The Reimagined PhD

Navigating Twenty-First Century Humanities Education

EDITED BY LEANNE M. HORINKO, JORDAN M. REED, AND JAMES M. VAN WYCK

Contents

Part II   Beyond Plan B: Preparing for What's Next

Foreword

• •

Toward a Sustainable Future

LEONARD CASSUTO

Welcome to *The Reimagined PhD*. The book before you renders the academic workplace in terms at once both bracing and hopeful.

The "bracing" part may be easier to see at first. (Hang on for the "hopeful" part.) Disjunctions are rife throughout the academic profession. The academic job market, never in harmony with its surroundings, now appears more disconnected than ever. Professorships continue to disappear, as administrators convert many of them to full-time positions off the tenure track. Most PhDs enter graduate school hoping to become professors, but as Robert Townsend demonstrates in chapter 1, their chances of achieving that outcome have become statistically remote.

The traditional "publish or perish" dynamic that fueled university presses no longer pertains at a time when libraries purchase fewer books and presses look more eagerly for titles that can make money. As Michael McGandy explains in chapter 3, the prestige and influence economies that govern scholarly publishing decisions these days place different kinds of pressures on authors and publishers that influence them in new and different ways.

If you're a graduate student or recently minted PhD, you might ask, "Where does this leave me?" The answer: in charge. You're in charge of your own graduate education, and its sequel.

Although the chances of landing a tenure-track job are slim, navigating the academic job market is straightforward in ways that are easy to take for granted. All of the notifications of possible job openings are easy to locate in well-known

locations, so the necessary information is all within reach. The conventions that govern the process of applying for those positions are, within each discipline, clearly and widely understood. (There are certain variations and nuances that require some insider's knowledge, but advisers usually know them, and in any case, books are out there to help too.)

Because the instructions are already out there, it's easy to give it your best shot—easier than in most other job markets. Yes, it can be maddening to jump through hoop after hoop, to craft multiple kinds of documents for different institutions. My point is simply that the instructions are out there to be followed. You don't have to wonder too much about what schools want, because they're usually telling you explicitly.

The problem, of course, is that there are lots of applicants and very few opportunities, so actually getting an academic job is brutally difficult. That means you have to look elsewhere, in other job markets that aren't as simply laid out as the academic one.

Outside of academia, you have to figure out what you want to do, and then look for a paying opportunity to do it. Most job markets work like that—the orderly presentation in academia is an anomaly. You may once have worked outside of the academy. If you did, you'll remember how much of the job search is up to you: you decide what you're looking for, and how to pursue it.

The simple and bounded search for an academic job causes too many graduate students to *un*learn how to look for other kinds of work. Maybe you haven't worked outside of academia since a summer job during your undergraduate years, or maybe all of your work experience has been as a teacher, tutor, or research assistant. Either way, give it a whirl. People who aren't as educated and talented as you are do it all the time. Even if you never leave academia, you'll have peace of mind when you feel that you can, if you want to. And as Joseph Vukov makes clear in chapter 7, academia is becoming an increasingly public-facing profession, so you need to know how to put yourself before the public whether you leave academia or not.

Maybe you'll look for a job as a stepping stone to another. Perhaps you'll even place that second stone yourself—as Will Fenton, a contributor to this volume, did when he collaborated with his supervisor and invented his own job. I've often noticed how unprepared many graduate students and recent PhDs are to do that. My advice to you: read this book.

The Reimagined PhD opens up the hopeful aspect of the academic workplace. From Augusta Rohrbach, for example, you'll learn that you already have some valuable and useful skills—and how you've been using them all through your graduate career. From Karen S. Wilson and Stephen Aron, you'll learn how to acquire those skills while you're in school. In fact, this book will help you become aware of what you already know—and what you can benefit from going out there to learn.

Here's the most important thing you need to know: You are the CEO of your own graduate education.

As the person at the helm, you have to plot your own course forward. Your advisers can help you steer, but you have to set the direction. The following chapters can help you do that.

To faculty and administrators: you sit on your graduate student's board of advisers, as it were. Your job is to use your experience and knowledge to help the person in charge. You should therefore educate yourself about what your students face so that you can help them design their graduate education and their diverse job search(es). This book will help you do that.

As I write this, the academic world has been turned upside down by the COVID-19 pandemic. The already-straitened academic job market has narrowed further, and pressure on the larger economy has brought forth comparisons to the Great Depression. Career diversity for graduate students has become more necessary than ever.

Call this an action memo. The action that this book calls for isn't specific: it's general forward motion. There's a scarcity of academic jobs, but many more professional—and scholarly—opportunities remain, and more are being created every day by people like you. Use your resources to help yourself figure out what you want to chase, and then go after it.

Fill your space. Do it with vitality and creativity. Take your energy and skills into the world, and do it soon, because society needs them—and you—urgently.

Preface

● ●

LEANNE M. HORINKO,

JORDAN M. REED, AND

JAMES M. VAN WYCK

This book is a positive call to action rooted in a grim moment for doctoral education in the humanities. A longitudinal view of the field reveals that this moment is nothing new: there have been long-standing fears over placement, completion rates, and just about every other marker by which we've judged success or failure for PhD programs. There are no satisfactory justifications for bloated time-to-degree numbers, or the circuit of postdoctoral fellowships ending in despair, or the adjunctification of faculty positions that erode higher education's mission from the classroom outward. As we write this preface, a global pandemic has disrupted every corner of higher education, and obliterated what was almost always optimistically described as the "market" for academic jobs. In response, we—editors and contributors alike—argue for and demonstrate how the humanities PhD has, can, and must be reimagined.

A central argument of this volume is that we must not expect a return to a previous steady state. Nor should we want such a return. There is no return to the narrow and flawed ways of preparing doctoral candidates in the humanities. Our reimagining must take us forward, not simply reify the status quo. Our response to the current crises we're facing must also include a reckoning with the fact that the humanities PhD has been underutilized for decades. We believe in a more expansive application of the humanities PhD. The competencies and skills acquired during doctoral training equip humanities PhDs for the questions, problems, and opportunities of the twenty-first century in

unparalleled ways. And humanists are needed—now more than ever—in every possible field of endeavor.

We don't hold these beliefs in the abstract: each chapter in this volume focuses on practical ways the value and the applicability of the PhD can be realized, whether you are a PhD student, or whether you work with graduate students as a faculty member or administrator. *The Reimagined PhD* serves up stories of creative professional development programs, meaningful institutional and structural changes, innovative curricular reform, and inspiring digital humanities projects.

This volume builds on previous clarion calls for change in doctoral education.[1] In 2011, for example, James Grossman and Anthony Grafton's "No More Plan B: A Very Modest Proposal for Graduate Programs in History" proposed a cultural shift in graduate education, one that still needs to be fully realized. Noting that a narrow focus on training for tenure-track positions was a "disservice" to students, they pointed to the diverse careers outcomes for history PhDs, including "museum curators, archivists, historians in national parks, investment bankers, international business consultants, high school teachers, community college teachers, foundation officers, editors, journalists, [and] policy analysts at think tanks."[2] This range of outcomes pointed toward the fact that historians—like all PhDs in the humanities—acquire skills that equip them for a wide range of careers.

