

2012

Faculty perspectives on facilitating holistic learning for engaged citizenship

Melissa Sturm-Smith
Iowa State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/etd>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#), and the [Higher Education and Teaching Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Sturm-Smith, Melissa, "Faculty perspectives on facilitating holistic learning for engaged citizenship" (2012). *Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. 12901.

<https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/etd/12901>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Iowa State University Capstones, Theses and Dissertations at Iowa State University Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Iowa State University Digital Repository. For more information, please contact digirep@iastate.edu.

Faculty perspectives on facilitating holistic learning for engaged citizenship

by

Melissa R. Sturm-Smith

A dissertation submitted to the graduate faculty
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Major: Education (Educational Leadership)

Program of Study Committee:
Nancy J. Evans, Major Professor
Katherine R. Bruna
Larry H. Ebbers
Barbara L. Licklider
Robert D. Reason

Iowa State University

Ames, Iowa

2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	vi
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	viii
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION	1
Background of the Study	1
Statement of the Problem	4
Purpose of the Study	5
Research Questions	5
Significance of the Study	6
Audiences	7
Description of the Study	8
Theoretical Framework	8
Researcher Positionality	9
Definition of Terms	11
Organization of the Dissertation	12
CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW	13
Civic Engagement in Higher Education: Setting the Context	13
History	14
National Commitment	15
Institutional Commitment	16
Institutional Approaches	20
In Search of Holistic Civic Education: Learning Outside the Classroom	24
Theoretical Underpinnings of Co-curricular Learning	25
Defining Co-curricular for the Civic Engagement Discussion	27
Academic and Student Affairs Partnerships: Opportunities and Obstacles	29
Role of Faculty in Teaching Civic Responsibility	31
Current Understanding of Best Practices	33
Faculty Resistance	36
Faculty Motivation	41
Good Citizen Model	42
Civic Voluntarism Model	43
Summary	45
CHAPTER 3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	46
Qualitative Approach	46
Epistemology: Constructivist	47
Theoretical Perspective: Interpretivism	47
Methodology: Case Study	48
Site for the Case Study	49
Participants	51

Methods	53
Interviews	53
Document Analysis	54
Direct Observation	55
Data Analysis	55
Goodness and Trustworthiness	57
Triangulation	58
Member Checking	58
Clarifying Research Positionality	59
Peer Debriefing	59
Ethical Considerations	60
Delimitations	61
Limitations	61
Summary	61
CHAPTER 4. RESULTS	62
Participant Profiles	63
Amelia	64
Diana	64
Dorothy	65
Ella	65
Jason	66
Johanna	67
Lana	67
Matthew	68
Melinda	68
Robin	69
Sara	69
Pathways of Teaching for Engaged Citizenship	70
Entry into Teaching for Engaged Citizenship	71
Why Teach Engaged Citizenship?	73
Course content and engaged citizenship: A natural fit	73
Engaged citizen component enhances the course	75
Logistical issues	76
Obstacles along the Pathway of Participation	77
What does it mean to be an engaged citizen?	77
How do I fit with the Engaged Citizen Experience?	79
Faculty in some disciplines don't feel welcome	79
Theme as invitation or deterrent	80
Workload concerns	82
The three-legged stool of faculty time	82
Engaged citizen courses can be more work	83
Unwieldy class size	85
The Lone/Lonely Experience of Teaching for Engaged Citizenship	85
Summary	87

Navigating Tensions in the Pursuit of Educating for Engaged Citizenship	88
The Right Way to Teach for Engaged Citizenship	88
Service-learning as the best practice	88
Contested classroom strategies	90
Pragmatism versus Idealism	93
Course Content in Competition with Engaged Citizen Outcomes	94
The Role(s) of Teacher and Learner	97
The role(s) of the teacher	97
Student as teacher	99
Developing student ownership	100
Summary	101
What Type of Citizenship?	102
The Academic Citizen	102
A citizen is informed and aware	103
A citizen is a critical thinker	104
A citizen uses her voice	105
A citizen maintains intellectual distance	106
Be a citizen of your profession	107
The Emotionally Knowledgeable Citizen	109
Knowledge of self	109
Member of a community	111
Role as member of the community	112
Empathetic listener	113
The Active Citizen	115
Importance of informed action	115
Thoughtful choices	116
Activities of a citizen	118
Volunteerism	119
Politics	119
Summary	120
Teaching for Engaged Citizenship: The Role of Co-curricular Learning	121
What is Co-curricular?	121
The Invisibility of Co-curricular Opportunities	123
Obstacles to Integration	124
The need for connections	125
University framing of the ECE co-curricular	127
Ineffective communication	128
Opportunities for Partnerships	129
Student dedication to co-curricular involvement	129
Vision for possibilities in the future	130
Summary	131
Summary	132
CHAPTER 5. SUMMARY, FINDINGS, IMPLICATIONS, AND REFLECTIONS	135
Summary	135

Methodological Discoveries	137
Findings and Discussion	139
Research question 1: How did professors come to include educating for engaged citizenship as a part of their teaching?	140
Resources	140
Engagement	142
Recruitment networks	143
Summary	144
Research question 2: How do professors describe their efforts to teach students to be engaged citizens as part of the larger university initiative?	145
Summary	150
Research question 3: What type of citizenship are faculty preparing students to practice?	151
Personally responsible citizen	152
Participatory citizen	153
Justice-oriented citizen	153
Research Question 4: What are professors' perceptions of co-curricular learning opportunities and their contributions to educating for engaged citizenship?	155
Strengths and Limitations	158
Implications for Practice	159
Recommendations for Future Research	162
Personal Reflections	164
APPENDIX A. INSTITUTIONAL APPROVAL	167
APPENDIX B. PARTICIPANT COMMUNICATION AND CONSENT DOCUMENTS	169
APPENDIX C. INTERVIEW GUIDE	177
APPENDIX D. ECE EVENTS ANNOUNCEMENT SAMPLE	179
REFERENCES	182

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to explore the experiences of professors participating in an institution-wide effort to educate students for engaged citizenship at Drake University, a Midwestern private institution that explicitly claims to prepare students for citizenship as part of the university mission statement. The institutional effort embeds civic learning into the general education curriculum and also includes a connected co-curricular component. In the study I sought to address deficits in the current research literature regarding faculty motivation to participate in institutionally driven civic education and faculty perceptions of the role of co-curricular learning in civic education.

The sources of data for the study included: transcripts of interviews with 11 faculty members who were teaching a course flagged as fulfilling the university's engaged citizen requirement, course documents provided by the interview participants, and field notes from an engaged citizen faculty development workshop. The data were coded and analyzed, and then organized into four themes: 1) the "pathways" of teaching for engaged citizenship; 2) the process of navigating tensions at the personal, classroom, and institutional level; 3) the types of citizenship professors are preparing students to practice; and 4) perceptions of the role of co-curricular learning.

A finding that is a new contribution to the literature was that many faculty were motivated to participate as teachers in the institutional civic education initiative because they felt that the course they were teaching naturally aligned with civic engagement outcomes, and therefore was not an additional component or an obstacle. The study confirmed previous

research that curricular and co-curricular civic education efforts remain separate and unconnected.

The findings of the study can inform the efforts of higher education administrators and student affairs educators who seek to support their institutions' commitment to integrated civic education by carefully integrating curricular and co-curricular learning. The study also has implications for faculty members who are interested in participating in efforts to educate students for engaged citizenship. Recommendations for future research include comparing the perspectives of faculty and students about their understanding of engaged citizenship and the role of co-curricular learning.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is hard to believe that this doctoral journey is now coming to an end. I stepped onto this path five and half years ago--on the same day my oldest son started kindergarten. From the beginning, my graduate work has been a team effort, and there is no way I could have successfully completed this process without so much love and support.

To my husband--you never wavered in your support and belief in me. Thank you for the extra hours of quiet time you provided for me by tackling the mounds of laundry, finding adventures to entertain the kids, and taking on a majority of the household responsibilities. I love you with all my heart, and can't wait to select the next big challenge we will accomplish together.

To my children, Ethan and Gabe--thank you for your big smiles and bigger hugs. You always took the time to ask me how I was doing on my "homework" and were so patient and understanding when I sometimes had to miss out on seeing you play in a game or participating in weekend fun. I am so proud to be your mom.

To my parents, Steve and Glynis, who instilled in me the core qualities that helped me to be successful in this endeavor--a commitment to hard work and a love of learning. You always had high expectations for all of us girls growing up, but provided a lot of support to help us achieve those expectations. When things got difficult as I worked through this graduate degree, I could hear my mom's calm voice telling me that I needed to stick with it, one step at a time.

To my sisters, Katie, Elizabeth, and Andrea--thank you for reminding me to laugh and not be so hard on myself. You listened to my boring stories about graduate school and writing my dissertation, and were always ready with a word of support or encouragement.

I could not have completed this dissertation while working full-time if I did not have such supportive colleagues. To Vicky, who founded the program at Drake that helped me fund this dream--thank you for your mentorship and vision. To the many other colleagues--Wanda, Renee, Sue, Rachel, Tasha, Jan, Dee, Kevin--who inquired about my progress, provided an encouraging word, volunteered to assist with reading drafts, or helped me when I was stuck. Your efforts touched me and often helped me find renewed energy and passion for this work.

To my major professor, Dr. Nancy Evans--from our very first meeting in your office five years ago to the last email I received with the final edits to my dissertation, you have been a significant force in my learning and growth in this program. Your words of encouragement, combined with insightful and challenging feedback, served to inspire me. Your prompt feedback meant so much to me, and it came whether we were facing a tight deadline or not. I always felt like I was a priority. Thank you. To my committee--Drs. Licklider, Ebbers, Reason, and Bruna--you joined me at different points along this journey, but have all uniquely contributed to my growth and learning along the way.

Finally, thank you to my participants. Amelia, Diana, Lana, Matthew, Dorothy, Robin, Jason, Ella, Melinda, Sara, Johanna--thank you for taking the time to participate in this study. Our interviews were scheduled at a very busy time of the year, but you welcomed me into your offices and shared some precious time with me. Your commitment to teaching is admirable and I learned a great deal about the mythical "faculty culture" I read so much about in the student affairs literature! It is my privilege to be your colleague.

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

This study was conducted to understand faculty perspectives on facilitating holistic learning for engaged citizenship. The first chapter provides an overview of the study that includes the higher education landscape that framed the study. A problem, purpose, and significance of the study are presented as well as the relevant audiences interested in the findings and conclusions. The research questions and overall design of the study are presented along with the researcher's positionality. The chapter concludes with a brief definition of the terms used in the study.

Background of the Study

“If we believe that democratic processes – slow and imperfect as they are – are our best hope for securing a just and dynamic future, then the way in which we educate citizens to participate in democracy is vitally important.”
(Kahne & Westheimer, 2003, p. 59)

A decrease in civic engagement among young people has been identified as a problem (Ehrlich & Hollander, 1999; Vogelesang & Astin, 2005). Prior to the 2010 presidential elections, voting rates for youth was the area of civic engagement that received the most attention. However, civic engagement encompasses a much broader set of behaviors, moving outside of the political realm. American society looks to higher education as the means to address the decline. For example, the “Chronicle Survey of Public Opinion on Higher Education” (2003) revealed that 85% of the public believes that preparing students to be responsible citizens is very important or important. Within higher education, students, faculty, and staff also seem to strongly endorse the importance of preparing students for civic engagement. A recent survey conducted by the Center for the Study of Higher Education and

Postsecondary Education at the University of Michigan for the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) on 23 college campuses revealed that 93% of students and 97% of academic administrators, faculty, and student affairs professionals agreed “strongly” or “somewhat” that preparing students to contribute to their communities should be a goal of a college education (Dey, Barnhardt, Antonaros, Ott, & Hopsapple, 2009).

