

Reimagining Leadership after the Public Turn

Thomas P. Miller and Joddy Murray

We seem to have a problem with leadership. As we prepared this issue, a campaign raged across the country between two of the most unpopular leaders in US presidential history. While we often bewail our leaders' weaknesses, we generally leave the study of leadership to sociologists, organizational experts, and schools of business. That is rather surprising. Preparing citizens for leadership was one of the founding purposes for studying rhetoric and the other liberal arts, and rhetoric's civic vision has taken on renewed significance as we have expanded our public engagements in service learning, community literacy, social movement studies, and political advocacy. While these lines of inquiry converge on an interest in collective action, leadership has not really been a topic of discussion in *College English*, *College Composition and Communication*, or other leading journals, perhaps because we tend to see leadership's traditional relations with rhetoric as being concerned with exercising power over others rather than with mobilizing collective action. The 2014 special issue of *College English* on "Reimagining the Social Turn" provides a useful point of departure for bringing leadership into our discussions. Jacqueline Rhodes and Jonathan Alexander coedited that issue, which opened and closed with calls to follow through on the public turn to "engage in critical reflection that moves toward

Thomas P. Miller, longtime member of NCTE, is professor of English and vice provost for faculty affairs at the University of Arizona. He has won awards for his research, teaching, mentoring, diversity leadership, and advocacy for faculty leadership. He has published five books and more than fifty scholarly articles, chapters, and reviews on faculty development, the history of higher education, theories and histories of rhetoric, and the teaching of writing. He received a national book award from the Modern Language Association for the first volume of his two-part history of college English studies. **Joddy Murray** is an associate professor of rhetoric and new media at Texas Christian University, where he teaches courses on writing, rhetoric, language theory, multimodal authoring, and poetry. He specializes in theories of rhetoric for both static and dynamic texts. He served as director of undergraduate studies in the TCU English department, as an administrative fellow for the AddRan College of Liberal Arts, and as an American Council of Education Fellow in 2014–15.

College English, Volume 79, Number 5, May 2017

collective action” (Young 586). In response to such calls to action, the articles in this issue examine how a rhetorical stance on leadership can help us engage with the opportunities that are emerging as the foundations of traditional academic hierarchies shift due to erosions in state funding, a deepening dependence on student tuition, increasing threats to federal grants, expanding numbers of non-tenure-track (NTT) faculty, and intensifying pressures to articulate the values of liberal education in more accessible terms to defend against the privatization of public education.

These trends can seem overwhelming, especially when we consider their impact on our field. Continuing declines in English majors have contributed to sharp declines in jobs, with the 2014-15 MLA Job List offering the next generation of faculty the fewest numbers of tenure-track jobs in forty years. These leadership challenges are rarely addressed in our journals or in our department meetings for that matter. When we discuss faculty leadership, we tend to focus on the need for it rather than its impact; when we refer to campus leaders, we tend to be referring to central administrators. These assumptions work against our best interests. While we generally think little of leadership, we think even less of administrators. The underlying assumption that administrative service is a distracting sideline that any scholar can casually step into is satirized in Donald Hall’s “How to Destroy an English Department.” Hall sardonically suggests that to destroy a department, a lackadaisical head should simply profess disdain for “loathsome leadership” obligations and ignore the rest of the university, particularly “stupid pseudo-fields” such as “leadership studies” (540–1). Such attitudes trivialize the challenges of collaborative leadership at a time when we need to get serious about it. The challenges of engaging faculty are familiar to anyone who has worked to advance collaborative initiatives, as administrators or as faculty. Those of us who take up such work often find that we have learned a lot about leadership from our studies of rhetorical analysis, collaborative learning, and cultural studies. Our studies of rhetoric and writing as a collaborative problem-solving process provide us with strategic ways of thinking that can help us re-envision leadership as a mode of collective action to respond to the forces that are undercutting the standing of our departments and our institutions.

While the challenges we face are historic, so are the opportunities. Many faculty leaders have come to recognize that research and teaching are integrally involved with service and outreach, as Ernest Boyer discussed in *Scholarship Reconsidered* and “The Scholarship of Engagement.” Boyer’s conception of the scholarship of engagement has helped shape a range of trends concerned with the “civic renewal” of higher education (Barker). Those trends have prompted universities to revise the criteria that they use to hire, evaluate, and promote faculty members (see, for example, the University of Arizona’s “Inclusive View

of Scholarship”). They have also opened the confines of the research concepts upon which the research university was founded. Research as an autonomous enterprise unto itself was elevated by the generation of faculty who built up the modern research university to its fullest height. That generation, the largest cohort in our history, is retiring in increasing numbers. This historic transition presents the next generation of faculty with a distinctive set of leadership challenges and opportunities. To prepare for those, our graduate programs should be attending to the collaborative skills needed to build community-based research programs, advance interdisciplinary student initiatives, and expand partnerships with schools and underserved constituencies.