As the downward trend in the academic job market continues, more academics, graduate programs, and professional organizations have taken up the cause of reimagining doctoral education. Leonard Cassuto's *The Graduate School Mess: What Caused It and How We Can Fix It* laid out fundamental flaws in the system and placed them in historical context. Cassuto's opening sentence asks "Is graduate school 'broken'?" The answer is a definitive "yes" if graduate school is meant to prepare students only to become tenure-track professors in jobs that are scarcer each year. As Cassuto noted, there is a profound need for graduate programs to "revamp their curricula, structures, and standards in a way that prepares today's graduate students for a wider range of employment, not just academia."[3] In short, we begin to fix the mess when faculty, graduate students, and administrators of graduate programs adopt a revitalized raison d'être for twenty-first-century graduate education.

A reimagined PhD cannot be merely a response to the dearth of tenure-track positions. Within the new reality facing doctoral education, one of the more serious shifts that has to continue to occur is the way we judge success and failure. What if we looked at success for humanities PhDs differently? What if we learned to reimagine the ends and means of doctoral preparation so as to allow for more kaleidoscopic outcomes? In a landscape of reimagined PhD training we must attend more carefully to the cultures within higher education (often born and bred within academic departments) that reify the notion that there

is one prescribed path for those in doctoral programs—preparing for a tenure-track job—and that all other outcomes are deviations from this norm.

We are convinced that hewing to this limited view of what constitutes successful outcomes for PhDs subordinates and at times even elides the success stories that we see on a daily basis. Humanities PhDs have—despite being largely ignored by the departments from which they emerged—gone on to remarkable successes beyond the academy. They've reimagined themselves and—despite limited institutional support—they've found ways to deploy their training in new and exciting ways. Many contributors to this volume recognize this trajectory as their own.

Career diversity has been happening at the margins: now it needs to be mainstreamed. Until recently, with the emergence and growth of the Graduate Career Consortium and the collating of resources on sites like Imagine PhD, graduate students in the humanities prepared for careers beyond the academy in a kind of shadowy, parallel universe to their doctoral preparation. There were conferences, coursework, and dissertation drafting, and then there were the professional development seminars, the career preparation exercises, and alumni panelists discussing careers beyond academia. These worlds didn't talk to each other, and each suffered because of this disconnect.

As we adopt new metrics for judging success, we must keep in mind that the changes that must come to doctoral education will work best if they make a collective, positive case for the value of the PhD, and do not merely collate a series of responses to the declines we've seen in tenure-track lines. It can't be business as usual, with a few tweaks.

Doctoral education has virtues and flaws that are rooted in institution-specific programs, histories, and experiences. And each doctoral program—and each student—represents a chance to remake it anew. The reimagined PhD thus also requires us to abandon our urge to view flaws in our own graduate programs as solely or primarily the effect of broader systemic issues across higher education—issues that are assumed to be beyond our control. It is time to stop thinking of doctoral programs as cogs in the machine of a discipline and instead view them as distinctive instances that serve their PhD students using the particular resources at their disposal. The work of reimagining the PhD must be systemic and local, worked out in professional associations and particular departments at once, and producing effects that help each PhD find meaningful ways to take their training into the world. Even as we attend to national trends, examine disciplinary data trends, and argue for comprehensive, intra-institutional changes, the reimagined PhD begins at home—in the departments around which so much of the life of a graduate student is centered.

The reimagined PhD recognizes doctoral education as a tool in the hand of the user, not the creation of a tool to be used in a system. PhDs are not created for a specific purpose, namely the tenure track. PhDs must be equipped for a

variety of purposes, which they must have wide leeway to construct for themselves. For them, the PhD is not only training for a career. The experiences in graduate school constitute a small part, the beginning, of a long career. With this in mind we must reframe how we view the role of graduate education. Graduate study is professional experience, whether a student ultimately goes on to be a professor or inhabits the wider professional world.

Another part of this change is to see the divide between the academy and the world beyond the academy for what it is: a nonexistent binary. One seemingly innocuous way this manifests itself is in the way we describe the academy using prepositions that indicate some kind of spatial relation between the academy and other spaces. There are careers "in" academia and those "outside" of academia, while others are "on" or "off" the tenure track. Still others are "beyond"—a much better, but still spatially bound concept—the tenure track or academia itself.[4]

Collectively, the chapters that follow show that a range of collaborating stakeholders is what it takes to prepare the twenty-first-century PhD. *The Reimagined PhD* undercuts the insidious notion that career preparation is a zero-sum game in which time spent preparing for a range of careers detracts from professorial training. In doing so, this volume provides practical advice geared to help PhD students, faculty, and administrators incorporate professional skills into graduate training, build professional networks, and prepare PhDs for a range of careers.

Broadly speaking, this book is divided into two sections. The first five chapters make the case that embracing career diversity is essential: diverse career outcomes are a must if we are to have thriving graduate programs and graduate students.

In chapter 1, Robert Townsend draws on extensive statistical studies of the academic job market, bringing the post-2011 picture into focus. Specifically, he looks at the surplus of humanities PhDs on the market compared to the job openings posted annually. From this, it is clear that the job market has not shown signs of improvement. In fact, academic job prospects are possibly even dimmer since Grossman and Grafton's initial article. The numbers—each connecting back to a particular doctoral student with a particular lived experience—highlight the necessity of reimagining the PhD.

Robert Weisbuch draws on wide-ranging administrative experience to outline how systemic improvement can become more attractive for students, faculty, and administrators alike. Building upon the vision set forth by Grossman and Grafton, in chapter 2 Weisbuch suggests ways to create consensus among traditionally recalcitrant constituencies. This consensus is possible through a buffet of customized approaches to broadening the professional outcomes of graduate programs, and each option can be aligned to institutional needs and philosophies.

In chapter 3, Michael McGandy—senior editor at Cornell University Press and editorial director of Three Hills Press—examines how academic publishers maintain the old prestige regime and why it is time to reconsider these dynamics. This reification of an influence imbalance happens when a first-year assistant professor at Harvard with a degree from Stanford is always preferred over the University of Michigan PhD working in a think tank or the associate professor at Towson State with a degree from Penn State. McGandy shares practical professional issues that have arisen with the waning (but not death) of the old prestige regime. Most examples are drawn from his experience as an editor, and these anecdotes illuminate trends, showing how gatekeepers assess quality, authority, and relevance, and point a way forward for a reimagined vision of these processes.

Leonard Cassuto and James M. Van Wyck, in chapter 4, envision how relationships between advisers and advisees can be reimagined. Given the abiding importance of the advisor-advisee relationship, these new practices and attitudes represent a key beachhead for changing graduate programs. Graduate program faculty are often anxious about what advice to give a student who wants to prepare for a range of careers Cassuto and Van Wyck's advice is to create a graduate school experience that centers on graduate students every step of the way.

In the final chapter of the first part, Augusta Rohrbach discusses how to transition field-specific knowledge and activities into the larger research space. She argues that graduate students need to think of themselves as leaders. This important shift in mentality is difficult, she notes, because graduate students often feel disempowered. Drawing on her own career experiences within and beyond academia, Rohrbach shows the ways experiences open to all graduate students can translate in a variety of contexts.

The second section of this book continues to offer concrete suggestions: the last seven chapters highlight ways students, faculty, and administrators can actively cocreate the reimagined PhD and revamp doctoral preparation for the twenty-first century.

