, but again I'm going to stress it with my labor group. If you're going to do outreach or engaged scholarship, it must be consistent with your university mission and unit mission. By unit I mean your department or your center. So I think that line, again, I'll come back to. It must be linked to your department, your center, your academic leash if you like. I really like the idea, and we are only just beginning the issue of promotion and tenure. I think you've got, again I've come to Michigan to find how you're doing this, I think it's really good how you are pushing that forward.

This, I think Burt was part involved, and this is from Highram's slideshow, please excuse me. I also presented this for the Fulbright New Century. I think this is a wonderful table to show, particularly because my university doesn't take column three seriously. As fact, some schools want to remove that from promotion. I think, I've also discussed, I think the idea of innovation, the theoretical concept of innovation is creating new products and processes. I think that we need to think through this as innovation, new products and processes which is different to just research—the creation of new knowledge. It's actually transforming new knowledge into products and processes. I think very valuable, that column.

What I see in your documents is you don't say when a person is not doing engaged scholarship. I think we need to; we need to say that quite clearly if we're going to win the battle. And I've got three examples and it'll link to my group as well. I think—and this is why at my university there's confusion over this—I think that an engaged economics professor that's serving as treasurer of the high school, is not doing, they're not doing engaged scholarship. They're doing what your documents call service. And I think you are absolutely right to say service is not always engaged scholarship. I'll go further, in my electrical engineering I think that

an electrical engineering prof who's just doing routine testing of electrical motors is not doing engaged scholarship, they're doing what I call routine testing work. And it's not classified by UNESCO as research. So that kind of contract work where people do a whole range of contract work which is just routine stuff, I wouldn't call it engaged scholarship. And the same, one of my research groups, I'll keep it confidential, but it's linked to this example: a professor of accountancy who's actually giving courses to local government on marketing. Marketing is not, going back to this, marketing is not the accountant professor's mission; accountancy is their mission. They are drifting into something else for consultancy work. I don't think we should recognize that as; we should say "look you're doing good consultancy". But don't put that on your; that's not engaged scholarship. So for me what you're saying what engaged scholarship is, is as important as clarifying for people what it isn't. But we can discuss that; some of you might disagree with that.

Very briefly—and when I go back for the rest of the year I am following through—I've started researching two groups. The one group is what I call, what's called Vaal University of Technology, so I'm doing two case studies of Vaal University, what we call a polytechnic or a technician. Interesting engagement issues. They're more like your community colleges or somewhere in between universities. And the other I am looking at what's called PLAAS at the University of the Western Cape; very interesting and quite high powered research center and I am looking at how they do work. Very briefly with the Vaal University of Technology, it's south of Johannesburg and I think what, the Vaal University of Technology it's a hundred miles from Johannesburg. They are really taking seriously the idea regional development and they are calling it the "Southern Johannesburg Infrentory Gauteng", they call it the area of southern Gauteng. So it's again linked to the idea of Michigan as a region. I'm looking at one, and this is why I'm looking at an industry group and a civil society group, where I think the university needs to work on both planks. There's an engineering group really doing very interesting research on applied electronics and I'm studying how they're doing that in terms of engaged scholarship. They've got difficulty; at least eighty percent of their faculty members don't have a Ph. D. So it raises serious issues about how you do scholarship, but they're interesting.

Another group is a nutrition group. Some of you might have heard about Sharpeville where police opened fire in 1960 and killed about eighty people. They've just had their fortieth, fiftieth anniversary. I was there and one group is doing nutrition research in Sharpeville. I asked her, "who are you linking up with, are you linking up with political and social groups?" She said no, she's linking up with the church. The church is particularly hopeful, which I found quite interesting as a group facilitator, so I'm looking at them. This university, why I've got involved, is they have a concept of new generation university where they are arguing they shouldn't only create new knowledge but they must be involved in innovation. Of turning the new knowledge into products and processes, so I'm looking at how they're doing that. Not just the creation of new knowledge or what standardly is called research, but innovation, putting your research into actual practice.