Scholarship on youth civic engagement and learning has boomed over the last decade; prior to that there was very little research on this topic outside of a few limited fields (Levine, 2011). Scholars have pointed to various factors, from low voter turnout in the 2000 presidential election to Robert Putnam’s (2000) declaration that America faced a crisis of declining civic involvement, for inspiring the resurgence of interest and research dedicated to understanding civic education. The recent publication of the *Handbook of Research on Civic Engagement in Youth* (Sherrod, Torney-Purta, & Flanagan, 2010) denoted for many scholars the maturity of the field of youth civic engagement (Levine, 2011).

However, despite significant research on student outcomes in civic education and a renewed public commitment among institutions of higher education to a civic mission, institutions still appear to be falling short. In the AAC&U study (Dey, et al., 2009) cited previously, which included responses from 24,000 college students, the findings revealed that while 93% of students thought that civic engagement preparation would be an important component of their college experience, only one third of the respondents felt strongly that their civic awareness had grown in college or that they had learned the skills to go out and effectively address issues in society. Institutional approaches to civic education may be at the heart of the reason students do not feel they are making great gains in their civic learning. A recent report from the Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and

Engagement (CIRCLE) and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (2006) stated: “Few colleges and universities today have thought through an overall framework for civic and political education that is comprehensive, coherent, conceptually clear, and developmentally appropriate” (p. 3).

Part of the challenge in creating comprehensive and coherent civic education efforts in higher education may be due to the lack of research dedicated to understanding the connections between curricular and co-curricular civic education efforts. When writing on behalf of the American Association of Colleges and Universities, Knepfelkamp (2008) extended the assessment of the 2006 CIRCLE and Carnegie report: “We cannot help students become integrated and whole if our curricula, campus activities and civic programs remain unconnected, unstructured, and unexamined” (p. 3).

Not only has the role of co-curricular learning gone relatively unexamined in the recent surge of civic engagement interest, but also, and more importantly, the role of faculty members who are central to the effort has received very little attention. Several recent reports (Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont, & Stephens, 2004; Dey, et al., 2009; Hollander & Burack, 2009) that discussed the future of the research agenda about civic engagement in higher education highlighted the importance of understanding how practitioners implement this work. In the case of the current research study, faculty members are practitioners because they are expected to implement civic education outcomes in their general education courses and connect with co-curricular civic engagement efforts. Higher education is currently requesting faculty to provide more than their academic training has prepared them to teach. It will be important for higher education administrators to discover why some professors decide to accept the extra responsibility of educating students for engaged

citizenship and how to best support those professors if higher education wants to be truly successful in meeting its civic mission.

I was interested in carrying out a unique case study of an institution that made a public commitment to prepare students for civic engagement in its mission statement wherein space in the curriculum was created for civic education, and opportunities were provided for co-curricular learning to be tied to classroom teaching. The faculty members at this institution were the key participants in the research study. Since civic education is becoming an institutional commitment at many institutions, embedded across the curriculum, it was important to understand these “early adopter” professors’ perspectives in order to engage the larger faculty community in the effort.

Statement of the Problem

A large number of colleges and universities across the country have recognized civic education as a central mission of their institutions, particularly during the past decade. Drake University has sought to create an educational environment that promotes learning about civic engagement through general education courses and co-curricular learning opportunities. The model in place at Drake depends upon several factors, all working in concert together: (a) faculty teach general education courses dedicated toward specific disciplines that entail a choice to add an additional component of engaged citizen learning outcomes, (b) faculty across campus in a variety of disciplines consistently teach engaged citizenship concepts, and (c) faculty assist students to make intentional connections with co-curricular opportunities. The role of faculty members is central to the success of Drake University’s commitment to civic education, not only in their roles to design and enact the curriculum but also by helping

to create intentional connections to co-curricular learning opportunities. Despite the central role faculty members play in the civic education effort at Drake, as well as other universities, there is a lack of data regarding how they perceive and carry out their role.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this case study was to explore the experiences of faculty who participated in an institution-wide effort to educate students for engaged citizenship at Drake University, a Midwestern, private institution that explicitly claims civic engagement as part of its mission statement. What motivates faculty to take on the additional task of educating students for citizenship, and make pedagogical decisions in support of civic education efforts that prepare students to become engaged citizens? In addition, what perceptions do faculty have regarding the role of co-curricular opportunities in civic education?

Research Questions

Maxwell (1996) suggested that most researchers in the qualitative field will not develop their research questions until a significant amount of data are collected. Additionally, in the majority of case studies, the researcher starts with a broad, sometimes vague, question and then proceeds to develop a series of more precise questions as the research progresses (Swanborn, 2010). The overall question guiding the study was: How and why do faculty members participate as teachers in an institutional effort to teach students to be engaged citizens? The initial subset of questions that guided this study was:

1. How do professors come to include educating for engaged citizenship as a part of their teaching?

2. How do professors describe their efforts to teach students to be engaged citizens as part of a larger university initiative?
3. What type of citizenship are faculty members preparing students to practice?
4. What are professors' perceptions of co-curricular learning opportunities and their contributions to educating for engaged citizenship?

Significance of the Study

A recent CIRCLE and Carnegie report (2006) that criticized higher education for its inability to provide civic education in a clear and comprehensive manner also included numerous recommendations for future research. The current study addressed several of those recommendations. First of all, the report called for new forms of research that are placed in context on university and college campuses. The report also stressed that the research needs to be “designed and interpreted in ways that make it useful to those who influence university policies and relevant to professional organizations” (p. 4). Thus, the current research used case study methodology to uncover the context in which Drake University faculty provide comprehensive civic education that leads to engaged citizenship. The university has elected to be named in this study because university officials perceive that it would be helpful to place the findings in context for practice as well as future study. Copies of the written authorization provided by Drake University to conduct the study and Iowa State University Institutional Review Board approval are included in Appendix A.

The CIRCLE and Carnegie Foundation (2006) suggested that future research needs to focus on relevant characteristics of institutions, not only size, type, or mission for which data are easily available, but also elements such as campus culture, policies, or institutional

leadership at all levels. The faculty participants were identified in this study as leaders in Drake University's civic engagement education efforts. The data collected in this study focused on their leadership as early adopters of the challenge to integrate civic engagement efforts into the general education curriculum.

Finally, CIRCLE and the Carnegie Foundation (2006) encouraged future researchers to investigate the integration of a broad range of co-curricular opportunities in civic education efforts. Drake University served as a rich site for this case study because of the presence of a specific programmatic series that takes place annually each spring semester to provide co-curricular opportunities that complement the classroom experience. I sought to determine how faculty members understand co-curricular learning and ascertain how they integrate those opportunities into civic education efforts.

Audiences

The findings from this case study have implications for academic and student affairs administrators at other colleges and universities who seek to fulfill the civic mission of higher education through institutional efforts designed to embrace all students through integrated opportunities both inside and outside the classroom. The findings from this study, centered in professors' perspectives, might help inform efforts by student affairs and academic administrators to more carefully and intentionally integrate curricular and co-curricular learning for civic responsibility. In addition, the study is relevant to faculty members who participate in efforts to educate students for engaged citizenship by sharing their practices with the academic community at large and identifying ways institutions can

best support faculty to assume additional responsibility that exists outside individual disciplines.

Description of the Study

I approached this qualitative study from a constructivist epistemology. The basic tenets of constructivism include understanding the experiences of participants within the context of their lives, exploring the meaning of phenomena within the context of a research study, and listening to multiple participant voices and experiences (Guido, Chávez, & Lincoln, 2010). Constructivist epistemology is an appropriate choice to undergird the research design to reveal the perceptions of faculty and how they make meaning of the experience, as teachers, of participating in an institution-wide effort to educate students for engaged citizenship, both inside and outside the classroom. A constructivist epistemology supports the selection of a basic interpretive approach as the theoretical perspective framing the study. Prasad (2005) described interpretivism as an approach that “takes human interpretation as the starting point for developing knowledge about the social world” (p. 13). Case study methodology guided the design of this study. Chapter 3 provides a more detailed description of the research design.

Theoretical Framework

Two different theories were used to construct the overall theoretical framework for the study. The theoretical framework “informs the phenomenon under study and links the unsettled question to larger theoretical constructs” (Jones, Torres, & Arminio, 2006, p. 25). The research questions fall into two overarching themes of why and how: Why do faculty members choose to participate in civic engagement education, and how do they teach for

engaged citizenship? The particular context of the case study lends itself to further refining the questions to look at the role of co-curricular opportunities in these faculty members' teaching efforts.

The civic voluntarism model, developed by Verba, Schlozman, and Brady (1995), presented three participatory factors that have been shown to lead to civic engagement: (a) resources, (b) engagement, and (c) recruitment networks. This framework guided the construction of interview questions, and later helped frame the analysis to understand the professors' stories about their participation in civic education efforts.

Westheimer and Kahne (2004a) contemplated the various conceptions of a "good" citizen and the resulting implications for developing curriculum on educating for citizenship. The authors presented a framework that delineates three visions of citizenship: the personally responsible citizen, the participatory citizen, and the justice-oriented citizen. The good citizen framework helped frame the data collection and analysis of how professors are teaching students to be engaged citizens at Drake University.

Researcher Positionality

In qualitative research, the researcher is the primary instrument for data collection and analysis (Merriam, 1998). Therefore, it is fundamental to the work of a qualitative researcher to reflect upon her relationship to the participants and topic. According to Jones, Torres, and Arminio (2006), "how a researcher positions herself within a research study is critical to understanding the lens used to interpret the data" (p. 104). As the researcher, I had insider status in the institutional context for the case study because I have worked at the university for 11 years. In addition, over the past 5 years, I have been actively involved with

the Engaged Citizen Experience, serving on the ECE planning committee, presenting at Engaged Citizen development workshops, and coordinating the ECE student organization grant process. Nevertheless, I simultaneously dealt with some issues of outsider status with the participants, since I also served as a student affairs administrator while all of the participants were faculty members. However, I enjoyed the opportunity to serve on a variety of institutional committees that facilitated my ability to develop collegial relationships with faculty on campus, and this visibility was helpful to me in securing participants for interviews.

My interest in this research topic is a personal one through my active involvement in the co-curricular aspects of the Engaged Citizen Experience as well as a significant interest in strengthening faculty support of co-curricular learning experiences. I am a strong proponent of learning that occurs both inside and outside the classroom; therefore, I have a propensity to seek and engage in co-curricular opportunities. Nevertheless, I have experienced significant resistance from faculty regarding the legitimacy of learning that results from co-curricular involvement at various times throughout my career as a student affairs practitioner. These experiences have also fueled my personal interest in better understanding faculty perceptions of co-curricular learning in the particular context of civic education. As I proceeded with conducting this case study research, I also sought to keep my researcher positionality and personal interest in mind as I constructed questions, engaged in fieldwork, and began data analysis.