In chapter 6, Leanne M. Horinko and Jordan M. Reed point specifically to the experience of first-generation graduate students for inspiration. Drawing on their own experience as first-generation students, Horinko and Reed examine the nascent body of literature highlighting the isolating nature of this experience for graduate students. As it turns out, the profound challenges first-generation graduate students face are heightened versions of the challenges faced by the general graduate student population. Further, the authors highlight programs for first-generation students at Princeton University and the University of Washington as inspiration for graduate programs across the United States.

Joseph Vukov offers practical tips for jumpstarting (and then maintaining) a professional network in graduate school. In doing so, chapter 7 argues that building professional connections within and beyond the academy is not typically a matter of high-stakes networking. Rather, it is a matter of developing a set of practically oriented habits and social skills. In themselves, these habits and skills may seem inconsequential. But taken together and over time, they can help graduate students build a healthy professional network that will support them through graduate school and beyond.

In chapter 8, Melissa Dalgleish provides students, faculty, and administrators the information they need to find and assess the graduate student and post-doc professional development (GSPPD) programming offered at and outside their university. The chapter helps them make strategic decisions about their GSPPD learning and teaches them how to best advocate for more or different GSPPD when what is on offer is limited or lacking. These programs typically focus on transferable skills that are useful in faculty and careers beyond the academy and career development skills that can help students assess and explore their career preferences and future.

Karen Wilson and Stephen Aron outline the goals and results of a new kind of hybrid graduate seminar/workshop, "The Many Professions of History," through two iterations and document its reception by (and influence on) graduate students. The bulk of chapter 9 discusses how the course's focus and organization provide a viable approach for PhD programs in history and other fields to foster career exploration while enhancing students' understanding of the wide applicability of their skill sets. Offering an example of broadening the horizons and networks of graduate students, the chapter presents what happens when students are asked to engage with actual and potential roles of PhDs in twenty-first-century society while collaborating on an applied research project.

Vernita Burrell compels us to consider the ways that reimagining graduate education—and preparing humanities graduate students for a range of careers—requires a reimagination of the graduate pedagogical training. Incorporating her experiences as a community college professor, she argues in chapter 10 that programs that train PhD students in the humanities to teach should not expect them to end up at similar institutions but should instead create bespoke, student-centered pedagogical tracks that align with individual student goals and alumni outcomes—within and beyond academia. She reminds us that pedagogical training in graduate school need not be a homogenous set of activities that prepare humanities PhDs for university-level classroom but rather can be composed of modules focused on discrete skills needed by each PhD, regardless of career outcome. When we consider graduate pedagogical training in the humanities in this way, she argues, it will best serve our graduate students—and the broad array of audiences they'll engage post-PhD.

In chapter 11, William Fenton takes stock of the digital humanities (DH) job market and considers how graduate students might best prepare for a career in this evolving space. First, he describes the state of the DH market by canvassing higher education job boards, speaking with higher education experts, and interviewing DH leaders. After, he shows how DH creates candidates with skills transmissible to tenure-track and nonacademic positions within the academy. Fenton further shows how a DH portfolio can enable candidates to translate their academic work for potential careers at think tanks, consulting firms, galleries, libraries, archives, and museums.

Alexandra Lord explores how students can use internships, work for academic organizations, research, and classwork to build both a CV for an academic position and a resume for a careers beyond the academy. The final chapter also explores how students can navigate within academic culture to determine the type of career they, not their advisors or peers, want. This has ramifications for not just the students themselves but also the faculty and administrators who guide the mission and structure of graduate study at their respective universities.

The stakes are high for graduate students professionally and the institution of graduate study more generally. Ultimately, the benefits of a reimagined PhD transcend the academy itself. Cassuto observed in the closing pages of *The Graduate School Mess* that "we can advocate better for our vocation if humanists work throughout society, not just in universities." He saw a need for "a new higher education ethic."[5] That ethic informs the reimagined PhD that we know can and must emerge as career diversity and wide-ranging doctoral preparation become the norm for the twenty-first century. We hope students, faculty, and administrators alike find inspiration in the chapters that follow and then reimagine graduate education both locally and globally. The time is now, and the stakes are high.

Notes

1 See American Historical Association, "Career Diversity for Historians " (n.d.), https://www.historians.org/career-diversity; Connected Academics (n.d.), https://connect.mla.hcommons.org/.

2 Anthony T. Grafton and Jim Grossman, "No More Plan B: A Very Modest Proposal for Graduate Programs in History," *Perspectives on History*, October 2011, https://www.historians.org/publications-and-directories/perspectives-on-history/october-2011/no-more-plan-b.

3 Leonard Cassuto, *The Graduate School Mess: What Caused It and How We Can Fix It* (Harvard University Press, 2015).

4 James M. Van Wyck, "Academia Is Not a Container." *Inside Higher Ed,* November 2, 2020.

5 Cassuto, *Graduate School Mess*.

Part 1

A Call to Normalize Careers beyond the Academy

• ••

5

Out of the Field and into the Woods

● ●

The PhD as Professional Compass

AUGUSTA ROHRBACH

It's not just the job market for people with PhDs that is under threat, facing the demand to provide that they "add value" and bring a "return on investment."[1] The major challenge beating down higher education and its research enterprise—from granting advanced degrees to doing basic science, scholarship, and translational research—is two-pronged. On the one hand, there is the mandate to uphold a standard of inquiry that has long been defined along disciplinary lines. On the other, there is a pressing need to address complex, multilayered problems in a nuanced and sophisticated way—be that by preparing students for the workforce or providing thoughtful contributions to meet the human needs in the world around us. For many, higher education's mission for decades—maybe even from its inception—treated these two goals as complementary.[2] What is different about the present moment (now confounded exponentially by the pressures brought on by the COVID-19 pandemic) is the confluence of forces galvanized by rapidly evolving digital technologies that are pushing the boundaries of and reinventing the methodologies for how we teach, learn, and conduct research—no matter what field or discipline. In the face of dynamic change, we notice with alarm the winnowing of interest in

conventional subjects, the uncertainty of the funding landscape, and the sheer magnitude of the challenges around us. As dire as the situation seems to many, including those in the STEM fields, people with training in the humanities and social sciences have a particular skill set to bring to bear on what appears to be a surfeit of ambiguity. What is needed, however, is a more active agenda coming out of higher education that empowers PhDs to be agents of change at this important time.

Rather than theorize on my own, I took the question to the experts—querying those holding or pursuing a degree in the humanities and social sciences. To learn more about what others holding a PhD thought, I posted a survey to a variety of listservs and other social media outlets.[3] I framed my request for information like this:

> Calling all of you who have thought about the humanities and/or advanced degrees: Share your thoughts with me for a piece I am calling "Out of the Field and into the Woods" exploring the importance of the humanities PhD outside traditional scholarly classroom activities. . . . Please go to: PhD into the Woods Survey to access a survey, and/or send your ideas to me offline by March 9. Very happy to acknowledge you if you do the survey—there's a space for self-identification. Or, take the survey anonymously. . . . Specific anecdotes and references will be especially valuable to help readers grapple with and move beyond otherwise abstract arguments that characterize training in humanities as "critical thinking." Feel free to share the link with your networks. Many thanks for considering.[4]

The survey reached a PhD-rich audience—almost 95 percent of those who responded either have or are working toward a PhD.[5] Importantly for the present discussion, 71 percent have worked outside of academia.[6] I turned to this group of respondents to help me better contextualize my own experience bridging the gap between what people generally understand as the value of the PhD and the actual functions for which this training can and should be utilized.