Preparing graduate students to lead will be broadly useful, not only to those who secure tenure-track jobs, but also to the majority who do not. When leadership is defined in the ways discussed in the articles that follow, it can be seen as an integrative paradigm that can help us expand our research into how groups organize themselves to exercise collective agency. It can also help us draw on that work to strengthen our collaborations with students, teachers, faculty, and staff from across the university. Such coalitions are vital if we are to respond effectively to the converging socioeconomic forces, institutional changes, and interdisciplinary trends that are breaking down traditional academic boundaries and expanding opportunities to articulate what we do to our public constituencies.

If we view leadership as an integrative frame for examining the civic potential of our work, we may be able to use leadership studies to integrate our public engagements into needed reforms of undergraduate and graduate programs, and we may also be able to expand our studies of writing programs to include coalition building with our colleagues teaching off the tenure track. These are the possibilities that emerge from the discussions in this issue. In our introduction, we set out a context for three lines of discussion that thread through the articles that follow. The first articles in this issue examine how administrative leadership can serve as a venue for empowering faculty to acknowledge the leadership that is already in place in our programs and departments. Recognizing our coworkers' leadership can help us develop a more inclusive understanding of the collaborative potentials in place in our programs. A place-based conception of leadership provides the transition to our second line of discussion, which focuses on the place of leadership in Native traditions and the broader distinction between organic and traditional forms of leadership. Following these two related lines of inquiry, our issue concludes with an examination of how such distributed models of leadership expand our field of vision beyond designated administrative leaders to consider the collaborative capacities of the complex adaptive systems in which we work. Higher education is faced with the sort of expansive ecological changes that are pressing traditional research universities to engage with their environ-

ments in more broadly based and regionally situated ways. These engagements call for new forms of leadership, and our discipline is well positioned to follow through on the public turn to develop those models of leadership.

LEADERSHIP AS A COLLECTIVE ACTION FRAME

Leadership studies provides an action-oriented framework that brings engaged pedagogies, research, and outreach into a civic paradigm that can be articulated to students, institutional partners, external stakeholders, and diverse constituencies. Such a framework is consistent with the civic tradition in rhetoric, though that tradition needs to be thoroughly critiqued, as discussed in our opening essay. In “Academic Leadership and Advocacy: On Not Leaning In,” Jane Detweiler, Margaret Laware, and Patricia Wojahn examine the assimilationist tendencies of the civic tradition as a case in point to reflect upon how writing program administrators and other faculty leaders are challenged to exercise influence within conflicted hierarchies while staying connected to the needs and aspirations of their broader constituencies. As administrators of writing and communications programs, Detweiler, Laware, and Wojahn recount how they rode the “service elevator” to the second floor to step into roles as assistant heads and associate deans. Those of us who occupy such positions often wrestle with popular perceptions that we have power and the troubling awareness that we do not. Distributed models of leadership can help us manage such ambivalences without becoming managers. As Detweiler, Laware, and Wojahn discuss, these ambivalences are compounded by the gendered dynamics of service that confront those who administer service units. The traditional subservience of service to research is shifting as universities expand their public engagement, and that shift is creating opportunities for us to rearticulate the values of general education, outreach, and service.

Such engagements have been marginalized by the disjunctures between our institutional and intellectual work that have been created by traditional research hierarchies, as Jonna Gilfus discusses in “The Spaces In-Between: Independent Writing Programs as Sites of Collective Leadership.” As a leader who teaches off the tenure track, Gilfus considers how respecting our service work can help NTT faculty members draw on their experiences to contribute to leadership in their units. Drawing on Theodore Kemper’s research on the mobilizing effects of emotion in social movements, Gilfus examines how she and other lecturers were treated as professionals in ways that established a “status accord” that enabled NTT faculty to step into leadership roles in her independent writing program. Gilfus examines how her unit’s respect for her work enabled her to foster collaboration in an outreach program with local teachers. Gilfus’s essay

provides a case study in how inclusive models of collaborative leadership can empower non-tenure-track faculty to develop partnerships with tenure-track faculty. The powers at work in such articulation efforts become visible when we identify them as ways to build upon the leadership that is already in place in our departments. While such a perspective will not in itself solve our “labor problems,” it can enable us to quit thinking of non-tenured colleagues as a problem and begin considering how we can work together to expand our field of work to include coalitions with teachers in local schools. As Gilfus’s essay demonstrates, if we consider the leadership potential already in place in our departments, we will be able to make better use of our expansive engagements with articulation programs, gateway courses, and our interdisciplinary engagements with collaborative learning and higher-order thinking.