Definition of Terms

It is unusual for a definition of terms section to appear in a qualitative study because “the terms as defined by the informants are of primary importance” (Cresswell, 2007, p. 77). Nevertheless, the following terms were defined for use in the study since they help to better explain the context in which this study was conducted.

Co-curricular: Defined as educational programs and activities that occur outside of the formal classroom (Diverse Democracy Project, 2005).

Engaged Citizen: There exists a valuable array of perspectives on the kinds of citizens that democracies require, but there is certainly a lack of consensus; protect liberal notions of freedom and equality, obey the law, respect the government, volunteer, or participate in the political process are some suggestions (Kahne & Westheimer, 2003; Dalton, 2008; Westheimer & Kahne, 2004a; Westheimer & Kahne, 2004b; Zukin, Keeter, Andolina, Jenkins & Carpini, 2006). A similar lack of consensus seems to exist in the higher education setting (Brabant & Braid, 2009). The institution at the center of this case study defined engaged citizenship through a set of four learning outcomes:

- Learn to evaluate the mix of diverse values and interests that influence democratic decision-making.
- Establish skills, knowledge, or dispositions that will lead them to be active stewards for the common good.
- Critically reflect on the social, economic, or political issues that they will face as citizens.
- Learn democratic practices or public engagement through participatory activities organized in the classroom and/or in the community.

Organization of the Dissertation

This dissertation is organized in five chapters. In Chapter 1, I provided a brief introduction to the topic of interest for this study and the experiences of faculty educating for citizenship. I then outlined a broad picture of the research study, including the problem, purpose, and research questions. I also addressed researcher positionality and my approach to the study.

In Chapter 2, I present the literature related to the research study, starting broadly with the history of educating for civic responsibility in higher education, moving through an understanding of the ways that institutions attempt to prepare students for engaged citizenship, examining the integration of co-curricular learning in higher education, and then focusing very specifically on the role of faculty members in civic education efforts.

In Chapter 3, I present the epistemology and theoretical framework that support the approach to the study, and explore the choice of case study as the methodology for the study. In Chapter 3, I also explain the methods for data collection, as well as delimitations and limitations, and present a discussion of the ethical considerations for the study.

In Chapter 4, I present the results as emergent themes from the data analysis and provide brief profiles of the study participants. Finally, in Chapter 5, I conclude with a discussion of the results as related to the existing literature and in context with the research questions. I conclude the chapter with an examination of implications for practice, suggestions for future research, and my reflections on the research process.

CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

I begin the literature review with a very broad look at civic engagement in the higher education setting nationally and proceed to a very narrow focus on the individual faculty member's experience with civic education. In the first section I seek to establish the overall context for civic education by examining the history of civic engagement in higher education, starting with the origins of teaching students to be citizens in the early 19th century and concluding with the current renewed interest in civic engagement in higher education and how institutions broadly participate in the effort. In the next section I move outside the classroom, exploring calls for civic engagement education to include integrated curricular and co-curricular opportunities while also illuminating the lack of understanding that exists on how to best work with faculty to connect curricular and co-curricular learning for engaged citizenship. In the final section I explore faculty participation, including identified "best practices" for civic learning and sources of resistance for faculty participation in civic education efforts. I also examine current theories of faculty motivation to participate in civic education.

Civic Engagement in Higher Education: Setting the Context

The first section of the literature review is designed to provide a picture of the broader context of civic engagement in higher education. First, I review the history of civic engagement in higher education in order to provide a better understanding of the current situation. Next, I investigate the practices whereby institutions demonstrate commitment to civic engagement and how institutional commitment is related to the accomplishment of civic

engagement objectives. Finally, I briefly describe the most common ways that higher education institutions are attempting to participate in civic education.

History

Colleges and universities historically embraced a mission to prepare students to assume the responsibilities of citizenship in a democratic society (Boyte & Hollander, 1999; Vogelesang & Astin, 2005). In the 19th century, American colleges explicitly taught civics and morality and expected their students to incur moral obligations (Boyte & Hollander, 1999). However, between 1880 and 1945, American universities sought to replace communal obligations with free, individual choices guided by scientific rationality and expertise (Carnegie report, 2006). Between 1945 and 1960, relatively little academic discussion or research was explicitly concerned with citizenship as it was seen as unscientific (Schudson, 1998). The 1960s and 70s were a time of pedagogical innovation in higher education. Initiatives such as learning communities, multiculturalism, and service-learning were based on reintroducing experiential opportunities to education and some initial experimentation with civic education efforts (Boyte & Hollander, 1999; Kezar & Rhoads, 2001). The late 1990s ushered in a significant interest in civic responsibility among higher education institutions. Ernest Boyer is credited with writing two transformative pieces, *Scholarship Reconsidered* and *The Scholarship of Engagement*, that prompted educators to design and implement large-scale service-learning and civic engagement opportunities (Brabant & Braid, 2009). The far-reaching impact of Boyer's call is demonstrated by a series of national proclamations regarding the role of higher education.

National Commitment

The far-reaching impact of Ernest Boyer is demonstrated by a series of statements that followed, where colleges and universities collectively claimed in various ways a renewed commitment to their historical roots of civic education. Campus Compact's *Wingspread Declaration on the Civic Responsibilities of Research Universities* (1999) marked an important moment for higher education wherein institutions claimed responsibility for civic education outside the traditional realm of a liberal education. Campus Compact is a national coalition of almost 1,200 college and university presidents, representing some six million students, which are committed to fulfilling the civic purposes of higher education (Campus Compact Who We Are, 2012). More than 90% of the member institutions include service or civic engagement in their mission statement and membership has grown by an average of 70 campuses per year over the past 5 years (Campus Compact Membership, 2010).

Another national association, the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), founded in 1915 by college presidents, represents the entire spectrum of American colleges and universities—large and small, public and private, two-year and four-year. AAC&U comprises more than 1,150 accredited colleges and universities that educate more than seven million students every year (About AAC&U, 2009). Through multiple initiatives such as *American Commitments*, *Shared Futures*, *Greater Expectations*, *Core Commitments*, and *Liberal Education and America's Promise* (LEAP), AAC&U has called its members to understand, support, and promote the nature of civic engagement and higher education (Knefelkamp, 2008). The institution selected as the site for this case study is a member of both AAC&U (a LEAP Campus Action Network Campus) and Campus Compact.

In addition David Maxwell, the president of the institution, is a member of the Board of Directors for AAC&U. Through this research, I sought to understand how selected faculty of this institution “understand, support, and promote” civic engagement both inside and outside the classroom.

Institutional Commitment

At an individual institutional level, the institutional mission statement is a very public way of demonstrating commitment to a particular value or outcome, in this case civic engagement, as the majority of the member institutions of Campus Compact do. Meacham and Gaff (2006) analyzed the mission statements of the top institutions in the country, as identified by *Princeton Review's The Best 331 Colleges* because, as they stated, “The mission statement is the necessary condition for many different individuals to pull together through a myriad of activities to achieve central shared purposes” (p.7). Meacham and Gaff (2006) found little consensus on the goals of a college education through their analysis of the university mission statements, but did find that contributing to the community was the second most frequently cited goal, mentioned 121 times.

University mission statements have been shown to be an important way of influencing the culture of an institution. Kezar and Kinzie (2006) stated that the mission of the institution is one of the most visible and powerful articulations of the culture and usually relates to values and meaning for a campus. The authors of a multi-site case study of 20 institutions used document analysis, interviews, focus groups, and observations to look at whether an institution’s mission is related to distinctive approaches for creating an engaging

environment for students. The study found that students' perceptions of alignment between the university's mission and actions resulted in more positive feedback from students.

The mission of the institution that is the subject of this case speaks to helping students develop as "responsible global citizens." So it seems, from the importance of university mission as a unifying force identified by Meacham and Gaff (2006) and the mission statements' potential ability to influence culture as found by Kezar and Kinzie (2006), that if the mission of the institution and its actions (in this case efforts of faculty and administrators to tie general education courses to co-curricular learning opportunities) align, the institution can potentially create educationally enriching experiences. The current research study was built on the work of Kezar and Kinzie because the role of the university mission statement is considered as part of the overall institutional context, but the focus shifts from students and centers on faculty understanding of engaged citizenship at an institution where the mission statement is clearly committed to developing civic learning for its students.

Mission statements alone will not ensure support, however. J. Boland (2011) conducted a qualitative multi-site case study of four community-based learning projects to study the policy, process, and practice of embedding a civic engagement dimension within the higher education curriculum in Ireland. He found that strategic institutional commitment to civic engagement could be viewed with skepticism and resistance by faculty, as demonstrated in this quote by one of his participants: "There's a critique of the fact that it is just kind of a PR statement or it's part of the strategy document that just makes the university look good" (J. Boland, 2011, p. 112). The qualitative results of the AAC&U study conducted by Dey, et al. (2009) echoed the concerns among faculty found in J. Boland's (2011) study. One participant, while acknowledging that learning to be a citizen and participating in one's

community should be an important part of a U.S. education, went on to say that civic engagement efforts should, “not be used.... to simply engage [students] in local community service projects to generate good public relations” (p. 17). Therefore, one aspect of this case study examined faculty support of a stated university commitment to engaged citizenship in its mission statement, and determined whether the mission is simply playing the role of a PR statement or if, indeed, it is acting as a guiding force to create a university culture where faculty and administrative efforts can align to achieve outstanding educational experiences as Kezar and Kinzie (2006) suggested.

A mission statement is one way to demonstrate commitment to civic education and can serve as a means for an institution to define what it means by civic engagement. Brabant and Braid (2009) stated that while there is no definition of civic engagement that fits all institutions, there may be similar forces driving universities and colleges to assume greater roles in their communities. They further argued that in order for institutions to have meaningful and long-term impact on students, the institution must engage in activities designed to define civic engagement for itself. Ashley Finley (2011) completed a comprehensive literature view of post-secondary civic education research for the 2011 roundtable meetings on civic learning for the Global Perspective Institute, Inc and AAC&U, and her conclusions indicated that institutions of higher education are not engaging in the type of meaning making that Brabant and Braid (2009) recommended. Finley found that: (a) civic engagement is not a term that is defined commonly in higher education. In addition, “for many it is synonymous with service-learning”(p. 19); (b) the practice of civic engagement comes in many forms and is framed by a variety of approaches; and (c) “the empirical evidence of the effects of the various practices is largely confined to service-

learning experiences” (p. 20). Part of the focus of the current study was to understand how faculty members who are participating in an effort to educate students for engaged citizenship make meaning of the concept, and if the work to establish a common understanding of engaged citizenship is evidenced in their perspectives.

Once the mission statement is in place and, hopefully, efforts to establish common understanding within the institution have taken place, support from the president of the institution and upper level administration is important as institutions pursue efforts to educate students for civic responsibility. As part of a quantitative study designed to assess the effects of a selected engaged pedagogy on student learning outcomes related to civic engagement, Spiezio, Baker, and K. Boland (2006) revealed a direct relationship between the level of support from the president and chief academic officer and the number of courses promoting civic engagement offered at each of the four participating institutions. Upper level administrative support is also vital to vibrant co-curricular offerings in support of civic engagement. A recent study by Kezar (2003) that involved 128 senior student affairs administrators at various types of institutions sought to examine the strategies that best support collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs. The findings indicated that senior administrative support was by far the most often cited strategy for successful collaboration, with 80% of respondents saying it was a very successful strategy (Kezar, 2003).