More than 85 percent of those responding to the survey believe the PhD will be (or is) an asset to seeking employment outside of academia. These results tell me that it is time, as Nicholas B. Dirks, a former chancellor of the University of California, Berkeley, says, "to do more than tell our story better. We may have to change the story we tell."[7] Following Dirks, I am looking for more than professional recuperation for PhDs and higher education. Rather, my goal is to plumb the survey data for an actionable agenda—and one that is meaningful to publics beyond academe—as to how advanced academic training can functionally serve the public good.

In reviewing the 184 responses I received, one central message was clear. For all the ways in which respondents had suggestions, criticisms, and

disappointments, there is a fundamental idealism embedded deep within the commitment to attain the degree itself that we just don't fully reckon as valuable. Of those surveyed, 48 percent believe the PhD was an asset to obtaining their jobs. What this tells me is that not enough has been said about the elemental belief in the power of thought and study shared by those who invest the time, money, and heart into an advanced degree. This key value and the transformative power it holds, evidenced in the sheer magnitude of the investment in training, registers a remarkable commitment to quality—a commitment that will benefit large-scale, ambitious projects that require intellectual stamina. Just because those in conventional academic positions are defined by institutional demands to produce tangible results according to disciplinary norms and traditions does not mean that PhDs are limited by those norms or traditions. The message is clear: keep feeding the idealistic spirit that attracts people to academia because it can and will animate its future.[8]

A core principle for those who make getting a PhD a goal is that we are (or should be!) invested in the notion that culture is participatory; we believe that individuals can be active agents rather than passive recipients of received wisdom. Treating texts and contexts as implicitly biased is an accepted fact, underpinning the prime directive to interrogate them. Such a deep understanding of complexly interwoven context and purpose is essential to creating well-informed and carefully reasoned decisions. Such analytic training positions people "to sift through thousands of pages in order to locate answers to questions" as well as anticipate objections and gaps in reasoning. Respondents agree that PhD training enhances capacity to do large-scale information processing, producing evidence-based, data-driven decision makers. We undersell the indispensable role research plays not just in decision making but in the broader process of what business speak calls "buy-in." Rather than just solve problems, as one respondent indicated, PhD training emphasizes the importance of offering a "methodology," in order to show the logic of change, helping others see shifts as neither "arbitrary or personal." Administrators and program directors can use the ethos of participatory culture to create opportunities for scholars across disciplines to merge approaches. At Tufts, we've been thinking about launching a program that creates a role for those currently pursuing a PhD to develop research opportunities in cross-disciplinary collaboration. The PhD Externship program, developed in partnership with PhD-granting departments, provides time and space for students to learn how to contribute to field-defining research outside of their chosen disciplines; it also incentivizes inclusion by offering a small stipend to support the initiative in the form of a supplement to existing fellowship funding.[9] By design, this program presents what one respondent thinks is the biggest advantage higher education has to offer: "an opportunity to build a wide range of skills and experiences while having some safety net of structure and financial support."[10] This program would

create cross-disciplinary opportunities and instruction for PhDs in training from other disciplines while also serving as a potential method to grow innovation outside the norms of the primary research group with which the student is working. The PhD Externship program aims to enhance opportunities for PhDs in training beyond traditional roles typically associated with their chosen disciplines. A goal of the program, as a long-term investment in broadening the way disciplines interact, is to teach people to speak a variety of languages and grow innovation through diverse perspectives.

For as much as we all talk about the importance of disruption and the need to think outside of the box, the truth is that truly interdisciplinary research is a skill that needs to be taught and takes time, patience, practice, and that magic elixir of life: money. Today, many educators are focused on developing programs for cross-disciplinary innovation at the middle school level, incorporating STEM approaches through "maker curriculums," for instance.[11] But at the upper levels of our talent pool—the soon-to-be, recent, or established PhDs— there are few or no opportunities to learn the practices that so many agree fuel discovery. The capacity to move across disciplines has remained too embedded in the training itself and by the need to produce predictable results. We need to be more explicit about how and why our training prepares us for a multitude of roles and take an active interest in working outside our comfort zones. Indeed, 90 percent of those who responded to the question in the survey affirming the value of their training articulated concrete ways in which preparation for the PhD helped them meet (and often enhance) the goals of their position. One respondent explained that the training improved the "ability to do high level management work," while another found lessons on diversity and inclusion provided by graduate education essential preparation for the workplace: "The advanced training I received prepared me to teach in a non-traditional setting. Working with individuals who thought their opinions, beliefs, and culture were the standard platform for advancement, I then surpassed the learning curves presented as a disqualifier initially. Cultural competencies, prejudiced social consciousness were revealed and addressed as team building and teamwork strategies in order to achieve the goals of the team."[12] In particular, one respondent argued that "the intellectual, procedural, and motivational rigor that goes into a dissertation have been essential for all the kinds of work done outside of research. Working with other people in particular and being able to see large projects and ideas in terms of stages and components is a particular skill learned through dissertation writing."

One major qualification that PhDs have and should be foregrounded is our ability to collect and use evidence-based approaches to advance long-range theories and/or action plans. PhDs have an enhanced ability to communicate research goals to various stakeholders, a skill that is essential in a knowledge economy. Yet outside of academic departments, a PhD in English is, at best,

often valued as a writing credential. Despite the continual emphasis on "critical thinking" that many use to position the English major, when it comes to the PhD, this message has little or no purchase in the working world.[13] Those responding to my survey had much more to say about the value of their training. One respondent noted that the PhD was preparation for "having an idea that is too big to really grapple with except over the course of multiple stages of inquiry."[14] They concluded that the degree was a contributing factor in helping people wrestle with some of life's most dire circumstances, such as cancer treatment and end-of-life care. While no other respondents cited such weighty outlets for their training, roughly 90 percent of those responding to the question used words like "essential," "vital," in addition to "required" when describing how doctoral training helped them get the position in which they are currently.

What the respondents seem to agree on is that there is a set of transferable skills that allowed them to cogently analyze complex ideas and communicate them in a trustworthy manner. Thus, though institutions are notoriously slow to change, those who emerge from them with a PhD have skills that are essential in the effort to move ideas from the lab and the library to the world around us. These very skills are among the characteristics needed to render abstract research and scholarship toward a social purpose. As participants in a knowledge economy, PhDs innovate by virtue of their ability to translate systems of thought into discrete actions, would that we simply be more tactical and explicit in our approaches. What can we do to help others see the important value we bring? Be ready with a clear example to help people understand your contribution in concrete terms. One of my respondents shared this story: "I worked with a Computer Science colleague to help him with a pitch to University leadership for a financial investment in a project he imagined. I presented with him, and it was clear that my presentation skills won the day for him. He's brilliant, but he considers me to be a brilliant communicator—a skill he can't approximate (just as I can't approximate his programming skills)."[15] This story makes clear that the ability to express complex ideas to an audience outside of your peers is indispensable. The proposal would have failed had it not been pitched properly.