So that's my research that I'll be doing for the rest of the year. Just some comments on PLAAS. They are what I call a real, this is, they are an institute for poverty, land and experience studies, so they work on rural areas. They are focused on rural development. They are really what I call a genuine center, but all on soft money. The university doesn't fund anything in terms of recurrent money but they're surviving on for over ten years. They're also involved in running a master's program because we don't have course work Ph. Ds. They do supervise thesis's for Ph. Ds. So they're an example I think of a new large center doing use inspired basic research and pure applied. And their basic mission is a commitment to making a difference for the rural pool in South Africa.

Their work is not so, it's very interesting to look at how they work. They started in 1994 by working with the government. So if you think of the university, industry, government and civil society they moved policy research to government. They then clashed with government because the government began, in 1998, 1999, to bolster up the traditional chiefs; to do a political deal with the chiefs. The PLAAS opposed that. They then lost the support of the government. So they shifted to do work with civil society organizations. They found they could work with NGOs but they couldn't find rural farmers who really organized. So they started looking for a rural social movement.

So, and I'm looking at how they do, but they do work; one group who is working with fisher people, another with people living in the rural villages, very poor, so I'm looking at how they link to civil society organizations. Since 2004 there's been a new minister of agriculture who's now more open to the ideas so PLAAS is going back to doing policy work for government. So I'm interested, I'm looking, I'm doing, I'm an anthropologist. I go to their meetings, I interview them, I hang around and I'm really trying to look at how they do their work in; and they work with a critical perspective. So they really do, in terms of your definition of engaged scholarship, have a critical social theory. It's the bedrock of their work.

Just what I've come to is to see them in terms of Burawoy's a President; was in 2004 President of the American Sociological Association where he introduced this idea of four types of sociology. These two are working already writing for other academics, professional sociology or critical sociology. This which a more self reflective critical perspective; this is the Burawoy concept. Then he argues you do policy, sociology, and public sociology. So he distinguishes, I find these two not so easy to distinguish, at least with PLAAS. So, and what I'm doing is, what I've become particularly interested, he sees public sociology as; he's got a concept of organic public sociology which I'm particularly interested in studying. I haven't found a major debate here. What he says is traditional public sociology is a public dialogue writing for the media, writing newspapers articles, doing policy research, engagement with your finding; policy dialogue. Talking to the public, sometimes in an engaged way, but a dialogue with the public.

He's got an interesting idea of organic public sociology where he argues that you are engaged with a social movement. So you actually, and I think what he's saying although he doesn't write in detail, is that if you are a university research group doing research this I think he would call traditional public sociology where you get involved with a civil society group, like a

labor movement or a group of trade union where you dialogue with them. So it's an engagement both ways in terms of trying to shape policy and strategy. But I think this; you also, with some groups in South Africa, like PLAAS, are also trying to do this. Besides shaping policy and strategy they're trying to build up the social movement. They're trying to act in a way to enhance the social movement which is different to shaping the policy and the strategy. You need to do different things to do that. And I'm interested in how PLAAS does that. It's very difficult to do that.

And I want to discuss now my last point of how I got involved trying to do organic public sociology with a labor group in the 1980s. So I would say that what we were trying to do was organic public sociology in the 1980s. And I'm going to share with you questions that come out of my involvement of this international labor research group. It was based in the sociology department; I actually initiated it in 1990, 1983. It was called ILRIG: The International Labor Research and Information Group and I was a lecturer in industrial sociology. So I became the principal investigator, the PI of this group. And I need to just, to start a debate about the issues; I just need to give you some background.

I decided twenty five—I actually left the group in 1989, I resigned from my own group. That's interesting, a PI withdrawing. And it was quite dramatic and I haven't—but twenty five years later ILRIG still exists and it had a twenty fifth year anniversary in 2008, from 1983 to 2008. And I agreed to write a critical article—I've never had feedback—but I wrote reflections twenty five years later of what I think happened. And much of what I'm going to say now I can send people 'cause I don't think this is online. Again labor movements and groups like this don't put their stuff online. So if you're interested I can send you the article and even try to get the book scanned to you. But different people writing about twenty five years of ILRIG.