The institution in the current study was perceived to have the critical support suggested by the previous studies to further its civic education efforts both inside and outside the classroom through the significant level of commitment to civic engagement from its president and chief academic officer. The President is a member of Campus Compact and the

Provost is responsible for administration of the Engaged Citizen Experience, an effort to connect curricular and co-curricular opportunities, through the Associate Provost of Curriculum and Assessment. Through this research, I sought to provide further understanding of what this type of senior administrative support means to faculty as they engage in the practice of teaching students to be engaged citizens, not measured by number of courses or number of faculty-student affairs partnerships, but rather through better understanding of faculty member perspectives.

Institutional Approaches

After mission statement revision and adoption is completed and presidential and senior level administration support is in place, the real work of educating students for citizenship begins. A review of institutional strategies designed to educate students for civic responsibility reveals a series of broad categories: specialized programs such as a certificate or minor, general education requirement, service-learning or community-based learning, co-curricular opportunities, or several strategies in combination. The case study institution combines a general education curriculum requirement with co-curricular opportunities, and so I will focus the review on what is understood about these particular strategies.

Incorporating civic education into general education requirements is a widely advocated strategy that presents an institution with several advantages (Adelman, Ewell, Gaston, & Schneider, 2011; Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont, & Stephens, 2003; Hollander, 2011; Hoy & Meisel, 2008; Spiezio, et al., 2006; Terkla, O'Leary, & Wilson, 2007). One important aspect of this strategy is the opportunity to avoid self-selection bias and reach out to all students. Colby, et al. (2004) further elaborated on this advantage of general education

integration by pointing out that not only does a general education approach provide the best opportunity to touch the hard to reach students, but also provides a more intentional path for students who have an interest in civic engagement but lack the tools to enhance their participation.

The second advantage inherent in a general education approach is the leveraging of multiple disciplines in the examination of the common goal of civic engagement. Spiezio, et al. (2006) urged both faculty and administrators to “carefully consider the possibility of utilizing general education as the institutional foundation and platform for an integrated, multidisciplinary learning environment expressly dedicated to the promotion of civic engagement” (p. 291). The concept of civic learning described by Adelman, et al. (2011) as part of their broader conversation about the importance of civic education as a priority across higher education in the *Lumina Foundation’s Degree Qualifications Profile* cannot be realized without integration into the general education curriculum, and echoed the argument made by Spezio, et al. (2006) regarding the importance of providing students with a broad knowledge foundation in support of civic education. According to Adelman, et al. (2011), civic learning requires

the integration of knowledge and skills acquired in both the broad curriculum and in the student's specialized field. In developing civic competence, students engage in a wide variety of perspectives and evidence and form their own reasoned views on public issues. (p. 11)

The institution in the current study includes an “engaged citizen” requirement as part of the general education curriculum. On the curriculum web page the requirement is described as “the opportunity to bring diverse disciplines to bear in further developing the skills, knowledge, and dispositions that will lead them to be active stewards”

(<http://www.drake.edu/dc/EngagedCitizen.php>). A few sample courses include a biology course called *Disease, Dialogue and Democracy*, a statistics course on *Using Statistics to Shape Health Policy*, and a music course called *Music and Politics*.

Third, a general education approach will involve the greatest number of faculty and students, providing the foundation for an institutionally based, mission driven commitment to civic engagement (Spiezio, et al., 2006). The current case study was centered at an institution where the mission promises students they will be prepared to act as citizens, and the general education curriculum includes an engaged citizen component, seeming to suggest that the institution is creating an institutionally based, mission driven commitment. However, the case study took previous studies further by examining faculty commitment to the initiative, because not only do presidents and senior administrators need to be on board with efforts to implement civic engagement across the curriculum, but also faculty must play a key role because they control the formal curriculum (Kezar, 2003).

Providing stand-alone co-curricular opportunities for students to enhance civic education is a less widely employed strategy in higher education than integration with the general education curriculum. One extensive example is the national Bonner Scholars and Bonner Leaders program that awards scholarship stipends to more than 3,000 students at 77 institutions of all types in long-term community-based service placements. A long-term study involving 1,500 student participants assessed the outcomes of the four-year co-curricular program, looking particularly at student development related to civic engagement. The results of the study indicated that almost all seniors felt that they benefited from the program, with 98% of students stating they gained skills to do effective service (Hoy & Meisel, 2008). The authors also examined the impact of service-learning courses, and the

data suggested that students' participation in one or a few service-learning courses did not significantly augment impact; what mattered more was the co-curricular program, further supporting claims of the value of co-curricular learning opportunities for advancing education for civic responsibility (Hoy & Meisel, 2008).

The Bonner model was strictly co-curricular in nature until 2003. The founders of the program believed that “without intentional strategies to link to the curriculum, program integration and influence were limited” (Hoy & Meisel, 2008, p. 2). Fourteen programs, funded by FIPSE grants, implemented minors and certificate programs to complement the strong co-curricular elements already in place. The extension of the Bonner model into the curriculum demonstrates the actualization of “the need for colleges and universities to intentionally structure the undergraduate experience as a whole—including curriculum, extracurricular activities and campus culture—in a way that facilitates the task of educating citizens for civic responsibility” (Fiarriolo, 2004, p. 107). The findings from the current research study could help support institutions that seek to intentionally structure the undergraduate experience as a whole in support of civic education through an exploration of the central role that faculty members could play in acting as the connection point between the curriculum and co-curriculum.

The specific example of the Bonner Scholars and Leaders program is important as it informs the overall case study. The case study institution does not provide a structured multi-year co-curricular and curricular linked experience as described in the Bonner programs, but it does seek to create connections between curricular study and co-curricular learning opportunities. In addition, the institutional structure is set up to further expand the reach of the civic education efforts by incorporating them into the general education

requirements so that all students must take at least one course that seeks to help prepare them to be engaged citizens, rather than linking to a small set of courses or a specified minor or certificate. Since the case study institution elected to include civic education in the general curriculum requirements and add a co-curricular component, broad participation by faculty in teaching the courses and support of co-curricular opportunities is vital to the institution's success in meeting its civic engagement commitment. It is not clear from the current state of the literature how to effectively engage faculty in these efforts and so the current research study will focus on faculty experiences of teaching engaged citizenship within a general education context and connecting to co-curricular opportunities.

In Search of Holistic Civic Education: Learning Outside the Classroom

In this section of the literature review I define co-curricular learning within the context of the study, highlight the role of co-curricular learning in teaching civic responsibility, and discuss the need for and obstacles to faculty and student affairs partnerships. I also illuminate the deficit in the literature regarding faculty perceptions of co-curricular learning opportunities.

In 1999, over 561 college and university presidents endorsed the Presidents' Declaration on the Civic Responsibility of Higher Education. The document states, in part, that higher education must "teach the skills and values of democracy, creating innumerable opportunities for our students to practice and reap the results of the real, hard work of citizenship" (Ehlrich & Hollander, 1999, p. 1). In addition, other national organizations such as the Pew Partnership and AAC&U are joining the call for civic education to take place both

inside and outside the classroom, and further urging that those experiences need to be connected and intentional (Fiarriolo, 2004; Knefelkamp, 2008).

Over 250 civic leaders, community organizers, faculty, academic leaders, and students came together for a conference to discuss higher education's role in strengthening democracy for the 21st century. One of the five main recommendations to come out of the conference was for institutions to be intentional about the democratic skills they want students to learn and then design curricular and co-curricular experiences aimed to enhance students' proficiencies in these areas (Thomas & Hartley, 2011). A unique program in place at the case study institution is a demonstration of this recommendation. Student organizations have the opportunity to submit monetary grant requests in support of programs that they want to sponsor during the spring semester. In the grant application, the student group must include a narrative that describes how the program will contribute to one or more of the learning outcomes of the Engaged Citizen Experience. I do not know if any faculty are aware that the program exists, attend student-sponsored engaged citizen events, or include student events on course syllabi. Again, this study seeks to highlight the perspectives of faculty in order to better understand how to partner in the integration of curricular and co-curricular learning.

Theoretical Underpinnings of Co-curricular Learning

Philosopher John Dewey is credited with first advocating the importance of grounding education in experience. Dewey's (1938) theory of experience placed emphasis on the educational relationship between the classroom and the world outside of it. Recent

reports urging higher education to stop seeing learning as separate from doing (Keeling, 2004; Wildman, 2005) have their roots in Dewey's original theory.

Echoes of Dewey can also be seen in Alexandar Astin's work. Astin's (1999) theory of student involvement, which suggested that the greater the student's involvement in college, the greater will be the amount of student learning and personal growth, points to the importance of supporting engagement among students inside and outside the classroom. Astin (1999) defined involvement as "the amount of physical and psychological energy that a student devotes to the academic experience" (p. 518). Astin further argued that it is not enough for students to simply take a series of classes in order to achieve the desired learning outcomes, but rather students must be required to invest sufficient amounts of energy and effort.

The conceptual framework of the National Survey of Student Engagement also rests on an understanding of engagement, and its positive relationship to student success, as inclusive of areas such as faculty-student interaction and participation in outside of the classroom activities (Kuh, 2003). In her discussion of what is currently known about the theory and approach to civic education, Vogelesang (2008) argued that although civic engagement is not the same thing as academic engagement, it is reasonable to conclude that the same principle presented by Astin (1984) and Kuh (2003) applies: the amount of effort students put into an experience will impact their own personal development and success (p. 15). Hoy and Meisel (2008) provided additional support for the tenet of the theory of involvement that holds that it is not the number of learning opportunities that are important, but rather the quality of effort. Hoy and Meisel (2008) found that participating in more service learning courses was not associated with greater learning outcomes for students. As

a result of this finding, the authors advocated for the need to identify pathways through the curriculum as opposed to creating a large number of single experience service-learning courses.

Defining Co-curricular for the Civic Engagement Discussion

There is a wide range of co-curricular learning experiences that occur on college campuses, and full agreement on a definition of what co-curricular means has not been identified. The Diverse Democracy Project (2005) created a typology to help campuses identify and assess practices that will help students function among society's diverse perspectives. The typology provides a definition of co-curricular initiatives and subcategories of co-curricular activities that will also frame the scope of co-curricular learning opportunities for this research project. Co-curricular initiatives are defined as "educational programs and activities which occur outside of the formal classroom" (The Diverse Democracy Project, 2005, para. 1) and the subcategories of co-curricular activities include: (a) rituals and celebrations, (b) workshops and retreats, (c) student organizations, and (d) intergroup dialogues (The Diverse Democracy Project, 2005). Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont, and Stephens (2003) also expanded the definition offered by looking outside of the specific project of intergroup dialogue to programs designed to foster communication and respect across diverse populations. A strategy of interest employed by the institution in the case study is to provide co-curricular opportunities for students as they are also enrolled in an engaged citizen designated course. One signature co-curricular opportunity is a two-day workshop that centers on the theme for the year and is planned by a small committee of faculty, staff, students, and community partners. In addition, student participation in clubs and organizations is a key component of the overall university experience. Drake University

is host to over 150 registered student organizations, and a recent administration of the Multi-Institutional Study of Leadership on the campus revealed that over 90% of respondents to the survey indicated they were a member of at least one student organization (Wise, 2008, unpublished raw data).