This expansive powerbase has been devalued by the marginalization of service courses and programs, but service is currently rising through the same historical trajectory that teaching moved through as it gained increased recognition over the last two decades (see Miller). The rising standing of teaching and service converges in ways that leadership studies could help us exploit. Many of our institutions have adapted to historic cuts in state funding and dramatic increases in student tuition by giving more attention to student recruitment and retention. Writing programs and English departments have the position and expertise to lead such evolutionary adaptations, and adaptive theories of leadership provide a framework for articulating what we do in more accessible terms (see Heifetz et al.). Undergraduates’ interest in leadership is powerfully apparent in the proliferation of related programs across our campuses. Many departments have adapted to such trends by introducing internships, an occasional service-learning course, and some uncoordinated professional writing and pop culture courses that can seem far afield from traditional English instruction. Leadership studies could help us advance the public turn in composition studies to develop an integrative frame for connecting these trends with courses in media, ethnic, and gender studies and our general interest in activism and equity. Such connections become vital if we consider preparing citizens to lead as one of the goals of our undergraduate programs (for examples, see Riggio et al. and Brungardt et al.). “Citizen leadership” provides a politically engaged alternative to traditional concepts of outreach and service learning (see Perreault and Langone). If we adopt a civic standpoint of leadership, we can see Gilfus’s work with articulation as integral to what our departments are about, rather than as a marginal concern for the service wing of the department.

Such an integrated approach to our field of study and work would help us prepare the next generation of faculty leaders to develop the sort of collaborations that the first two essays examine. Attention to leadership can help us connect our

intellectual work with our institutional base by reorienting our graduate programs to attend to the opportunities and challenges facing the next generation. MLA reports on graduate education have begun to recognize that encouraging PhDs to consider nonacademic jobs can only provide an alternative to the declining number of tenure-track positions if we revamp graduate programs to provide students with broader skills and engagements. Unfortunately, the 2014 *MLA Task Force Report on Doctoral Study in Modern Language and Literature* perpetuates our discipline's tunnel vision in its failure to recognize that most literature PhD programs are designed to prepare students for jobs that only graduates of elite institutions are likely to get. As Colander and Zhuo have detailed, "[T]he majority of English graduate programs are preparing their students for jobs at research-focused universities, but most of their graduates do not get such jobs and cannot expect to" (145; see also Cassuto). While graduate programs in rhetoric and composition are more focused on the work that faculty actually do, they could be doing more to prepare leaders to respond to the deprofessionalization of teaching and service. Gilfus's discussion of how her graduate studies helped her professionalize her leadership invites us to consider how our graduate programs can help support NTT faculty in advancing their own professional development. If our graduate programs considered part of their role to be serving as professional resources for teachers and NTT faculty, we might be able to develop integrated programs of study that locate leadership at the center of our efforts to re-articulate our engagements with the constituencies discussed by Gilfus and Detweiler, LaWare, and Wojahn, each of whom uses somewhat different terms for NTT faculty. We have retained those differences because titles such as *contingent* or *FTF* often have particular implications within specific institutions.

REIMAGINING THE PLACE OF LEADERSHIP

Following Jonna Gilfus's reflections on her leadership of an articulation program, the articles by Victor Villanueva and Rachel Jackson provide a more expansive perspective on the conjunction between articulation and leadership. *Articulation* became a key topos in cultural studies through the work of Stuart Hall on the critical junctures where prevailing hierarchies are called into question as they circulate through social movements and networks (Clarke). Villanueva looks back to one of Hall's principal intellectual sources, Antonio Gramsci, whose work provides a rich array of concepts for thinking about oppositional standpoints on leadership. Villanueva uses Gramsci's distinction between organic and traditional intellectuals as a heuristic to reflect on his leadership contributions as an administrator and scholar of color. Gramsci considered intellection as a

sociopolitical process in which leaders articulate the practical needs and political aspirations of historical groups. As Villanueva discusses, Gramsci defined organic intellectuals by their engagements in the experiential lifeways of a social movement or historical formation. In contrast, traditional intellectuals tend to be institutionally sanctioned leaders such as priests and academics, who often speak in more universalist terms that position them at a critical distance from political divisions and utilitarian applications. Villanueva's reflections on the engagements that have shaped his life and work complement Rachel Jackson's assessments of her position as a Cherokee woman graduating from a PhD program in rhetoric and composition. As she considers the prospect of "going on the market," Jackson is confronted with the choice of uprooting herself from her tribal community to find a place in the academy. Her essay develops a model of indigenous leadership that resides in the storied landscapes that empower tribal leaders.