As I mentioned I established it. I saw, I didn't use the word engaged scholar, but I saw myself doing what we then called extension service. So as a lecturer I was lecturing undergraduates on international labor studies. I've done a Ph. D on Botswana and I lectured on, I started on Botswana Trade Union and Tanzanian Trade Union. And then I found African Trade Unions quite boring because they were quite co-opted so I turned to Latin American and started teaching Chilean and Brazil and Bolivia, so I was teaching the stuff. What I found, what I knew from my electrical engineering department—I had a wonderful electrical engineering prof who did research on lighting. Every afternoon after he lectured us he used to go hold firm and even the university only lights. He was doing more pure applied research than use inspired but he was an engaged scholar. And he had his research group, that's a traditional principle investigator and a few post graduates. So I thought in 1983 why don't I do this before the labor movement? Instead of working with industry let me do exactly the same. So I, and I've just followed with research grants anybody, any tenured lecturer could start a group or a unit. So I opened up ILRIG as a research group.

We started doing these booklets and this is a booklet on Brazil, this is one on Bolivia, this is Brazil. We translated all the booklets into African languages and we did a Mayday book. But the short books became much more popular on Mayday than the longer books. Now I mentioned

a few things. There was a history of this; there was a group in Cape Town doing what we call South African labor history books. We decided to produce our books with much more glossy pictures and looking nice. They'd done much more basic books. But they'd started the thing in the 1980s. And a group of academics had launched the African Labor Bulletin which still exists, you can get it online. So I wasn't starting new, there was a history.

I just want to mention a few things because the issues come out of this. We got a grant from a Dutch NGO. I didn't know at the time that they were linked ANC, African National Congress. Somebody suggested ask them for a grant and I sent in a proposal and I got quite a bit of money to do four books. I said good, let's go. And the idea was to do International research and information and I'll come to this. We did some information, but we also had research in our title. We produced first of all four books and then we did an Africa series. We also did information packs, a kind of education package of Extremis and Bulwese, etc. All the work, at least initially, we linked to my trade unions in my third world sociology core. So I would deal with one person; my work was integrated between research, teaching and engagement. It's interesting I didn't think of it like that, and your center is studying the integration. But I knew I had to do an integration.

The...there was a shift. We started with doing research for the booklets, but slowly education workshops and we found that people really wanted a short booklet. So there was a shift in our group from more research based work to more education work, which I'll come back to. Then most importantly, and I visited The Center for Community and Economic Development, you've got a building in the middle of Lansing and good luck to you, you've survived for that. One of the problems—and also strengths—of I think ILRIG is we, in 1986 a new building, Community House, was opened up two miles from the university. And I was overjoyed and all of us, we took an office in Community Hall. So we had a research office in the department and another office with our library in Community Hall. Lots of issues. Before we even got into Community House the security police bombed the foundation and they placed the bomb in the wrong place, otherwise the building would have come down. So that was a start, and in a sense if you were in Community House between '86 and '89 there we meetings every day. Half the people were, belonged underground to the ANC, some were actually gorillas, so it was that kind of atmosphere, trying to do engaged scholarship in that kind of framework.

I started with two part time researchers and by 1989 we had ten part time administrators. We'd formed a center, we'd actually formed a center top structure, we drifted into that. By that time I was doing, interestingly, I was doing what I call use inspired basic research. I'd got involved in the study of worker council movements after the First World War. Most people didn't know, I didn't know about it, worker councils took over every major German city, running Berlin, running Hamburg, and then spread across Europe. So I was interested in this worker council social movement and spent about three years doing research. And I'd hoped to do booklets on that, to write that up as booklets.

Right, with that background, what are the issues that I had to face? I think that ILRIG is about 9, 10 people now, so I am talking about 1989. We were all agreed on that. We saw

ourselves as helping to strengthen the emerging trade union movement, what is called the Independent Trade Union. And I think without this new the labor movement the ANC would not have come to power. That was one factor. I think this investment, other struggles, their own struggles as well. I think building a labor movement was central, and we saw ourselves as linking to that. So we were engaged scholars doing research education to strengthen that movement. On that there was no disagreement.