PhDs have an important role to play as navigators of complex systems. They are trained in the kind of nuanced thinking required to fit solutions to the real-life context in which problems are situated. Many funders incentivize research to be more adaptive—supporting proposals that are large in scope, address problems that have complex causes, require new technologies, treatments, or policies, and have real-world relevance.[16] These requirements are meant to create a fertile nexus between three strands: *research*, *policy*, and *practice*. Humanists are accustomed to braiding these three components together, fostering innovation within the norms of existing communities because they are trained

to do this work without losing sight of the ultimate goal. As one respondent noted, "Working with other people in particular and being able to see large projects and ideas in terms of stages and components is a particular skill learned through dissertation writing."[17] Many PhDs pivot between two axes—as scholars seeking to understand, explore, and expand knowledge and as educators looking to share knowledge. Combined, these two modalities provide the dexterity required to traverse the intricate set of relationships that characterize current needs for education, research, and scholarship inside *and* outside the academy. We can further facilitate this kind of training by providing opportunities during graduate school through a variety of programming.

As editor-in-chief of *ESQ: A Journal of Nineteenth-Century American Literature and Culture*, I looked for ways to instill the value of participatory culture broadly, emphasizing its purpose across multiple constituencies. To that end, I developed an outreach program for graduate students that helped them be active producers of knowledge others could use by reporting on scholarly proceedings at major academic conferences. Using a networked model of distributed communication, graduate students met and worked together to produce a report from the field that captured the current conversation and framed possibilities for future collaborations. Dubbed "The Year in Conferences," this program remains in practice today because it creates opportunities across several sectors while emphasizing the purpose of research rather than by simply archiving it.

As a literary scholar, I wanted to understand fundamental currents that shaped U.S. literary realism. I used the lens of business history to reread literary history when writing *Truth Stranger Than Fiction: Race, Realism and the U.S. Literary Marketplace*. What I found by studying literature from a market perspective was that slave narratives were a taproot for realism—one of the most popular genres in nineteenth-century U.S. literature, a genre long seen as the province of white men. I saw it differently, tracing in African American literary form and realism a shared aesthetic, an emphasis on the nitty-gritty details, and the importance of money and finances, as the tools by which plot is advanced. Prior to the work I did for my first book, there was no identifiable link between the African American literary form and realism, a popular fictional form dominated by white middle-class (mostly male) writers.

The rhetorical modes that my earlier training in close reading equipped me with weren't sufficient for the task of convincing other literary scholars to accept my theory as anything more than a coincidental stylistic similarity.[18] Putting aside the monumental differences between stories about slavery and white middle-class life, I focused instead on the common denominator: these two genres shared a medium—print—and a market. It was in the print marketplace that I found demonstrable evidence of how anxiety about the remarkable success of slave narratives might have provided a model for white

writers eager to succeed as literary authors. Slave narratives flourished by telling stories in graphic detail for a moral purpose, tapping into the evangelical capitalism of the period and thus circulated broadly through a variety of print mediums. I believed that realism essentially adapted this strategy in the effort to galvanize the interest of middle-class white people to see their plight as meaningful.

I could have tried to bolster my literary analysis with other field-specific approaches, but instead I chose to frame my analysis in a manner more accessible to those beyond my field of study. I followed the money, taking a systems-level approach to how knowledge is created and disseminated through a study of the literary marketplace. Framing my analysis this way, paradoxically, made it resound all the more with my fellow literary scholars.

None of this is to say that the road is easy or straightforward. But my point here is that the discipline's utility is real—what is holding it back is our own fear of change. Bridget McKenzie in "Towards the Sociocratic Museum " argues that the answer to museums' existential crisis in the digital era is "not in the familiar question 'how can museums survive?' but in 'how can museums do work that matters?'" The same question is at the heart of discussions about reforming the PhD conducted by major organizational leaders like the Modern Language Association and the American Historical Association. So too have funders supportive of the humanities begun to play their role in fomenting change—with public scholar programs sponsored by the National Endowment for the Humanities, incentives to retrain and undertake cross-disciplinary training like the Burkhardt fellowship, sponsored by the American Council of Learned Societies, and Mellon's New Directions fellowships aimed at helping midcareer scholars advance their studies while also transforming educational prospects.

Though these opportunities are far fewer in number than there is need for, what they portend is a willingness to support change holistically, rather than simply let the professoriate die on the vine. The Mellon Foundation has also developed a dedicated funding stream toward enriching humanistic study. Through programs like the Sawyer Seminar, clusters of institutions are provided "support for comparative research on the historical and cultural sources of contemporary developments."[19] Importantly, Sawyer Seminar support is meant not to build on established institutional structures—like centers—but rather to create a fluid space for dialogues that would otherwise be difficult to pursue in an institutional setting—a kind of pop-up market of ideas. Fueled by a start-up mentality, preference is given to proposals that include a diverse set of participants—from all levels of the academy both inside and outside of the institution. This emphasis on inclusion is one way the foundation intends to create greater communication across a number of constituencies. These baked-in requirements, like those in place from the United States Agency for

International Development (USAID) for established, in-country partners, create necessary conditions for lasting change. The challenge programs like this offer is to move from more sedentary forms of reflection to critical thinking in real time, prompting academics to be agents of change among themselves and across disciplines.[20]

Let us heed the message being sent by Mellon and USAID alike. PhDs are well suited for this kind of work. After all, folks in the humanities and the social sciences were theorizing alternate models of identity long before the federal government took up legislation around such controversial topics as discrimination in the military or gender-neutral bathrooms. Yet few of its thought leaders have engaged in the public dialogue around these issues. One rarely hears of a professor of gender studies giving expert testimony to Congress, and yet these are precisely the spaces where change happens—even if slow and incremental.[21] Humanists excel at the iterative and use threaded discussions and other pedagogies to generate and implement change, yet the role of policy influencer is usually reserved for people who are in the hard sciences. It would seem to me that insights drawn from literary studies would greatly advance the work of many other disciplines if the field worked harder at sharing its lessons.[22]

This is not to say that literary studies is without its flaws or limits. Like so many other disciplines, it can also be functionally blind to its hamartia. Our efforts to claim value can alienate the public, especially when we emphasize our value as exclusive. As former chancellor Dirks observes, "When we say we have a 17-percent acceptance rate, the public hears that we have an 83-percent rejection rate."[23] And rather than sneer smugly at the parochial view of the *New York Times* whenever the Modern Language Association comes to town for its annual convention, we might try a little harder at helping those not committed to the monastic life of the academy to see the value in the "Jane Austen and the Masturbating Girl" session famously derided by the *New York Times*.[24] It's the ultimate challenge to bring your knowledge and expertise to outside audiences—to test its value and your own for a larger purpose.

To help me keep a healthy perspective, I prefer to tarry on Twitter feeds like this tweet from @ShitAcademicsSay for the bracing effect of self-awareness it provides: "just wondering if you had time to grab a coffee to discuss how busy we all are."[25] We fail when we forget how much liberty we have to dwell in our own thoughts about our own problems—no matter how real or imagined. However, once the laughter subsides, I am reminded of how easy it is to recede back into the cynicism that threatens much of the joy this work can create. According to the survey results, we flunk most detrimentally when it comes to creating a positive affect around the work we do. An overwhelming number of respondents agreed that the PhD has not contributed to a sense of job satisfaction. Indeed many believe that the residue of feeling around the degree is primarily negative—no matter where one works. Thus we all must answer one

major and important existential question: Why is it so difficult to claim the idealism that fuels the hard work we do?