A defining aspect of the co-curricular learning environment is the variety of opportunities to practice theoretical concepts such as leadership, problem-solving, or critical thinking. In looking specifically at learning, the monograph *Learning Reconsidered* (Keeling, 2004) defined learning as a complex, holistic, multi-centric activity that occurs throughout the college experience. Keeling suggested that it is important for institutions of higher education to map the learning environment for sites where learning occurs and discover opportunities for collaboration.

The university setting for the current case study includes a public commitment, through the mission statement, to providing opportunities for students to practice and ultimately be prepared to “be active stewards working for the common good” (Drake University ECE website, n. d.). It would seem that professors educating students for engaged citizenship within this particular university context need to find ways to provide opportunities for students to practice action and develop self-confidence in taking action. A “knowledge” model of citizenship education is not enough (Haste, 2004, p. 433). It is through praxis, whether in the school or in the community, that a student gains an identity as an active citizen, and the skills and efficacy to become one (Haste, 2004). In a recent study entitled *Civic responsibility: What is the campus climate for learning?* ((Dey, et al., 2009), the authors found that, among the respondents, students who reported participating in co-curricular activities were more likely to strongly agree that their commitment to change

society for the better had grown during their time on campus and that they had learned the skills to help them effectively change society than those students who did not participate in co-curricular activities. It was an important facet of the current study to explore and understand how faculty are providing students with opportunities to practice and develop confidence in their ability to act as citizens upon graduation.

Academic and Student Affairs Partnerships: Opportunities and Obstacles

A report to the U.S. Department of Education, *A Crucible Moment: College Learning and Democracy's Future* (2012) named faculty, staff, students and the institution as equally important “drivers of transformation” (p. 46) in the civic engagement movement. The current study may contribute, at varying levels, to better understanding the role of three of the four important drivers: the institution provides the context for the study, student affairs professionals on the campus help facilitate co-curricular opportunities in support of civic learning, and the main focus of the study is the perspectives of faculty who participate in civic education efforts. In this section I look more specifically at partnerships between faculty and student affairs professionals. As previously described, co-curricular experiences can powerfully inform students’ civic learning and the student affairs professionals who help facilitate those experiences are poised to partner in those efforts. In a study conducted by Dey, et al. (2009), students named student affairs professionals as the most visible public advocates on campus for the importance of students becoming active and involved citizens, as compared to faculty and academic administrators.

The student affairs literature is full of calls, pleas, and recommendations to increase collaboration with faculty, but the faculty voice seems to be missing from the conversation.

Faculty perceptions of the co-curricular learning environment are not well documented. Do faculty think that learning can occur outside the classroom, using techniques other than assigned reading and homework? In the current research study I explored how faculty make meaning of the process of teaching students to be engaged citizens, and how co-curricular opportunities fit into their understanding of student learning.

The obstacles that stand in the path of academic and student affairs partnerships are better documented in the literature than representations of faculty perceptions of co-curricular learning. Schroeder (1999) named five obstacles, broadly supported in the literature, that have been present over the long history of academic and student affairs partnerships. According to Schroeder (1999), as he examined the literature, the most significant obstacles included: cultural differences, historical separation between the formal curriculum and the informal curriculum, perception of student affairs as a secondary function to the academic mission; different and competing understanding of learning, and different reward systems for faculty and student affairs professionals. The findings of the current study were informed by these well-documented obstacles. Further, I sought to confirm whether or not one or more of these obstacles still present significant concern to warrant consideration in efforts to connect curricular and co-curricular initiatives in civic education.

Bourassa and Kruger (2001) sought to discover the obstacles to successful implementation of student affairs and academic affairs collaborations in higher education through an informal survey process with a small number of student affairs practitioners and scholars who were identified as leaders in the movement to promote these collaborative partnerships. Bourassa and Kruger (2001) identified the need to resolve cultural differences between faculty and student affairs as the top priority. One striking example of cultural

difference identified by Bourassa and Kruger (2001) was the collaborative approach to problem-solving and initiative-building in student affairs compared to the generally solitary, autonomous work of faculty. A quote from one respondent described the cultural divide for both student affairs practitioners and faculty members:

I don't think that the typical faculty member devalues student affairs, but I don't think they know much about student affairs. Student affairs administrators also need lessons in faculty life. We need to know how faculty members structure their time and the various elements of the promotion and tenure process. (p 14)

One aspect of the current study is to learn, from faculty members' perspectives, how all the elements of their life as a faculty member fit together, in particular their obligations to teaching, research, and service, and then describe that experience for my fellow student affairs colleagues so that we can start to break down the cultural divide and build productive collaborative partnerships between academic and student affairs in support of a holistic approach to civic education.

Role of Faculty in Teaching Civic Responsibility

This section begins by emphasizing the central role faculty play in institutional efforts to educate students for engaged citizenship as owners of the curriculum and powerful, yet previously ignored, connection points between curricular and co-curricular learning. Next, one particular set of recommendations is described on best practices for teaching engaged citizenship. Finally, possible sources of resistance from faculty to civic engagement learning are explored, particularly as related to initiatives to embed such efforts into the general education curriculum, and motivating factors for faculty participation as identified in the research literature.

In the book *Courage to Teach* (2007), Parker Palmer advocated an approach to teaching that blends intellect, emotion, and spirit--a very holistic approach to teaching that mirrors the model for student learning of civic responsibility described earlier. Parker (2007) stated, "Seldom, if ever, do we ask the 'who' question--who is the self that teaches?" (p. 4). Faculty are at the heart of any effort to teach students to be engaged citizens. Hoy and Meisel (2008) identified five key factors in supporting implementation of a developmental academic civic engagement program, and named committed, engaged faculty as one of the most important factors. The current study was designed to center college professors as teachers, amidst their other competing roles of scholarship and service, and better understand "the self that teaches" (Palmer, 2007, p. 4) civic engagement, an area of the research literature that is very thin. The setting for the study provides a rich backdrop for this line of inquiry, because Drake University places a great emphasis on the role of faculty as teachers.

A study that sought to examine the practices of 15 research-intensive institutions found that generating faculty buy-in was one of the two most significant obstacles to implementing civic education efforts (Hollander, 2011). The study was focused on American research-intensive institutions, so it may be somewhat limited in its applicability to the current study. However, most of the institutions in the study claimed to be involved in both specialized, intensive civic education programs and curricular efforts to educate students for citizenship and were seeking to improve the integration of curricular and co-curricular efforts (Hollander, 2011). The institution involved in the current case study is also trying to reach all students with its civic education efforts and connect more intentionally to co-curricular opportunities. It depends heavily on faculty involvement to support civic education efforts. There are 73 courses currently listed as options for meeting the engaged citizen requirement

on the official university website, and all five colleges and schools are represented in the course offerings. The political science department shoulders a significant burden by sponsoring over half of the courses, but there is also significant diversity in departmental offerings, ranging from biology to music to statistics.

As identified previously in the literature review, professors play a key role in supporting a university's efforts to pursue civic education as gatekeepers of the curriculum. However, not only is it important to learn from faculty because they control the curriculum, but even more so because faculty members have the greatest opportunity to influence student learning about civic responsibility. Spezio, et al. (2006) found that "when faculty employ pedagogical strategies expressly dedicated to promotion of civic engagement, they can have a significant effect on the value that students attach to the concept of engaged citizenship" (p. 290). The findings from Spezio, et al. (2006) further support the purpose of the current study. By seeking to better understand the experiences of faculty teaching for engaged citizenship, those experiences can be shared with other faculty and civic engagement learning can be expanded.

Current Understanding of Best Practices

In the previous section I established that faculty members are central and crucial players in any institution's effort to educate students for engaged citizenship and additionally noted that understanding the experiences of faculty participating in that effort will be a central component of this study. One aspect of the faculty experience includes how they understand and describe their efforts to educate students for engaged citizenship. In her review of the literature, Finley (2011) stated that most empirical evidence of the effects of

various practices to advance civic learning is focused on service-learning. A singular focus on service-learning within the civic education literature was a particular challenge for the current study since Drake University, as stated previously, has focused on ways to advance civic learning outside the area of service-learning. However, several other reports provide insight into other promising educational practices in the area of civic engagement.

In 2006, AAC&U launched an initiative to “reclaim and revitalize the academy’s role in fostering students’ development of personal and social responsibility” (O’Neill, 2012, p. 2). The Core Commitments project, designed in collaboration with another initiative—Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP)—identified a set of learning outcomes for personal and social responsibility that are designed to “prepare all college students for work, life and citizenship in the twenty-first century”(O’Neill, 2012, p. 2). As mentioned in the introduction to this research study, the institution that served as the site for the case is a member of AAC&U and a LEAP campus action network campus. One of the five outcomes identified by Core Commitments is contributing to a larger community. Findings that identify educational practices that positively influence attainment of this outcome are informative to the current study (AAC&U, 2007; O’Neill, 2012).

In 2009, the Core Commitments Research and Educational Change Collaborative (the Research Collaborative) was convened in order to examine the existing data to better understand the kinds of educational practices that expand students’ development of personal and social responsibility (O’Neill, 2012). Educational practices found to produce positive growth in the area of Contributing to a Larger Community were tagged by O’Neill (2012) as engaged learning practices. The four engaged learning practices identified by O’Neill (2012) include: “1) talking about course content with students outside of class and communicating

with professors outside of class; 2) active and collaborative learning; 3) challenging academic classes and high expectations; and 4) integrative learning” (p. 44). O’Neill (2012) added a fifth engaged learning practice, participation in interdisciplinary courses, which was first identified by Astin, Astin, and Lindholm. Astin, et al. (as cited in O’Neill, 2012) credited participation in interdisciplinary courses for helping students to “appreciate the subtleties of intellectual problems and to see the value of using the knowledge and methods of multiple disciplines as a means of understanding complex issues and appreciating multiple perspectives” (p. 60).

The use of several terms in the findings on engaged learning practices call for some additional definition. Active learning is defined in the Glossary of Education as:

a method of learning where active student participation is encouraged through project-based exercises. One unique characteristic of active learning is that the teacher acts as a facilitator of the education process rather than as a unilateral source of information. Examples of active learning include in-class debates and discussion circles on reading assignments.
(<http://www.education.com/definition/learning-experience/>)

Collaborative learning is defined in the Glossary of Education as:

an instructional approach that teaches students how to be effective, collaborative, and supportive team members. Development of those interpersonal skills are [*sic*] accomplished through group activities such as group projects, shared and individual accountability for tasks, and peer teaching. (<http://www.education.com/definition/learning-experience/>)

Integrative learning is defined by AAC&U as “an understanding and a disposition that a student builds across the curriculum and co-curriculum, from making simple connections among ideas and experiences to synthesizing and transferring learning to new, complex situations within and beyond the campus” (<http://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/pdf/integrativelearning.pdf>).