When I wrote this article twenty five years later, what I theorized was that there was a serious identity difference between myself and most of the rest of the group; myself and maybe one other person. I was an academic, I was a tenured academic in the sociology department doing what I call extension work. And it's interesting, I looked up last night, we had a definition of extension work which a group of us academics had developed and it's very close to your engaged scholarship. None of my ILRIG group had been part of those discussions. We defined extension as it's made possible by the expertise and knowledge of the academic discipline of the staff member. Very particular, so it's made possible by the expertise of the knowledge of the academic discipline of a staff member who are providing such a service, and is rooted in rigorous academic work of the staff members concerned. So it's based in your academic work and it must be rigorous. So interestingly that was 1986, a group of us said this is what we mean by extension work.

Most of the people in my group were a combination of what I call activists, education people and research people. Most of them were quite young, they were fired up by an activism, and they had a multiple identity. They saw themselves as doing education, but their activism was just as important and their education was probably more important work. Some were affiliated with the ANC, some were non ANC, but all of them were politically involved. Which at that time they were legal organizations, nobody officially was part of the ANC or part of a legal organization. But they were all appointed by the sociology department; the only way I could pay them with the grant is they were sociology appointees. That was very important, but they often forgot that. They were members of the sociology department, part of my research group.

Right, I want to talk about the latest ways to solve problem challenges. I faced problems, but let's call them challenges. What's interesting is I thought the main problem would be the security police. And this is in ascending order of problem. The lowest problem was the security police, then the University—and this is my view—then the ANC, and then Community House. And I would say being in Community House was a major issue. Let me walk through each of those problems, or challenges.

We knew the security police didn't like our books. But by 1987 we'd distributed 250,000 in English and nearly 10,000 in African languages. The May Day one we produced—to our surprise—immediately we sold 10,000. And then there were resource packs. Again, reflecting twenty five years later, and I'll talk about Bolivia. We wrote a book on the 1952 National Democratic Revolution in Bolivia where effectively the ANC had a Freedom Charter. I think in 1952 we felt that in Bolivia they tried to put the Freedom Charter into practice. They nationalized some of the mines, they gave land to the peasants, they gave education and health

and they stimulated small businesses. So we thought, let's write a book about how the Freedom Charter would look if it was applied. We then showed the problems that a country runs into when trying; as a matter of fact when I read this on the plane coming over, a lot of these problems you could read South Africa. It's very interesting. And eventually, this is 1952; eventually military rule takes over in the 1960s so it degenerates. So we wrote this book. But I think if you had to ask, what we were trying to say is we were trying to make workers to imagine what it was like to be a worker in Bolivia. This was about, what was it like to be a worker in Brazil? That was the underlying idea. And this created, we had to find a style and we told most of the books through a story.

So there for instance in the Bolivia book we had a story of this woman, Domitylla who was on the mines. So we told a lot of it through a historical narrative; semi-fiction I would say. There was a heavy stress on what I call the experiential voice; through narrative we brought in the experiential voice. And ILRIG was very strong on the experiential voice. I used to stress the analytical voice, that built into the book has to be analysis and we all agreed on that. In the Bolivia book it was quite easy to, what we did when we came across controversial issues we had three workers debating things. There was the issue of whether you should be linked to a political party; the union should be linked. One worker says yes, the other says no and the other one takes a middle position. So we did debate through workers talking. So in the Bolivia book it was quite easy for the analytical voice to be partly built into the workers.

The first conflict we had in ILRIG was around the Tanzania book—which I wrote—because my analysis was not based on what any workers were saying in Tanzania. And I said this has to be the ILRIG, this has to be the writer voice. When a person reads the Tanzania book they must see that ILRIG is saying this, and we need to find a way of saying this. Some people in the group said, “no the workers in Tanzania must be saying this” and I didn't think it was an important issue. But I think it is an important issue because there are some analytical things which workers are not saying, I think scholars are saying. And I think you have to be open about what you as a scholar are saying. You can't bury it and pretend that the labor movement is saying this, we had problems with this. But it wasn't then a major debate.