Training for the PhD teaches the ability to disentangle discrete narrative strands—tracking historical events, aesthetic conventions, social and political norms, and economic conditions, as well as a myriad of other factors that go into shaping events. But we can't let ourselves forget what a privilege it is to have access to time and the opportunity to be reflective. As shown in this tweet by @ShitAcademicsSay, "I don't always get emotional. But when I do I call it affect."[26] We, as specialists, must help others recognize that this skill is extremely valuable in today's global context, where to be effective, one must be able to negotiate complex and multilayered systems on the ground and in real time. Being able to think across and between multiple narratives while maintaining the discrete distinctions of each is precisely what the PhD trains its recipients to do. Why do so few—including ourselves—proclaim the value of this training?

It is not only the federal agencies and for-profit and nonprofit funding organizations that are increasingly changing the type of proposals they support, but rather the needs, hopes, problems, and desires that arise out of our twenty-first-century global context. Agencies as different as USAID and the MacArthur Foundation agree that discoveries made in the silos of academia are far from ready to enter the world.[27] As one respondent to my survey explained, training in the humanities has "made it easier to access work which stretches across categories such as diversity, access, and institutional change," providing the language needed to successfully communicate and prompt transformation in "a variety of different work environments."[28] Another person emphasized the way in which the training has contributed to an ability to "do high-level management work," made successful by the ability to justify policy and decisions in real time.[29]

As many have already argued, clarifying the value of the PhD becomes even more urgent when considering graduate education, especially during a period when colleges are closing and PhDs are less in demand than ever before. What did those who responded to the survey say when asked if they would recommend getting a PhD in the current job market? A mere 1.2 percent responded with an unequivocal "yes." However, all others, including most of those who would not recommend getting a PhD, urged those interested in pursuing a degree to be prepared to accept employment outside an R1 institution.[30] Those who responded to this question emphasize the importance of purpose, ensuring that the work we're undertaking can improve the future of thinking *by doing*.

As a writer, advancing the value of the PhD has meant undertaking projects that bring unlikely subjects into fruitful juxtaposition—like drawing a through line from nineteenth-century publication practices to the political and

ideological goals afforded by social media as I did in *Thinking Outside the Book*.[31] Though I was interested in the historical mechanisms that promoted certain writing strategies in the nineteenth century, I was just as interested in what those strategies could tell us about our current cultural moment and the digital tools that inform it. Bringing the past into contact with the present is one way that humanists can help others have a longer, more hopeful view. For those designing programs, directing dissertations, or working with graduate students in general, encouraging students to make connections between discipline-specific content and the world around us is essential. Requiring, for instance, at least one assignment be directed to the public will train students to contribute to what the National Science Foundation (NSF) calls "broader impacts," requiring grantees to articulate a plan to share the knowledge generated with a larger public than the community of researchers with whom scientists typically communicate.[32] Better yet, why not require a chapter in each dissertation dedicated to such "broader impacts" just as NSF requires its grantees to do?

As an administrator, my background as a scholar and educator has helped me understand, in concrete ways, what the stakes are when we consider change on a structural level and how important it is to preserve the discrete values epitomized by the various fields of study—as well as their unique contributions. In each of these cases, academic training gave me the vision and the discipline to launch these efforts, engage others in their development, and sustain them over the course of years.

Like with other professions, the world around us shapes both the content and forms research and scholarship take. As a result, literary studies produce important and useful insights—though, like any other form of expertise, such insights often require a degree of translation for them to be comprehensible to those not trained in the discipline. Far from being "economically irrelevant, unaffordable luxuries," research-intensive humanities degrees enrich nondisciplinary professional outcomes in part because this training demands taking the long view.[33] At a recent industry relations panel that assembled representatives from pharma, tech, and venture capital, for instance, speakers agreed that a major incentive in partnering with academic researchers is the fact that academics are *not* driven by the business calendar but rather seek results unencumbered by those limitations. Academic training emphasizes the pursuit of knowledge for the sake of inquiry, operating in the kind of "what if" mode that often fuels innovation. Instead of relying strictly on fee-for-service, business-oriented research and development units, industry looks to the university for the ways in which disciplinary norms ensure high-level thinking and results that have been developed in terms of the broadest possibilities. Our belief in the possibility of truth provides an important, even if not always convenient, contribution. Part of what the PhD certifies is what Leonard Cassuto calls "an

ethic." As he defines it, an ethic " provides a way to rethink day-to-day actions and a basis for large-scale engagement."[34]

What the panelists emphasized as a drawback, however, was that academic partners undermine their value when communication is too slow and/or too vague. Although results may not be available as planned in the third quarter, for instance, industry partners still need to allocate resources for the next quarter. Failing to submit a report on the current state of the project—especially when plans are not aligned with the agreed-upon schedule—is tantamount to students expecting to receive a passing grade on an assignment never turned in. This same lesson follows when transitioning from an academic job to an administrative one. Just as syllabi are due and classes take place at a given time, research-related work products also need to meet firm deadlines. Being reluctant to communicate honestly about the state of research—what's taking place and what's not—is the deal breaker. Just as we accept—and expect—students to run into sudden and unexpected pitfalls as they try to complete assignments, researchers doing high-level thinking cannot anticipate all that may arise through inquiry. But what we can do—and need to do more of—is be more transparent about the steps in the thinking we're doing, and why continuing to think deeply will result in the kind of thoughtful and intelligent change that most people want to see define the work they do. In my administrative role, I try to bring this process-oriented approach to projects and take great joy in finding ways to open up conversations to ideas and practices from all corners. For instance, when we were in the information- gathering stage of the Research and Scholarship Strategic Plan at Tufts, we found that there was much more to learn from faculty than the time we had put aside would permit.[35] Instead of sticking with our plan, we extended our study period, adding additional focus groups. At the same time, the commitment to specific goals and a timeline helped advance this work at a pace that satisfied the need for productivity while also creating an opportunity for innovation and much-needed growth. Sometimes, the commitment to objectivity can surface as a too rigid demand for autonomy. What we forget at these times is that we are in a partnership working toward a common goal and it just doesn't pay to finish a job that doesn't suit the purpose. In our case, our purpose was to enhance opportunities for research and scholarship at Tufts, not just create a tidy narrative about what we thought that might look like.