Victor Villanueva's essay, "I Am Two Parts': Collective Subjectivity and the Leader of Academics and the Othered" is central to this issue because he provides pivotal insights into how we locate leadership within the academy and within our public engagements. Villanueva examines how the distinction between organic and traditional intellectuals fails to account for the multivalent "collective subjectivities" that he identifies with as a Puerto Rican, "Nuyorican," Latino, and scholar of color. Such affiliations are vital in exploring the potentials of leadership as a mode of collective action, and Gramsci's concept of intellection provides a powerful benchmark for assessing how leaders articulate their constituencies' experiences. Such assessments can help us develop ethnographic perspectives that are grounded in the distinctive experiences, traditions, and needs of our diverse constituencies. Villanueva's reflection on the spaces and places of leadership resonates with the ambivalences that Detweiler, Laware, and Wojahn work through as they consider the challenges of leaning in to work within prevailing institutional hierarchies and leaning out to collaborate with the constituencies with whom they identify. Villanueva's perspective is also pivotal to the turn from Gilfus's focus on leadership in place in writing programs to Jackson's examination of the place of leadership in the traditions of her people. Villanueva advances our discussions of the place of leadership by shifting back and forth from modes of leadership that are "organically rooted in a place" to the spaces for collective action that are "discovered amidst the contested traditions of prevailing institutions" (p. XX)

Rachel Jackson presents a more locally engaged model of leadership in "Resisting Relocation: Placing Leadership on Decolonized Indigenous Landscapes." While Villanueva looks back over decades in the academy, Jackson focuses on the prospect of dislocating herself from her tribal lands to market herself as a new PhD. She resists the pressures to go on the market because she does not want

to displace herself from the modes of leadership that have sustained her and her people. Jackson identifies her resistance to relocation with the historical relocation of the Cherokee. She draws on that resistance to consider the decolonial project that Villanueva discusses, but Jackson's vision of leadership is rooted in her ethnographic research on indigenous leaders who engage their audiences in storytelling as a means to enact the traditions of their people. Jackson's model of indigenous leadership is one that values locally engaged and cosmopolitan modes of leadership that "advance decolonial collaborations both in their communities and their institutions" (p. XX). Jackson's essay looks to the performance of stories as a collaborative process of enacting indigenous leadership.

Villanueva's and Jackson's essays challenge us to consider models of leadership that integrate our public engagements into our intellectual inquiries and institutional work. Critically engaged modes of professionalism are taking on renewed significance as the institutional confines of modern disciplinary enclaves break down. An alternative to the ethos of the disciplinary specialist is provided by the civic professionalism of progressive tradition. Civic professionalism provides a broader historical frame for Jackson's "local cosmopolitanism" and Villanueva's reflections on his transnational affiliations. The civic professionalism of nineteenth-century educators is examined in Bender's influential research on how college educators served as community intellectuals before the rise of the research university (see also Boyte and Fretz). Lacking the institutional apparatus of the modern university, nineteenth-century educators participated in more locally rooted learning networks such as the teacher institutes that Anne Ruggles Gere discussed in her historical survey of the public engagements that make up the "extracurriculum." A more recent exemplar for civic professionalism is provided by the activism that made ethnic and women's studies so central to the converging social movements, institutional reforms, and intellectual trends that expanded educational access in the 1970s. According to Boyte and Fretz, such community-based academics get involved in more organic forms of community organizing than the traditional outreach efforts of disciplinary specialists seeking to disseminate their expertise. Such dislocated perspectives on outreach stand in sharp contrast with the way Jackson articulates the place of leadership in the lifeways of the Cherokee and the way Villanueva understands the shifting affiliations that have shaped his career as a scholar of color committed to challenging the hierarchies that he has worked with as a "subversive" administrator in the academy.