So I mentioned what the book was about. What I didn't expect with the Bolivia book was how long it would take and how difficult it would take. You can't; none of us spoke Spanish so that was a major problem, we had to read. It was very difficult doing a simple book; simple books are very difficult to do because you really have to be a good scholar. You don't want to write rubbish about Bolivia. And it raises an issue about cutting edge knowledge. So it took us much longer to do the research; we sent it to somebody to check. Fortunately the person who read the Brazil books was in ILRIG and could speak Portuguese. But for me it began to be a problem, I felt we weren't often expert enough. Because you don't want to; actually I would argue and the group, you don't write nonsense for the labor movement, you want cutting edge scholarship. So I think we hit the issue of longer and difficult became to be a problem.

And then an interesting thing happened. The book was banned by what is called the South African Publication Board. Some of us, particularly myself, had a position of what I call a

war position. We should fight a legal struggle, that the way to build up the labor movement is to find the legal space. So we had a very good lawyer who took the book and argued, right before the Publication Board. At that time fiscal theory wasn't well known, and he said to the Publication Board; there was a very sophisticated academic who had read the book, a conservative who said, "This book is revolutionary and calling for action". And our lawyer said, "But where's the word revolution mentioned in the book?", he took a content approach, "and where's the call for action?" and he won it. So the book was then unbanned. And after that occasionally the police visited the university but I took seriously our research. We were present in our research report and our university was quite supportive.

So that comes to the university. What was interesting is our Vice Chancellor, new Vice Chancellor, gave support to ILRIG. He actually instructed the administrators in the Research Office to launch our unit as a unit. He wanted us to change the name ILRIG into National Labor, Research and Information Group. He said the "G" is too much a big group, I want you to call it a Project, a "P". But by that time we'd already advertised the original ILRIG, not ILRIP so we ignored it and he didn't ever call us in. My department supported it, but what I found most difficult was not getting support from faculty, but getting them to actually get involved. For instance I asked one person to write on the Russian Revolution and other changes and it was very difficult to get other faculty involved.

The Research Committee said we are not doing research; they didn't want us to fall under the Research Committee. Well I argued that we're doing research. What I said about Bolivia, I really think actually the research side was most difficult. So we fell under a new committee called Extension. So there was a split between the Research and Extension Committee. I remember I used to argue with the Research Committee and other scholars that writing a simple book—and I still hold this—if you're in quantum physics, if you're a quantum physics professor try writing a simple book about what quantum physics is for K-12 people. Very difficult, it's more difficult than writing a journal article. So I think being a scholar and writing simple is difficult.

Occasionally the university and my own department said, "Why aren't you writing more peer review publications?" and in retrospect I think we should have written more. But in actuality the university wasn't an issue. What I didn't expect is that the ANC would become a problem and actually in a sense cut off our funding, or at least groups did. And I still don't fully understand why it happened but at least some of the issue was we had started with working with Cape Town unions, the best part was we were in Cape Town. But those unions began to question the United Democratic Front, the popular front and they actually didn't join the union. And that created enormous tension, and we were seen as part; as a matter of fact I thought the unions were wrong not to join the UDF. But again in such a charged political; everyone said one was seen as part of the union. So that I think was the first issue.

I thought from 1985 there was too much stress on what I call mobilization: marches, even underground struggle, I think they were very important. My own position—which isn't such a public debate—but I felt organization, actually building shops and committees was actually more

important than mobilization, at least more important than it was being stressed. That was a tension because our book certainly stressed organization. What became a problem was our books were, they called it classist. We raised issues of race and national struggle back in Brazil and Bolivia. But there was a class underlying stress, and certainly at that time the UDF was not stressing class and so our books were seen as classist.

But if I had to guess, our biggest problem was Brazil. And again my naivety, I knew when we chose Brazil in 1984 there was the issue of the Workers Party. Which the Workers Party growing up as a party linked to the automobile worker unions. So there was an interesting link between the trade unions and the political party. But what interested me most in Bolivia was that under military oppression you could still organize a trade union movement. Brazil is a very interesting example. I was also interested in understanding, what in the literature said was bureaucratic authoritarianism, which I thought South Africa was very similar to Brazil as a bureaucratic authoritarian regime. At least those two ideas of building movements under oppression and the nature of the state, those were the lessons for me, not the issue of the Workers Party. But the Brazilian Party was against the Communist Party in Brazil. And this book was taken as we were supporting a Workers Party against the South Communist Party and some trade unions were arguing that. So we were seen as what were called the Workers Party. And that wasn't actually my position, but you enter this, as one of my black researcher's said, "don't go into this naively, wake up, you're in a political minefield".