Truthfully, the elite educational background I have been afforded infuses what many would call a privileged view of work—that it should be more than just financially remunerative but also personally rewarding. I have also had the luxury of a fully funded education financed by teaching and research assistantships. Since getting my PhD, I have taught in elite settings and been employed by research-intensive colleges and universities like Tufts—where I am currently employed. I got my PhD during the height of the "canon wars," as literary

studies were striving toward inclusion. My interests were conditioned by those social and political concerns—about what wasn't getting talked about in academic settings and why. My first project, in which I reread literary history through the lens of business history, allowed me to reframe the rise of canonical literature as a market phenomenon, driven by the need to make authorship pay more than prestige. In some ways the argument I am making here mirrors the one nineteenth-century authors had to make—we need to earn money, not just respect—to survive in this capitalist society. Indeed, what drew me to higher education and the pursuit of the PhD was precisely the desire to do work that was both intellectual and useful. The PhD required that I devote myself to the twin purposes of teaching and learning. And though I spent over a decade in pursuit of a tenure-track position, I did not restrict myself—or my value—to the limits of academic activity. As I continue to work outside of my field, I find I have countless opportunities to continue to chase those goals—and find new ways to fulfill them. I agree with the survey respondent who linked success and job satisfaction to how advanced training not only made an attractive non-faculty role possible but also provided the resources and perspective needed to grow the role itself.[36]

We can heed Daniel Lee Kleinman's clarion call that "all public higher-education leaders should be making a specific argument for the employment relevance of liberal arts and humanities education and taking this case directly to the economically concerned and utility-oriented citizens of these states."[37] But not enough of us with a humanities background have made it clear why we are well positioned to foster the kind of intelligent growth in research and scholarship most needed to meet the demands presented by the twenty-first-century global context. From focusing on infrastructure and programming to foster innovation to breaking new ground through targeted investments and creating opportunities to braid together resources made possible by their strong liberal arts tradition, universities are poised to do more than reclaim the respect of an earlier era. That reputation had its roots in a siloed ivory tower, removed from the day-to-day world around it. Today's universities have more to offer as long as they keep an eye on the business proposition: extended and deep thinking over time is a value-add. Survey respondents emphasize "training and practical experience in a wide variety of research methods, analysis, and learning how to learn new things independently" as a key contribution. Another respondent noted the impact of advanced training on the ability to take on the role of collaborator, improving work products over time by deepening team conversations with the express purpose of advancing them.[38]

Humanities PhDs need to take a more vocal stance on why their skill set should be seen as "the most effective way to increase the creativity and innovation in their business and technology" as scholars Rafael Alvarado and Paul Humphries claim.[39] Career options outside of the professoriate require radical

acts of creativity—and this is, in part, what drew me away from my tenured position. Alvarado and Humphries caution that if we can't "responsibly generalize in our readings and our representations, the possibility of collective public life is imperiled."[40] Now more than ever, PhDs are needed in the workforce to bring to bear the large-scale complex analyses that are at the heart of the training the degree represents. Indeed, as Alvarado and Humphries argue, "the increasing pace and consciousness of globalization have made thinking on a wider scale of space, at least, a scholarly imperative. Consciousness of planetary forces and problems, such as environmental destruction, species extinction, and global warming, have also forced a reckoning with the long-term processes behind these developments—and the vast extent of their impact."[41] The abilities to conduct intensive literary analysis and communicate the insights generated, especially when made legible to people outside academia, have all the elements of leadership. People with PhDs are people who have studied complex systems and learned to conduct multilayered analyses, often driven by key principles such as equity, democracy, and access. PhDs are problem solvers because they are problem finders. We are trained to be critical, an important asset that can be diminished by an inability or aversion to collaboration. Working outside the academy incentivizes collaboration as it is simply required to succeed. As many PhDs take to the internet, mobilize using hashtag activism, and crowdsource syllabi to satisfy the need to create change and expand our audience, they may just as significantly use those impulses to put words into action by shaping policy, informing organizations, and advancing other humanistic goals all across society.[42]

In other words, taking a research-intensive degree into a context not defined by the disciplinary norms that were used to produce it requires those norms to be examined and repurposed with a view toward utility and efforts to advance goals that can be enormously satisfying.[43] Being careful, and critical, about what one's "value add" is to a shared goal may seem like a departure from the rigors and solitary practices of the scholar, but I suggest answers to such questions provide a healthy and ultimately rewarding antidote to what can be a corrosive anxiety about the true legitimacy and social purpose of expertise. As one respondent to my survey commented, "Working outside my discipline has helped me think more critically about the meaning of the discipline itself and the many ways that my scholarly work informs the agendas I most care about."

Notes

Newlin, Elizabeth Padilla, Jodine Perkins, J. Jeanine Ruhsam, Sandy Vaughn Suazo, Gustavo Vargas, Katherine Walden.

1   See Robert Weisbuch and Leonard Cassuto, "Reforming Doctoral Education, 1990 to 2015 Recent Initiatives and Future Prospects" (Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, June 2, 2016), https://mellon.org/media/filer_public/35/32/3532f16c -20c4-4213-805d-356f85251a98/report-on-doctoral-education-reform_june-2016 .pdf. As they say, "More recently, academic positions in the sciences have been in decline as federal and state support of higher education continues to decrease. Time to degree has remained terribly long, with over eight years from the start of a program to graduation now the norm in the humanities. And the cyclical grant-making mechanism of the sciences built a structure that relies on student populations to staff laboratories to do the work that would allow the grants to be renewed. Such research exigencies, then and now, have severely compromised the academic development of doctoral students."

2   Studies from Burton Bledstein, *The Culture of Professionalism: The Middle Class and the Development of Higher Education in America* (Norton, 1965), up through more recent studies of the university as a neoliberal institution such as Christopher Newfield's *Ivy and Industry* all recognize the effort of higher education to "serve" the public.

3   The survey was posted on the C19 list, the Boston Digital Humanities list, my Facebook and LinkedIn pages, the Hutchins Center Facebook page, and multiple Twitter accounts. I received 189 responses. The survey ran March 2–10, 2019.

4   Augusta Rohrbach, "LinkedIn Post Announcing Survey," March 5, 2019.

5   Among the fields represented were varieties of education, language, literature, history, philosophy, religion, and one outlier with a PhD in cognitive psychology.

6   I defined "outside academia" as "in a non-teaching position" so my results do not exclude those in academic administration.

7   Quoted in Karin Fischer, "It's a New Assault on the University," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, February 18, 2019, https://www.chronicle.com/interactives /Trend19-Intrusion-Main.

8   For more the need to promote community among academics, sharing ideas and work, see Jane Tompkins and Gerald Graff, "Can We Talk?," in *Professions: Conversations on the Future of Literary and Cultural Studies*, ed. Donald E. Hall (University of Illinois Press, 2001); Maggie Berg and Barbara K. Seeber, *The Slow Professor: Challenging the Culture of Speed in the Academy*, reprint ed. (University of Toronto Press, 2017). Maggie Berg and Barbara Seeber blame the corporatization of the university; I see the problem as stretching well beyond the effort to use business principles to support educational and research institutions.

9   Unlike other programs, Tufts plans to grow collaboration through the interaction of grad students together with faculty. Other programs include students, but usually undergrads, or they strictly focus on grad students *or* faculty. For a program that focuses on grad students that was recently funded by NSF, see, for instance, a recent grant that Texas Tech got from NSF, Developing Reflective Engineers, and Mcubed at the University of Michigan, which focuses on faculty. Another way of thinking about it is as a mini-IGERT program without the risk and stresses on students and faculty to support students across degree requirements from different schools and departments. Ryan C. Campbell et al., "Fostering Reflective Engineers: Outcomes of an Arts- and Humanities-Infused

Graduate Course," in *2018 World Engineering Education Forum—Global Engineering Deans Council (WEEF-GEDC)* (IEEE, 2018), 1–6, https://doi.org/10 .1109/WEEF-GEDC.2018.8629714; Mcubed, "Mcubed 3.0 Essentials," https:// mcubed.umich.edu/mcubed-essentials; "Welcome to IGERT.Org," http://www .igert.org/.