Villanueva's and Jackson's articles provide bookend perspectives on a career in academe. Their perspectives should encourage us all to reflect upon our own personal and professional development as leaders. Their articles invite us to consider the modes of leadership that we identify with—in our institutions

and extracurricular communities. Stepping back to consider how we imagine ourselves as leaders is a vital step in the process of thinking systematically about the changes in our institutions. The essays in this issue challenge us to consider the questions that rhetoric began with: what can we achieve together in this situation, and who will we become together by articulating our aspirations and needs in the ways we imagine? Such rhetorical questions become more broadly engaging when viewed from an ethnographic perspective, as Jackson's essay documents by grounding her reflections on her own leadership in her ethnographic studies of the leadership traditions of her people. An ethnographic perspective on leadership enables us to consider how we position our work in relationship to those whom we presume to represent. Ethnographic perspectives on leadership are consistent with related trends in participant-action research, especially as it has been developed in the areas of community literacy and service learning (see Flower). Such ethnographic inquiries can also be turned on our own work within the academy in the ways that Villanueva's essay examines. The lines of inquiry set out in this issue follow through on the public turn to return to the sort of institutional critiques that James Porter and his coauthors proposed "as an activist methodology for changing institutions" (610). Oppositional perspectives on leadership studies can advance these lines of inquiry by shifting our focus to the modes of collective agency that unfold as groups reimagine traditional assumptions to subvert prevailing ideologies and challenge institutional hierarchies.

Repositioning leadership in the ways that Jackson and Villanueva suggest can help us rearticulate the terms of engagement for institutions of public learning. If we view leadership from the perspective of people working together to rearticulate their collective aspirations, and not from the traditional standpoint of designated individuals in positions of authority, then we may be able to develop leadership studies into an integrative action-oriented paradigm that brings together engaged pedagogies, research, and outreach. Community engagement is a converging area of concern in our institutions and our discipline. To develop leadership into an integrative frame for advancing the public turn, we should consider the strategic possibilities that emerge at the conjunctions where social movements converge with expanding disciplinary changes and shifting institutional needs and priorities. The conjunctions among social, disciplinary, and institutional changes provide opportunities to rearticulate the values of engaged scholarship, teaching, and service. *Engagement* provides a locus for placing leadership at the conjunction of several interdisciplinary trends, including not just service learning, community literacy, and school and community outreach, but also participant-action research and social-movement studies. The leadership opportunities that emerge at the conjunctions of these trends can be better understood if we think of higher education as a complex system that is in the process

of adapting to historic changes in our social and educational environments. As we will discuss in the next section, research on complex adaptive systems has focused on distributed forms of leadership and ecological modes of thinking that expand upon ethnographic perspectives.

LEADERSHIP AS AN INTEGRATIVE FRAME FOR ENGAGEMENT

The concept of complex adaptive systems has gained currency as a postmodern frame for thinking about interacting economic, epistemological, technological, and environmental systems—including neurological networks, global economies, the internet, and other complex ecologies that evolve in response to environmental changes. Such adaptations are self-organizing, insofar as they are shaped by self-correcting processes that cannot be explained by a simple cause-and-effect analysis but require more holistic, even analogical, interpretive frames, as in such popular formulations as the butterfly effect. In the last essay in this issue, “Complexity Leadership and Collective Action in the Age of Networks,” Joddy Murray examines the leadership possibilities that emerge as the adaptations of complex systems reach tipping points and transformative changes emerge. An example of the emergence of such an adaption is the flipped classroom. If we view our institutions as complex adaptive systems, we can see that such transitions in learning concepts are emerging out of our evolving work with the networked technologies. Those interactive technologies are giving rise to opportunities for leaders to articulate the collaborative potential of the classroom in new ways. Such evolutionary adaptations are emerging in various areas of our institutions as they adapt to the environmental changes we have noted throughout this introduction. In response to those changes, research universities have become more attentive to experiential learning, business and community partnerships, and the scholarship of engagement. These individual initiatives have converging potentials that become apparent when we consider how higher education is evolving as a complex adaptive system. The emergence of the paradigm of “the engaged university” provides a generative frame for considering the adaptations at issue.

Murray provides a theoretical framework for thinking about engagement as an adaptive response to decreases in state funding, increased reliance on student tuition, and looming threats to grant funding. The “engaged university” is a systemic change supported by an international movement that includes a wide range of foundations, associations, and publications on trends ranging from service learning through translational research to community development. The evolutionary adaptations involved in this movement are surveyed in David Watson’s coauthored *The Engaged University: International Perspectives on Civic*

Engagement. The “engaged university” marks the convergence of the public turn in higher education with broader changes in the environment, such as deepening economic disparities, rising population growth, changing demographics, and technological innovations. As Watson and other commentators have noted, universities around the world have responded to such changes by getting more involved in economic and community development, often following the lead of students pressing for expanded access and increased responsiveness. The turn to engagement has become such a prominent part of higher education that community partnerships and experiential learning are considered in rankings and categorizations of institutions, most notably the Carnegie Foundation’s Community Engagement Classification. An “integrated model” for advancing civic engagement is provided by Sandmann, Saltmarsh, and O’Meara, who outline a series of leadership efforts that are needed to advance engagement, including helping disciplines reassess traditional hierarchies. Many disciplines have recognized engaged scholarship in recent decades, including CCCC, which just recently set out their *Statement on Community-Engaged Projects in Rhetoric and Composition* that cites related scholarship, national initiatives, and criteria for assessing the scholarship of engagement. These efforts advance the public turn in rhetoric and composition by connecting with the tradition of civic humanism in ways that have intradisciplinary significance for English departments, as Gregory Jay has discussed.