There was another issue of I appointed particularly black researchers, on academic grounds. I didn't ask them whether they were UDF, ANC or non entity. My prime concern was I wanted good researchers. And I still hold to that. But what happened is we heard was that the Dutch Agency was cutting our funds off in the next round. And I was fund raising in 1988 and I went to see them and they said to go and see the ANC. So I took my little son on the train and we went to a café in London and met with young ANC people. And I argued, look we're doing worker education and there's debate and we're not taking political sides. I myself support the ANC, although I'm not a member, please support us. They felt, for whatever reason, they felt the thing was too political and they raised questions. And they said to me, "why do you have all these black researchers, you're not ANC aligned". When I said I appointed them because of academic reasons, they didn't like the idea, they said, "You appoint ANC people".

So to just summarize, there eventually came to a head in 1989. And I think the reasons I had to withdraw from the group was a series of reasons becoming more and more important. It was clear for me that while I was involved in research on the European labor issue, the group as a whole was doing much more educational workshops or libraries and there was a tension. Actually I was, my own group was saying, "why are you taking so long doing the research?". And my reply was I still don't understand the European Labor Movement. So there was really an issue of use inspired basic research versus more immediate. And a debate emerged between what I call; I was basically arguing for theory as an academic based in the university. Others in the group were saying we need to stress work experience, activism and struggle. And this became a real tension.

And sometimes it even took—though interestingly not among black researchers—but some of the others started saying “you’re just an academic at the university and you’re losing touch with experience, activism and struggle”. And in some senses that was right, and I suppose that was not my main role. I was getting certainly involved in longer term research rather than short term issues. I was beginning to worry about the academic work that we were doing. For instance some researchers brought out a pack on solidarity in Poland. I thought this was bad research, it was quick and dirty and not serious enough. And even some of the facts, not so good. I raised questions, and they said “well we need to do the research quickly, it’s a topic that must come out”. And the same thing emerged when people proposed we must do a news letter. And I think for me that links back to MSU’s definition of scholarship. You cannot get involved as an engaged scholar unless your scholarship is good. I still hold to this no matter how immediate the other work is needed. But this was never resolved.

But these two became a central issue at the time the trade unions were worried about NGOs and saying NGOs are not accountable to us. You are running our education programs, the service organizations they were called and they need to be more accountable to the labor movement, which led to at least one or two ILRIG people proposing we should come under the direct discipline of the trade union. That when we run a workshop they must decide when it is done and how it is done for an education workshop. For me this is really a complication. A university based research group coming under the direct discipline of; but this was being directly proposed. And I had to ask myself, what about our books then? Will they be vetoed, and what is the autonomy of scholarship? In a sense, you often, I suppose here in Michigan you’re not faced directly with that. Being in Community House in 1989 in South African, this was a central issue.

And then finally, I think the final thing that persuaded me was that I saw our group, and it links to that Michigan idea that it needs to be based in your niche. Our niche as I saw it was ILRIG, International Labor Research and Information Group based in the sociology department in industrial sociology. We got a request to write a booklet on the bus boycott in Cape Town. I said to my group, “it has nothing to do with industrial sociology, it’s more needed than industrial sociology, but it’s not our niche”, they said “niche, niche, it’s needed”. So they were actually asking me to move out of my niche, and I could see this was impossible so I moved on.

What happened is ILRIG changed. We had an interesting debate about whether the “R” stands for research or resource. And they were right, they wanted to be resource group more than a research group, and they changed the name. Honestly I thought that was good. And they’ve survived for twenty years. They stayed on campus for a while then they moved on and become a service organization. By 2003 they changed the “R” from—they were known as International Resource and Information Group—they changed it back to resource in 2003. And they are now doing really interesting globalization research with an international perspective. So they’ve gone through an interesting transition.

I myself, shifted to higher education studies. I shifted fields, that’s how I got involved. I got involved in university and I am now not an engaged scholar anymore, I’m studying the scholarship of engagement.

Thank you very much.