10 Response to Q11, submitted to Augusta Rohrbach (n.d.).

11 K–12 Blueprint, "Maker & STEM," May 13, 2014, https://www.k12blueprint.com /toolkits/maker-stem.

12 Responses 10 and 32 to question 10 submitted to Augusta Rohrbach (n.d.).

13 Sam Fallon's article in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* provides a recent example of how academics contribute to the popular notion that professors bluster over moot points rather than contribute to a larger discussion. Fallon, "The Rise of the Pedantic Professor," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, March 1, 2019, https:// www.chronicle.com/article/The-Rise-of-the-Pedantic/245808?cid=cr&utm _source=cr&utm_medium=en&elqTrackId=60196e66569c4f408ce4f8b152facc8 6&elq=427facbf3df345769ded4ab02c33776c&elqaid=22469&elqat =1&elqCampaignId=11084.

14 Survey response to question 10 submitted to Augusta Rohrbach (n.d.).

15 Survey response to question 10 submitted to Augusta Rohrbach (n.d.).

16 Educational Advisory Board, "For the Greater Good: Boosting the Value of Industry Partnerships " (2017), https://attachment.eab.com/wp-content/uploads /2019/07/For_Greater_Good_URF_Finals.pdf#page=21.

17 Survey response to question 10 submitted to Augusta Rohrbach (n.d.).

18 Today's scholars can use digital tools to refine analyses of style and word frequencies such as those described by Ted Underwood in "The Stone and the Shell." However, even when leveraging the most sophisticated tools to establish patterns across the large digital corpora available today, I wonder how much weight that kind of evidence would hold for those outside of the humanities. Underwood, "The Stone and the Shell" (n.d.), https://tedunderwood.com/.

19 See https://mellon.org/programs/higher-learning/sawyer-seminars/ for a full description of the Sawyer Seminar program.

20 Institutionalized forms seem to promise innovation but often outlive their purpose. As Mark Garrett Cooper and John Marx explain about the failure of centers to galvanize change, centers exerted "a compelling pull on the intellectual life of the period, humanities centers supported grand agenda-setting projects for the humanities, but they addressed niche audiences habituated to the academic star system." In this case, taking a business model approach that includes a sun-setting clause, I would agree, is a useful hedge against institutional forms outliving their function. Marx and Cooper, *Media U: How the Need to Win Audiences Has Shaped Higher Education* (Columbia University Press, 2018), 213.

21 There are exceptions, of course. Research on electromagnetic interference by Dr. Elaine Scarry, Walter M. Cabot Professor of Aesthetics and the General Theory of Value, Harvard University, made its way into the National Transportation Safety Board's report. See Emily Eakin, "Professor Scarry Has a Theory," *New York Times Magazine*, November 19, 2000, https://archive.nytimes.com/www .nytimes.com/library/magazine/home/20001119mag-scarry.html ; Nathan Schneider, "A Literary Scholar's Voice in the Wilderness," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, February 17, 2014, https://www.chronicle.com/article/A-Literary -Scholars-Voice-in/144733.

22 See Thomas Koenigs's argument for "the workplace value of the kind of supposi-tional reasoning and conjectural thinking inherent in the reading of fiction" in "Fictionality Risen: Early America, the Common Core Curriculum, and How We Argue about Fiction Today," ed. Osucha Batker and Augusta Rohrbach, *American Literature* 89, no. 2 (June 1, 2017): 225–253, https://doi.org/10.1215/00029831 -3861493.

23 Fischer, "It's a New Assault on the University."

24 Nick Gillespie, "Who's Afraid of the MLA?," *Reason*, December 27, 2005, https://reason.com/2005/12/27/whos-afraid-of-the-mla/.

25 Shit Academics Say (@AcademicsSay), "Just Wondering If You Had Time to Grab a Coffee to Discuss How Busy We All Are," Twitter, February 21, 2019, https:// twitter.com/AcademicsSay/status/1098647081965768707.

26 Shit Academics Say (@AcademicsSay), "I Don't Always Get Emotional. But When I Do I Call It Affect," Twitter, March 25, 2015, https://twitter.com /academicssay/status/580693264904359936?lang=en.

27 For more information on USAID and the MacArthur Foundation, see US Aid, "What We Do," February 16, 2018, https://www.usaid.gov/what-we-do; Crain's Chicago Business, "A New Nonprofit Helps Match Donors with Causes," February 28, 2019, https://www.chicagobusiness.com/nonprofits-philanthropy /new-nonprofit-helps-match-donors-causes.

28 Survey response to question 10 submitted to Augusta Rohrbach (n.d.).

29 Survey response to question 10 submitted to Augusta Rohrbach (n.d.).

30 Breakdown of responses to Q12—"Would you recommend getting a PhD in the humanities in the current job market? If so, why? If not, why not?" Total $n = 50$; $Y = 6$; $Yb = 17$; $N = 17$; $Nb = 6$; n/a $= 4$.

31 Augusta Rohrbach, *Thinking Outside the Book* (University of Massachusetts Press, 2014).

32 NSF defines its Broader Impacts criterion by offering a series of questions: "How well does the activity advance discovery and understanding while promoting teaching, training, and learning? How well does the proposed activity broaden the participation of underrepresented groups (e.g., gender, ethnicity, disability, geographic, etc.)? To what extent will it enhance the infrastructure for research and education, such as facilities, instrumentation, networks, and partnerships? Will the results be disseminated broadly to enhance scientific and technological understanding? What may be the benefits of the proposed activity to society?" Peter March, "Broader Impacts Review Criterion—Dear Colleague Letter " (National Science Foundation, n.d.). https://www.nsf.gov/pubs/2007/nsf07046 /nsf07046.jsp.

33 Roger L. Geiger et al., *A New Deal for the Humanities: Liberal Arts and the Future of Public Higher Education*, ed. Gordon Hutner and Feisal G. Mohamed (Rutgers University Press, 2015), 86–100.

34 Leonard Cassuto, *The Graduate School Mess: What Caused It and How We Can Fix It* (Harvard University Press, 2015), 210.

35 For information on Tufts' Research and Scholarship Strategic Plan, see https:// viceprovost.tufts.edu/research-scholarship-strategic-plan.

36 Response to question 11 submitted to Augusta Rohrbach (n.d.).

37 Daniel Lee Klienman, "Sticking Up for Liberal Arts and Humanities Education: Governance, Leadership, and Fiscal Crisis," *New Deal for the Humanities*, 86–87.

38 Response to question 10 submitted to Augusta Rohrbach (n.d.).

39 Rafael Alvarado and Paul Humphries, "Big Data, Thick Mediation, and Representational Opacity," *New Literary History* 48 (2017): 786.
40 Alvarado and Humphries, "Big Data," 784.
41 Alvarado and Humphries, "Big Data," 784.
42 See Augusta Rohrbach, "Realism 2.0," in *The Oxford Handbook to American Literary Realism*, ed. Keith Newlin (Oxford University Press, 2019), for further thoughts on the impact of web 2.0 capabilities on the active roles educators and scholars can now take.
43 In *The Graduate School Mess*, Cassuto reminds readers that utility was in the DNA of U.S. higher education. With its origins in the Morrill Act of 1862, the land-grant university was conceived in order to "advance all kinds of professions in utilitarian as well as theoretical ways." Cassuto, *Graduate School Mess*, 12.