The turn to public engagement in higher education presents two leadership challenges of the sort that Murray considers in his analysis of complex adaptive systems. Those challenges are set out in Hartley and Saltmarsh’s conclusion to “*To Serve a Larger Purpose.*” First, service-learning programs, community-based research partnerships, and other engagement initiatives tend to be “discrete efforts wholly disconnected from one another on campus” (290). Second, “rather than openly questioning the prevailing norms, customs, and structures of the academy, civic engagement efforts have instead adapted in order to ensure their . . . legitimacy within it” (290). Faculty leadership is needed, according to Hartley and Saltmarsh, to help ensure that service learning and volunteer programs become something more than a “conventional, even timid” set of student services. Faculty leadership is needed to provide critical vision and curricular support for such programs. That need is one of most compelling examples of Murray’s analysis of how leadership in complex adaptive systems depends on forging connections among emerging trends that can seem unconnected unless viewed systemically. As an adaptive response to systemic changes in higher education, we can see that “active and collaborative forms of teaching, learning, and scholarship” are converging on an integrative concern for “active and col-

laborative forms of leadership” (Hartley and Saltmarsh 294–5). That convergence presents opportunities for collaborative interventions of the sort that Murray discusses in his article.

To develop those collaborative forms of leadership, we need to revise the hierarchy of research, teaching, and service that has been used to hire, promote, and classify faculty members. Boyer’s conception of the scholarship of engagement provides an integrated model that articulates the values of action research, service learning, school partnerships, and other modes of collaborative inquiry. Engaging in such collaborative leadership opportunities provides us with powerful venues for rearticulating a civic vision of higher education to resist the trends that are working to privatize higher education. The scholarship of engagement is a powerful integrative paradigm for thinking about the potentials of civic leadership studies: it provides a focal point for thinking about the integrative modes of learning that will be vital to the next generation of faculty. In “The Neglected Learner: A Call to Support Integrative Learning for Faculty,” Rossing and Lavitt argue that

[e]ngaged scholarship can be understood as a faculty equivalent of integrative learning. Engaged scholarship requires co-constructed, decompartmentalized knowledge—both deep and broad—that reaches beyond the boundaries of the university and solves community problems, thereby fulfilling the civic mission of higher education. (39)

Integrative learning has generally been identified with interdisciplinary course sequences and experiential learning programs that span general education and upper-division curricula. Such integrative approaches break down traditional skills-content dichotomies that compartmentalize student learning and faculty expertise. This deadening dualism has marginalized the teaching of writing and undercut the intradisciplinary synergies that English departments need to develop among writing, literary, and language studies.

The synergies among authorship, agency, and leadership are central to Murray’s analysis. Drawing on complexity theories, Murray examines how network studies and broader work on the socio-institutional construction of knowledge are reshaping conceptions of authorship and authority in evolving ways that can help us reimagine leadership to advance the lines of inquiry set out in this issue. Murray explores how networked systems have created distributed forms of authorship and leadership that can be better understood by drawing on complexity theories. Traditional conceptions of leadership and authorship are based on the assumption that individuals set a goal and then persuade others to advance it. Adaptive theories of leadership shift the focus from individuals in designated leadership roles to the collaborative processes involved in collective action, and

complexity theories focus on how those processes are mediated across interactive networks that are beyond the control of individuals or designated authorities. While traditional perspectives on authorship and leadership have tended to focus on the translation of intentions into action, complexity theories shift the scene of action to the transactional junctures where un-envisioned possibilities emerge. Complexity theories expand upon the focus on articulation that Stuart Hall helped to establish as a focal point for cultural studies, and those theories also expand upon related trends in leadership studies, particularly in adaptive theories of leadership argued by Heifetz, Grashow, and Linsky, as well as Peter Senge's conception of learning organizations as ecological systems.

WHERE DO WE WANT TO BE IN FIVE YEARS?