These definitions, along with the engaged learning practices identified in the research literature, will help frame my analysis and possibly provide additional language to depict how faculty describe their efforts to teach students to be engaged citizens.

Another source for examining and identifying educational practices to further civic engagement education efforts can be found in the Principles of Excellence, another component of the LEAP initiative. The National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement (2012), as they reviewed leading institutional programs for civic education, found that “civic-oriented faculty members are often practitioners” (p. 47) of the following Principles of Excellence: teaching the arts of inquiry and innovation, engaging the “Big Questions,” connecting knowledge with choices and action, and assessing students’ ability to learn and apply complex problems. The relevant Principles of Excellence identified by the Task Force provide an additional tool, which will work in tandem with the engaged learning practices, to guide my analysis of the data from interviews as well as course documents related to how faculty describe their efforts to teach engaged citizenship.

Faculty Resistance

After providing an outline of national and institutional commitment to civic engagement, an overview of programmatic strategies for fulfilling civic education commitments, and establishing the central role of faculty in holistic civic engagement efforts, I next pay attention to obstacles for implementation. I examine both external obstacles existing in the higher education landscape and, given the focus of this study on the experience of faculty in educating for citizenship, sources of faculty resistance as institutions

look to implement either general education, co-curricular, or holistic models of civic education.

A source of resistance cited by external critics of higher education is the fact that educating students for civic responsibility challenges the traditional training of faculty as academic specialists. Stanley Fish, an American literary theorist and legal scholar, wrote a column in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* that urged educators to confine their efforts to what they could hope to accomplish: “giving students a set of materials and skills and stimulating enthusiasm for the subject at hand” (as cited in Wilhite & Silver, 2005, p.46). In other words, college and university professors should limit themselves to teaching students within the boundaries of their given discipline and have neither the responsibility nor the capacity to venture outside of those boundaries into the realm of educating students for engaged citizenship. Ira Harkavy (2006) termed this premise the “disciplinary fallacy” (p. 15) afflicting higher education.

One descriptive study examined a general education curriculum revision at a small liberal arts college, not tied to civic engagement specifically but to the general concept of integrative learning. The findings from the study have important implications for the current research, however. The authors emphasized that asking faculty to teach courses that integrate broad skills across disciplinary lines is something graduate school did not prepare them to do and their previous teaching experiences did not encourage them to do (Bloss, Hanstedt, & Kirby, 2010). It is important for institutions to recognize that by asking faculty to integrate civic education principles into their discipline-specific courses as part of a general education curriculum initiative they may be asking faculty to undertake a responsibility they are ill-prepared to handle. Fish (2003) took the argument one step further

by proclaiming that faculty should not wander outside their discipline-specific knowledge at all. The current case study sought to examine what motivates faculty to step outside their disciplinary comfort zone and engage in education for citizenship as an additional layer in their teaching.

Recognizing that faculty may not be adequately prepared to participate in civic education efforts leads to the need for providing faculty development. Some critics go so far as to caution against faculty trying to use pedagogies of engagement for fear that faculty have not been properly trained and would therefore not do them well (Wilhite & Silver, 2005). If civic education is going to be implemented on a broad scale throughout the curriculum, faculty would benefit from opportunities to participate in faculty development, discussion groups, and national associations in order to develop the content knowledge and pedagogical expertise to contribute to an institutionally based, mission driven effort (Colby et al., 2004; Wilhite & Silver, 2005).

A study by Abes and Jackson (2002) further highlighted the importance of development opportunities as faculty try to incorporate pedagogies of engagement into their teaching. The authors were seeking to fill a void in the literature by examining the factors that motivate and deter faculty in using service-learning for their courses. The authors found that not knowing how to use service-learning pedagogy was a significant deterrent for faculty who had considered service-learning but had not yet implemented it in their classes. The current study sought to understand challenges faculty may face when they try to embrace educating for engaged citizenship, and how they had found support for those challenges. The institution involved in the case study sponsors an Engaged Citizen workshop every spring and provides compensation for faculty who attend, as well as stipends for those who choose

to develop new courses. The findings address whether this formalized development opportunity is identified as a critical component of support from the faculty perspective. A second method of support, coming out of the service-learning literature, recommended that faculty who had successfully implemented service-learning could provide professional mentorship to other interested faculty (Abes & Jackson, 2002).

Very few studies have investigated faculty perspectives on civic engagement education to better understand sources of faculty resistance. Looking outside the U.S. higher education literature, J. Boland (2011) conducted a qualitative multi-site case study of four community-based learning projects to study the policy, process, and practice of embedding a civic engagement dimension within the higher education curriculum in Ireland. J. Boland (2011) described four broad “orientations” to civic engagement among the participants in the study: (a) personal orientation, derived from personal beliefs, values, and experiences; (b) student/learning orientation; (c) civic orientation, related to concern for civic/social issues; and (d) higher education orientation, focused on the role, purpose, and interests of higher education. The majority of the faculty participants adopted a student learning orientation, whereas administrative participants articulated a civic orientation (J. Boland, 2011). The faculty concern identified by Boland’s study may be best articulated by Fish (2003): “What I have been saying is that democratic values and academic values are not the same and that the confusion of the two can easily damage the quality of education” (p. 5). The findings from Boland’s study emphasized the importance of demonstrating to faculty that civic education enhances student learning and can be considered integral to student learning rather than an add-on experience. The current study sought to understand faculty members’ views on civic education—is it seen as an add-on or an integrated component of student learning?

Civic mindedness has been placed in the category of affective learning, a dimension that has traditionally been the area for student affairs educators to address (Kezar & Rhoads, 2001). The research on intergroup dialogue can provide some insight into faculty resistance to the affective learning domain. Intergroup dialogue has been identified in the literature as one of five engaged pedagogies that support civic education outcomes (Colby et al., 2004). Intergroup dialogue is described as the opportunity, “through civil engagement guided by facilitators, for students to develop a passion for thinking, relating, and acting not only for personal fulfillment but also for a larger social project of effective collaborations across differences to enhance community life” (Gurin, Nagda, & Sorensen, 2011, p. 3). The pedagogy of intergroup dialogue is based on a framework that privileges both cognitive and affective learning. Wong (Lau), Walker, and Landrum-Brown (2011) identified three main contributions of emotion to the dialogue process: (a) reflects the emotions that are often part of intergroup history and relations, (b) humanizes the issues, and (c) acts as a catalyst for the group’s relationship building and learning. However, dealing with emotion in the classroom can be contrary to academic training, which often teaches to keep dialogue at the intellectual level in order to avoid the risk and discomfort as well as to maintain academic rigor (Wong (Lau), et al., 2011). The current case study sought to understand whether the role of emotion and affective learning is seen as an obstacle by faculty and ways faculty have observed affective learning connecting with cognitive learning in their classrooms or co-curricular opportunities.

Faculty Motivation

Throughout my search for studies to inform my understanding of the faculty experience in civic education, I discovered that the research on faculty motivation was very limited. The report, *Educating Citizens: Preparing America's Undergraduates for Lives of Moral and Civic Responsibility* (Colby, et al., 2003), written for the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, is the primary source of research regarding the factors that motivate faculty to participate in educating students for civic responsibility. Colby et al. (2003) conducted a multi-site case study involving 12 institutions representing various sectors of higher education, all selected because they shared a commitment to integrating academic and civic commitments. The findings from the study, which were reinforced in later studies focused on faculty motivation to participate in service-learning (Abes & Jackson, 2002; Banerjee, 2007), identified five factors that motivated faculty to participate in civic education efforts: (a) a conviction that undergraduate education should address the “whole person” and include the broader goals of a liberal education, (b) a way to bring work and personal values together, (c) development of a network of fellow scholars to talk about teaching, (d) desire to develop satisfying relationships with students, and (e) a method to further enhance student learning. The Carnegie report provided an excellent foundation for the current case study, particularly providing some initial understanding of sources of motivation that may recur again and will be explored in the fieldwork.

The current study sought to extend the work of Colby, et al. (2003) in several significant ways. First, the Carnegie research was conducted as a multi-site case study, where the focus was on developing an overall descriptive picture of institutional participation in civic education. The current research study was a single case study, wherein the case is

the faculty experience of civic education, and the institution, while still important in providing the context for the case study, is in the background. Second, the Carnegie research promoted co-curricular opportunities as an important component of civic education, as cited previously in the literature review, but did not examine how faculty integrate curricular and co-curricular learning opportunities, whereas a main focus of the current study will be to also examine how faculty perceive co-curricular learning as a contribution to civic engagement. Third, the Carnegie study focused on classifying the type of civic education practiced by the participating institutions, identifying three themes: community connection, moral and civic virtue, and social justice. An area of interest in the current study is how faculty understand the type of citizenship they are preparing their students to practice.

Good Citizen Model

Developed by Westheimer and Kahne (2004a; 2004b), the good citizen model provides a lens to understand how faculty members describe their efforts to educate students for citizenship, through both curricular and co-curricular strategies. Westheimer and Kahne (2004a; 2004b) contemplated the various conceptions of a “good” citizen and the resulting implications for developing curriculum on educating for citizenship. This model will contribute to the theoretical framework for the current study. The authors presented a framework that delineates three visions of citizenship: the personally responsible citizen, the participatory citizen, and the justice-oriented citizen. Westheimer and Kahne (2004b) conducted a 2-year study of 10 programs in the United States that aimed to advance the democratic purposes of education. The authors discussed the three conceptions of citizenship

as well as the political implications differing conceptions have on important outcomes regarding ways that students should act as citizens (Kahne & Westheimer, 2003).

Currently, the ideal of personally responsible citizenship, as represented by the Campus Compact organization, receives the most attention and funding in the American education system but such an approach distracts attention from systemic solutions and analysis of causes of social problems (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004a). The authors acknowledge that to solve social problems and improve society, the personally responsible citizen contributes good character and the participatory citizen takes leadership positions in established systems and community structures (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004a). However, the authors privilege the justice-oriented citizen, a citizen who questions, debates, and changes established systems and structures that reproduce patterns of injustice over time.

The curricular approach that Drake is using to educate engaged citizens seems, at first glance, reflective of a blend of justice-oriented and participatory citizenship as students are supposed to establish skills, knowledge, or dispositions that will lead them to be active stewards for the common good and critically reflect on the social, economic, or political issues that they will face as citizens, as stated in the learning outcomes. However, the way the program is currently structured, courses must only show they are designed to meet one of the four outcomes, previously identified in the definition of terms section, in order for a particular course to acquire the engaged citizen designation.

Civic Voluntarism Model

Verba, Scholzman, and Brady (1995) sought to develop a model “of the process by which citizens come to be active in politics” (p. 3). The authors developed the civic

voluntarism model, comprised of three components: (a) resources, (b) engagement, and (c) recruitment networks. Resources considered by Verba, et al. (1995) included time, money, and civic skills. Verba, et al. (1995) included interest, knowledge, and self-efficacy as the elements of engagement. Recruitment networks included friends, family, colleagues, and others who might be in a position to encourage or invite participation. The model was designed to help explain the process by which citizens come to be active in politics and provided a useful framework for examining a different kind of participation: faculty participation in civic education efforts.

To develop this model, the authors used a two-stage sampling method that started with a random sample of 15,000 members of the American public who participated in a brief telephone-screening interview, which allowed the researchers to select a sample that overrepresented activists and minorities (Verba, et al., 1995). The secondary set of interviews was conducted with a representative sample that contained sufficient cases of those who engage in rare and interesting forms of political activity, as well as African Americans and Latinos (Verba, et al., 1995). The authors were able to compile “the largest and most comprehensive cross-sectional data set on the nature and origins of political activities” (p. 6).

The model developed by the researchers indicated that while resources explain why individuals are able to participate, the other factors (engagement and recruitment) explain why individuals choose or choose not to participate, which is important because political involvement is voluntary. Similar to political participation, the participation of faculty members in the university’s civic education effort is voluntary and the model helped frame the analysis of how faculty members came to include civic education into their teaching--was

it because they had the resources, because they wanted to, or because someone invited them? The civic voluntarism model (Verba, et al., 1995) has not been applied in a research study concerned with understanding the participation of faculty members in educating for engaged citizenship in a higher education setting, so the use of the model will be exploratory.

Summary

This chapter provided an overview of the literature related to the study. In the first section, I outlined the long and uneven history of commitment to civic engagement in higher education and then presented the current state of civic engagement education efforts in the higher education setting by describing several participation strategies implemented by institutions: general education integration, co-curricular opportunities, and a hybrid combination. In the next section, I moved outside of the classroom, exploring research that supports the need for civic engagement education to include integrated curricular and co-curricular opportunities, while also demonstrating the lack of understanding that exists on how to best work with faculty to connect curricular and co-curricular learning for engaged citizenship. In the following section, I situated the study in the research on what is known about the importance of the role faculty play in teaching for engaged citizenship, best practices in civic education, sources of resistance to civic engagement efforts, and faculty motivation to participate in civic education. In the final section, I described the theoretical framework for the study, a combination of the good citizen framework and the civic voluntarism model.

CHAPTER 3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In this chapter I provide the epistemological and theoretical perspectives guiding the study, as well as the rationale for the selected methodology and methods. This chapter also includes a more detailed description of case study as a methodology, a thorough outline of the research plan, a description of the case study site and participants, and an explanation of the data analysis process.

Qualitative Approach

I selected a qualitative research design for this study. Merriam (1998) outlined several essential characteristics of qualitative research that help describe why a qualitative research design is the appropriate choice for this case study. First, qualitative researchers are interested in understanding the meaning people have constructed, and understanding the phenomenon of interest from the participant's perspective, not that of the researcher. In this study, the experiences and perceptions of faculty members participating in civic engagement efforts were the phenomena of interest to understand how faculty are making meaning of those experiences. Second, since qualitative research focuses on process, meaning, and understanding, the product of a qualitative study is richly descriptive (Merriam, 1998). The literature review revealed a gap related to the experiences of faculty participating in civic education efforts that are situated in the general education curriculum and seek to connect with co-curricular opportunities. Thus, conducting the research from a qualitative perspective will provide thick, rich descriptions of those experiences.

Qualitative research design depends upon congruence among the epistemology, theoretical perspective, methodology, and methods. According to Crotty (1998),

epistemology is a way of understanding and explaining how we know what we know. Furthermore, epistemology is “the theory of knowledge embedded in the theoretical perspective” (p. 3). The theoretical perspective, in turn, informs the methodology, and the methodology “governs our choice and use of methods” (Crotty, 1998, p. 2). A qualitative researcher must pay attention to the interdependence of these four elements of the research design and carefully construct the scaffolding of the study to ensure congruence (Crotty, 1998).

Epistemology: Constructivist

A constructivist epistemology perspective frames the case study. Constructivism, according to Crotty (1998), focuses exclusively on the “meaning-making activity of the individual mind” (p. 58). A constructivist engages in research with the assumption that reality and knowledge evolve through lived experiences of the research participants (Creswell, 2007). Thus, I examined the individual social action of professors teaching engaged citizenship. Therefore, my efforts to speak with faculty about their perspectives on preparing students to be engaged citizens, and then sharing their perspectives with others who are interested in supporting the civic engagement responsibility of higher education, was guided by this framework.

Theoretical Perspective: Interpretivism

A theoretical perspective influences how the researcher will approach and design the study (Jones et al., 2006). Specifically in case study research, the connection to a theoretical perspective “both adds philosophical richness and depth to a case study and provides direction for the design of the case study research project” (Jones et al., 2006, p. 54).

Interpretivism guided the research design of this qualitative case study. In interpretive research, “education is considered to be a process and school is a lived experience. Understanding the meaning of the process or experience constitutes the knowledge to be gained” (Merriam, 1998, p. 4). Since developing an understanding of the individual experiences of faculty members teaching engaged citizenship is at the center of this study, an interpretivist perspective is appropriate.

Methodology: Case Study

The defining feature of case study methodology, compared to other approaches employed in qualitative research, is the focus on a “bounded system” (Jones, et al., 2006; Merriam, 1998; Stake, 1995). The bounded system for this particular case study is one institution, Drake University, and more specifically the faculty in the university who participate in institutional efforts to teach for engaged citizenship.

This qualitative study is a hybrid between an intrinsic and an instrumental case study. An intrinsic case study focuses on understanding the particulars of one case, whereas an instrumental case study is less about the case itself and is more interested in understanding an issue (Stake, 1995). As an intrinsic case study, the research focuses on the uniqueness and story of the context. In this case, the context is an institution that has taken a unique approach to fulfilling its civic mission by creating a curricular commitment to educating for engaged citizenship within the general education curriculum and pairing it with an intentional co-curricular component. As an instrumental case study, the research explores issues related to how faculty develop as teachers of civic engagement, with an additional focus on how they integrate co-curricular experiences with their teaching.

There are several reasons why case study methodology fits well with this research study. First, case study is useful when examining social processes and social phenomena (Swanborn, 2010). When conducting this study, I tried to understand the social phenomenon of how faculty teach engaged citizenship in the context of an institution whose mission claims to prepare students for citizenship, senior administration demonstrates support for civic education, and curriculum has made space for civic education. Second, the variables of interest in case studies included “thoughts, values, expectations, motives, opinions, experiences, attitudes, and behaviors” (Swanborn, 2010, p. 26), which fit very well with the focus of the current study. Third, case studies are an appropriate methodology when the researcher is starting with broad, vague questions focused on why and how (Swanborn, 2010). The initial research questions guiding the study were:

1. How did professors come to include educating for engaged citizenship as a part of their teaching?
2. How do professors describe their efforts to teach students to be engaged citizens as part of a larger university initiative?
3. What type of citizenship are faculty members preparing students to practice?
4. What are professors’ perceptions of co-curricular learning opportunities and their contributions to educating for engaged citizenship?

Site for the Case Study

Drake University is a private, independent institution located in Des Moines, Iowa. US News and World Report ranked the university third overall in the category for Midwest Master’s level institutions, out of 142 total, and awarded the university the second highest

score for Academic Quality among the same peer group. In Fall 2011, Drake University reported 3,203 full-time undergraduate students and 5,384 total students in the student body. The university consists of three colleges and two professional schools as well as a law school. In Fall 2011, the ethnicity profile of the university was represented as: 82% White Non-Hispanic, 5% Non-Resident, 3% Black Non-Hispanic, 3% Hispanic, 3% Asian, Non-Hispanic, 2% race and ethnicity unknown, 1% two or more races, Non-Hispanic, .01% Hawaiian/Pacific Islander/Indian/Alaskan Native, Non-Hispanic. In terms of gender, 58% of the undergraduate population identified as female, 42% as male.

The university just completed the fifth year of the Engaged Citizen Experience (ECE) project, an institutional model designed to advance civic engagement through a blend of new and revised courses and co-curricular experiences and programs that create a campus-wide dialogue on a significant citizenship theme or public issue with local, national, and global ramifications. The ECE is part of a broader, mission-driven curriculum revision. The ECE connects with and supports the Engaged Citizen curriculum goals by providing a forum for broad discussion of a common topic and related understandings of responsible global citizenship. A theme is selected for each ECE, which occurs throughout the spring semester every academic year. The theme is selected based on input from first-year students in their first-year seminar courses and then serves as a source for course development and programming by student organizations, residence hall staff, and the ECE planning committee composed of faculty and staff. Unlike the focus on service-learning found among most civic education efforts in higher education (Finley, 2011), sustained attention to service-learning is a recent development in civic education efforts at Drake University. The university hired a service-learning coordinator in the summer of 2011, at the start of the fifth year of the ECE.

Participants

The participants in this study were initially identified through purposeful sampling. “Sampling in qualitative inquiry is distinguished by purposeful sampling, that is, sampling for information-rich cases that hold the greatest potential for generating insight about the phenomenon of interest” (Jones, et al., 2006, p. 66). I further defined the sampling criteria for this study to include faculty who have taught an engaged citizen course at least two times in the last five years, which is the length of time the Engaged Citizen Experience co-curricular component has been in place and the revised learning outcomes for the engaged citizen courses have been in effect as those faculty with more experience teaching for engaged citizenship would most likely provide “in-depth coverage and insight into the phenomenon under investigation” as recommended by Jones et al. (2006, p. 67). After piloting the interview, I chose to add snowball sampling to my selection criteria but found that I did not discover any new names that did not turn up in the initial criteria. Upon review of the Engaged Citizen Experience website, it appeared that faculty members representing a diverse array of disciplines participate in civic education efforts at Drake University, with upwards of 30 faculty members teaching an engaged citizen designated course every spring semester.

Seidman (2006) suggested two criteria for determining “how many participants is enough” (p. 55): sufficiency and saturation of information. Sufficiency refers to including a sufficient number to reflect the range of participants. Saturation has been described as the point in the study when the interviewer begins to hear the same information reported (Jones et al., 2006; Rubin & Rubin, 1995; Seidman, 2006). Knowing the approximate number of

faculty who teach an engaged citizen course every spring semester, I set a preliminary goal of interviewing 12 faculty members. The Office of Student Records at Drake University instructed me on how to use an information system that is internal to the university to identify faculty who teach an engaged citizen course. I conducted five searches in the database corresponding to each spring semester for the past 5 years. Once I built the matrix, I found that a total of 25 professors met the identified selection criteria, which was much smaller than the number I thought might be available. The number of potential participants continued to shrink, as upon additional investigation, two of the potential participants were unavailable due to illness and another four potential participants were on sabbatical. I successfully completed 11 interviews from 19 remaining potential participants.

There were several reasons I selected Drake University and the faculty as participants in the case study. First, the faculty participants offered an informative case (Swanborn, 2010), given the institutional context in which they are teaching. For example, the Engaged Citizen Experience is a unique initiative that is designed to involve the entire campus in a community conversation regarding civic responsibility, and faculty teaching engaged citizen designated courses receive regular updates from the provost's office inviting and encouraging them to incorporate selected co-curricular opportunities into their course. In addition, civic engagement co-curricular opportunities are coordinated and sponsored in collaboration between academic and student affairs units, so there is some faculty participation in the planning of co-curricular opportunities. Second, the institution fulfilled pragmatic criteria, in that it was accessible to the researcher (Swanborn, 2010). I address some of the implications of the accessibility of the research site and my relationship to the institution and the participants in my discussion of my positionality as a researcher.