That is the sort of question one uses to begin a workshop on leadership, because leadership development begins with reflecting upon where we're going and how we plan to get there. Individually and collectively, we need to be asking this same sort of question about our discipline. We hope that the articles in this issue will raise questions about what we could achieve if we considered leadership as an integral part of our field of work. The call to leadership takes many forms, as is evident in the survey of "emerging faculty leaders" reported in Deborah DeZure and her coauthors in "Cultivating the Next Generation of Academic Leaders: Implications for Administrators and Faculty" (XX). DeZure and her collaborators found that many faculty members share the ambivalence about leadership that Detweiler and her coauthors examine in this issue. Faculty understandably fear that "going to the dark side" will throw their lives out of balance and take time away from their own research and teaching. The faculty in DeZure's study share the same sort of experiences that Detweiler and her coauthors discuss. The respondents reported that service roles had been "steppingstones" in their move to administrative positions, with women and minorities often having to sidestep traditional assumptions about who should be in service to others and who is prepared to lead. Most of the respondents in DeZure's study felt called to take the step into leadership roles because they saw it as an opportunity to advance change and have a broader impact. To help faculty members think about taking on leadership challenges, DeZure stressed the importance of thinking and talking about leadership as an extension of faculty teaching and research. DeZure notes that the faculty respondents who worked in fields such as rhetoric, writing, and communications felt particularly well prepared to lead because they recognized the broader applications of their teaching and research.

The next generation of faculty leaders is stepping into evolutionary changes that simultaneously threaten the values we profess and open up possibilities to

articulate those values in more broadly engaging ways. The value of serving in leadership roles has become more recognized as our institutions have developed more integrated assessments of engaged research and teaching, as called for in works such as Boyer's *Scholarship Reconsidered*. In *Leadership Reconsidered: Engaging Higher Education in Social Change*, Alexander Astin and Helen Astin use the trends we have surveyed to outline practical ways that faculty and others in higher education can work together to exercise transformative leadership. Like Boyer, Astin and Astin call upon us to renew our civic commitment to preparing citizens for leadership. Like Boyer, they note the disabling disjunctures that have loomed between our institutional and intellectual work. As we have discussed in this introduction, and our collaborators discuss further in the articles that follow, we can bridge these disjunctures by following the public turn through to consider how we can better prepare our students, our colleagues, and ourselves to engage in transformative leadership. The challenges are clear, as are the opportunities.

So where do we want to be in five years—as individual faculty, as a discipline, and as a nation? That question took on historic significance after we had finished this issue and sent it off to be prepared for publication. We have added this paragraph to our introduction to take account of how the election of Donald Trump has overturned our shared assumptions about leadership and expanded our engagements in collective activism to an extent that was unimaginable when we first began work on this issue. Before Trump's election, political campaigns and presidential transitions in leadership seemed far removed from what we teach and study. Such positions are being swept away with the surge in political activism that promises to renew our shared interests in social movements, collective agency, and community organizing. The call to engage in leadership is familiar to those of us who are versed in participant-action models of research, activist theories of pedagogy, and disciplines such as women's studies that view community organizing as integral to academic inquiry. Converging institutional, ideological, and interdisciplinary trends call us to reconsider leadership as an integrative frame for what we study, what we teach, and what we need to be doing over the next four years. Leadership studies could help us draw on the civic traditions of the liberal arts to advance an integrated response to the challenges of our time. Those challenges present a frame of reference that has emerged since the following articles were written, but which we hope will make them even more useful to consider as we take up the work with leadership that our times press upon us.

WORKS CITED

Astin, Alexander W., and Helen S. Astin. *Leadership Reconsidered: Engaging Higher Education in Social Change*. Kellogg Foundation, 2000.

- Barker, Derek. "The Scholarship of Engagement: A Taxonomy of Five Emerging Practices." *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, vol. 9, no. 2, 2004, pp. 123–37.
- Bender, Thomas. *Intellect and Public Life: Essays on the Social History of Academic Intellectuals in the United States*. Johns Hopkins UP, 1993.
- Boyer, Ernest L. "Scholarship of Engagement." *Journal of Public Service and Outreach*, vol. 1, no. 1, 1990, pp. 11–20.
- . *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990.
- Boyte, Harry C., and Eric Fretz. "Civic Professionalism." Saltmarsh and Hartley, pp. 82–101.
- Brungardt, Curt, et al. "Majoring in Leadership: A Review of Undergraduate Leadership Degree Programs." *Journal of Leadership in Education*, vol. 5, no. 1, Summer 2006, pp. 4–24.
- Cassuto, Leonard. *The Graduate School Mess: What Caused It and How We Can Fix It*. Harvard UP, 2015.
- CCCC Statement on Community-Engaged Projects in Rhetoric and Composition. Conference on College Composition and Communication, April 2016. www.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/community-engaged
- Clarke, John. "Stuart Hall and the Theory and Practice of Articulation." *Discourse*, vol. 36, no. 2, 2015, pp. 275–86.
- Colander, David, and Daisy Zhuo. "Where Do PhDs in English Get Jobs? An Economist's View of the English PhD Market." *Pedagogy*, vol. 15, no. 1, 2015, pp. 139–56.
- DeZure, Deborah, et al. "Cultivating the Next Generation of Academic Leaders: Implications for Administrators and Faculty." *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, January-February, 2014. www.changemag.org/Archives/Back%20Issues/2014/January-February%202014/cultivating_full.html
- Flower, Linda. *Community Literacy and the Rhetoric of Public Engagement*. Southern Illinois UP, 2008.
- Gere, Anne Ruggles. "Rented Rooms and Kitchen Tables: The Extracurriculum of Composition." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 45, no. 1, 1994, pp. 7–92.
- Gramsci, Antonio. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, edited and translated by Quinten Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith, International, 1971.
- Hall, Donald E. "How to Destroy an English Department." *College English*, vol. 73, no. 5, May 2011, pp. 538–47.
- Hall, Stuart. *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. London, Sage, 1997.
- Hartley, Matthew, and John Saltmarsh. "Creating the Democratically Engaged University—Possibilities for Constructive Action." Saltmarsh and Hartley, pp. 289–300.
- Heifetz, Ronald, et al. *The Practice of Adaptive Leadership*. Harvard Business, 2009.
- "Inclusive View of Scholarship." Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. The University of Arizona. facultyaffairs.arizona.edu/universitys-inclusive-view-scholarship
- Jay, Gregory. "The Engaged Humanities: Principles and Practices for Public Scholarship and Teaching." *The Journal of Community Engagement and Scholarship*, vol. 3, no. 1, 2012, pp. 51–63. jces.ua.edu/category/jces-vol-3-no-1/
- Kemper, Theodore. "A Structural Approach to Social Movement Emotions." *Passionate Politics: Emotions and Social Movements*, edited by Jeff Goodwin et al., U of Chicago P, 2001, pp. 58–73.
- Langone, Christine A. "The Use of a Citizen Leader Model for Teaching Strategic Leadership." *Journal of Leadership Education*, vol. 3, no. 1, Summer 2004, pp. 82–8.
- Miller, Thomas P. "Humanities as a Public Works Project." *Academe*, vol. 98, no. 6, Nov-Dec, 2012, pp. 34–8.
- MLA Task Force Report on Doctoral Study in Modern Language and Literature. May 2014. www.mla.org/Resources/Research/Surveys-Reports-and-Other-Documents/Staffing-Salaries-and-Other-

- Professional-Issues/Report-of-the-Task-Force-on-Doctoral-Study-in-Modern-Language-and-Literature-2014
- Perraeault, Gerri E. "Citizen Leader: A Community Service Option for College Students." *NASPA Journal*, vol. 13, no. 4, Winter 1997, pp. 147–56.
- Porter, James E., et al. "Institutional Critique: A Rhetorical Methodology for Change." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 51, no. 4, 2000, pp. 610–42.
- Report on the MLA Job Information List, 2014-15*. MLA Office of Research. December 2015. https://www.mla.org/content/download/40038/1744556/Rpt_JIL_14-15.pdf
- Riggio, Ronald E., et al. "Leadership Education at the Undergraduate Level: A Liberal Arts Approach to Leadership Development." *The Future of Leadership Development*, edited by Susan Elaine Murphy and Ronald E. Riggio, Lawrence Erlbaum, 2003, pp. 223–36.
- Rossing, Jonathan P., and Melissa R. Lavitt. "The Neglected Learner: A Call to Support Integrative Learning for Faculty." *Liberal Education*, vol. 102, no. 2, Spring 2016, pp. 34–41. acu.org/liberaleducation
- Saltmarsh, John, and Hartley, Matthew, editors. "To Serve a Larger Purpose": *Engagement for Democracy and the Transformation of Higher Education*, Temple UP, 2011.
- Sandmann, L., J. Saltmarsh, and K. O'Meara. "An Integrated Model for Advancing the Scholarship of Engagement: Creating Academic Homes for the Engaged Scholar." *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, vol. 12, no. 1, 2008, pp. 47–64.
- Senge, Peter M. *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization*, Doubleday, 1990.
- Watson, David, et al. *The Engaged University: International Perspectives on Civic Engagement*, Routledge, 2011.
- Young, Morris. "Writing, Rhetoric, and Composition in the Age of Obama." *College English*, vol. 76, no. 6, July 2014, pp. 580–6.