Methods

One of the defining features of case study research is that researchers collect multiple forms of descriptive data rich in context (Cresswell, 2007; Swanborn, 2010). Yin (2009) identified six primary sources of data in case study research: documentation, archival records, interviews, direct observation, participant observation, and physical artifacts. This study incorporated three methods of data collection in order to provide rich sources of data: semi-structured interviews, participant observation, and document analysis.

Interviews

Tellis (1997) identified interviews as the most important source of data in case study methodology. I conducted interviews with faculty members who were participating in civic education through the general education curriculum by teaching an engaged citizen flagged course or through service on committees supporting co-curricular engaged citizen efforts. After the study was approved by the Institutional Review Board at Iowa State and Drake University, via email I invited faculty members to participate in an interview (Appendix B-1a: Recruitment Email). Interviews are useful for investigating an educational organization's way of doing and seeing things as perceived by its individual members (Thornton & Jaeger, 2006). The interviews lasted for approximately 90 minutes. The interviews were audiotaped and sent to a professional transcriptionist for transcription.

Rubin and Rubin (2005) suggested that an interview process include three types of interview questions: main questions that introduce or explain the purpose of the study, probing questions that are used to prompt more in-depth responses, and follow-up questions for clarification and review of main questions. Using these three types of questions as a

guide, I conducted semi-structured interviews to very broadly understand, “In what ways do our teaching and learning practices on this campus cultivate a sense of civic responsibility?” (Ziotkowski & Williams, 2003, p. 11). The interview questions covered topics such as: personal understanding of civic engagement and “what kind of citizen” they are teaching students to become; pedagogical choices that support teaching students to be engaged citizens; motivation and inspiration for taking on the additional task of citizen education; sources of support for engaged teaching, either personal or institutional; personal challenges teaching for engaged citizenship; and perceptions of co-curricular opportunities on campus as contributors to their goals as teachers of civic responsibility.

I piloted the questions with a faculty member who met the selection criteria, but did not include her as a final participant. The pilot provided an excellent opportunity to explore the flow of the questions, determine the clarity of questions, and identify any gaps in what I hoped to learn compared to the data I collected. As a result of the pilot, I altered the order of several questions, consolidated three questions into one question, and clarified the question regarding employment status to be inclusive of faculty members who may not be tenure track. The final interview guide was sent to IRB for approval (see Appendix C).

Document Analysis

According to Yin (2009), document analysis is likely to be relevant to every case study. Yin further identified the strengths and weaknesses of document analysis. The strengths of document analysis include: unobtrusive method of data collection, stable source of data that can be reviewed repeatedly, provides exact information such as name or details of an event, and includes broad coverage of information that spans the entire phenomenon of

interest. The weaknesses of document analysis include: difficulty in retrieval, potential unknown bias of the author, potential for deliberate withholding of documents, and incomplete selection of documents to review. I conducted document analysis by requesting syllabi and other assignment prompts from each of the participants. I reviewed the syllabi and assignments looking for (a) examples of pedagogical choices made by faculty seeking to educate for engaged citizenship, (b) how citizenship is presented as a learning outcome for the course, and (c) inclusion of co-curricular learning opportunities on syllabi.

Direct Observation

Yin (2009) described direct observation as a formal or informal observation of the case being studied. I engaged in direct observation by attending the Engaged Citizen faculty development workshop on May 24, 2012. I notified participants prior to the workshop that I would be conducting a direct observation (see Appendix B-2: Recruitment Email – Participant Observation). Participant observation requires the researcher to be perceived as a member of a particular culture. Since I was a past participant in the Engaged Citizen workshop this requirement was not difficult to achieve. Careful note taking is an important part of the process as the researcher “records observations that are descriptive, sensory, reflective, affective, and interpretive” (Jones, et al., 2006, p. 59).

Data Analysis

The methods described previously are “the techniques or procedures used to gather data related to some research questions” (Crotty, 1998, p. 3). The data sources for this study included interview transcripts, reflective field notes, course syllabi and assignments, and analytical memos. Cresswell (2009) outlined a non-hierarchical six step process for

engaging in qualitative data analysis that guided the data analysis for my research study. The first step is to organize and prepare the data for analysis. As soon as the interviews were completed, I sent the audio file to the transcriptionist to produce a raw transcription. I also typed field notes and memos as they were generated and developed a system for organizing the notes and memos.

The second step is to read through all the data in order to “obtain a general sense of the information and to reflect on its overall meaning” (Cresswell, 2009, p. 185). During this step I listened to the audiotapes as I reviewed the transcription in order to check for accuracy and also to better familiarize myself with the data. I then recorded initial thoughts and observations.

The third step in data analysis is to begin the coding process. According to Saldana (2009), “a code in qualitative inquiry is most often a word or short phrase that symbolically assigns a summative, salient, essence-capturing and/or evocative attribute for a portion of ... data” (p. 3). Coding should begin as soon as the first sets of data are collected; for example, during the organization process, such as typing up field notes or filing documents. These “preliminary jottings” recorded my initial thoughts about words or phrases for codes (Saldana, 2009, p. 17). Some sources for codes in the material could include: topics that readers would expect to find; codes that are surprising or unusual; and codes that address a larger theoretical perspective (Cresswell, 2009, p. 187). Saldana (2009) suggested starting with this initial coding process, and then proceeding to focused coding, a process of searching for the most frequent or significant initial codes, in order to categorize the coded data.

I developed a system for organizing my raw data and codes using Microsoft Excel. This organization system was important for dealing with the large amount of data generated during this study. I tracked the raw data, either a quote from a participant, an excerpt from a document, or lines from my field notes, along with the source of the data (interview, document, direct observation) and the preliminary code.

The final analysis steps identified by Cresswell (2009) are interconnected: theme generation, representation of themes, and interpretation of the data. The coding process moves from open coding to focused coding in order to generate categories or themes for analysis, generally seeking to identify five to seven themes for further exploration (Cresswell, 2009). Moving through the process of open to focused coding, I then further organized the results into four overall themes, which are presented in Chapter 4. Once the themes were determined, I had to make decisions about how to represent the themes. The most popular approach to representing the themes in qualitative research is to select participant quotes from the raw data that best illustrate the theme (Cresswell, 2009), which is the method I selected. In the final stage of analysis, presented in Chapter 5, I made meaning of the data by returning to the literature and exploring how the findings of the study either extended, confirmed, or diverged from previous studies.

Goodness and Trustworthiness

Cresswell (2009) identified eight primary strategies researchers employ to help ensure trustworthiness of the research findings, and recommended using multiple strategies in order to “enhance the researcher’s ability to assess the accuracy of findings as well as convince readers of that accuracy” (p. 191). Those strategies include: triangulation, member checking,

rich description, clarification of researcher positionality, presentation of negative findings, prolonged time in the field, peer debriefing, and use of an external auditor. I employed a variety of these strategies in the design of the study, which I discuss in more detail in the next sections.

Triangulation

Triangulation is a strategy often used in qualitative research, and is particularly prevalent in case studies. It is designed to increase the credibility, dependability, and confirmability of the data and the process of gathering it (Anfara, Brown, & Mangione, 2002; Cresswell, 2009). In the context of data collection, triangulation serves to corroborate the data gathered from other sources (Cresswell, 2009; Tellis, 1997). As the analysis progresses, if themes are established based on several participant perspectives or data sources, then the process adds to the validity of the study (Cresswell, 2009). In the current study, the primary source of data was interview transcripts, but document analysis and participant observation provided additional sources of data and supported the process of triangulation. Syllabi, assignment outlines, and assessment instruments were collected from interview participants and provided additional context to the information provided in the interviews.

Member Checking

Member checking is a strategy that invites the participants to react to the initial findings or interpretations that resulted from their participation (Cresswell, 2009; Jones, et al., 2006). The participants did not review raw transcripts, but rather I provided the quotes I attributed to each individual participant, organized by the themes I generated, and then participants commented on whether or not I understood and appropriately represented their

experiences and perspective. Several participants chose to clarify a quote I selected, but the clarification did not change the meaning of the quote. One participant disagreed with the placement of her quote within one of the themes and stated that from her perspective it fit with a different theme. I reviewed the data, and chose to include her quote in the theme that she felt fit better.

Clarifying Researcher Positionality

I previously described my positionality within the research by explaining my relationship to the research setting, participants, and topic. Given the fact that I am an employee of the institution serving as the site for the case study and that I have a personal interest in the co-curricular learning aspects of the case, it was vital to the trustworthiness of the findings of the study to engage regularly in journaling and writing reflective field notes. As a qualitative researcher, I am the instrument of data collection and analysis and, therefore, I was extremely aware of my own relationship to the setting and constantly grappled with assumptions and challenges to those assumptions (Bogdan, 2003; Jones et al., 2006).

Peer Debriefing

My faculty advisor served as a peer debriefer for the research study, “a person who reviews and asks questions about the qualitative study so that the account will resonate with people other than the researcher” (Cresswell, 2009, p. 192). As I engaged in peer debriefing sessions, I also shared my audit trail, a strategy suggested by Anfara et al. (2002) to enhance the dependability of the study.

Ethical Considerations

Qualitative research involves a sustained and sometimes intensive interaction with the research site and participants, which introduces a range of ethical issues (Bogdan, 2003; Cresswell, 2009). One ethical issue I addressed was gaining entry to the setting by securing agreement from the “gatekeepers,” individuals at the research site who allow research to be done (Cresswell, 2009). I met with the senior level administrator who is responsible for civic education efforts at the institution in order to discuss the study and the potential for negative findings. The email correspondence confirming the approval for the study to proceed and further stating that Drake University was willing to be named the site of the study appears in Appendix A.

Even though the administrator in charge of the ECE program agreed to have the site for the research study identified, I designed the study to maintain confidentiality for faculty participants. I anticipated that participants would experience very little risk, if any, from their participation in the study but I enacted measures to ensure the research was conducted in an ethical manner that emphasized the protection of the participants. For example, I assigned pseudonyms to the participants and those pseudonyms were used in the recorded data that were sent to the transcriptionist as well as in the final report. The measures I took to ensure confidentiality for participants and other important ethical considerations for the study are outlined in the informed consent document that all participants read and signed. Two informed consent documents were used in this study (see Appendix B-1b: Informed Consent, & B-2b: Informed Consent – Participant Observation.)

Delimitations

This research study was delimited to a case study conducted at one Midwestern, private liberal arts university and the members of the faculty, both full-time and adjunct, who had taught a course flagged in the general education curriculum for meeting the engaged citizen designation for at least two semesters.

Limitations

The limitations are related to the size and scope of the study. The research site was one mid-size, private institution and the number of faculty participants is small. Qualitative research is not generally concerned with producing results that are generalizable. However, case study methodology produces a vivid portrait of the phenomenon of interest, and “with a well-written case study, the reader is empowered to make judgments about the applicability of learnings” (Rossman & Rallis, 2003, p. 105). Therefore, the findings from this particular case study have the potential to inform the efforts of other institutions, both faculty and administrators, as they try to create integrated efforts for civic education.

Summary

This chapter provided an overview of the plan for conducting the study by exploring the epistemology, theoretical perspective, and methodology guiding the study and how that foundational framework informed other choices about how the research was conducted. In the next chapter, I provide profiles of each of the 11 participants and describe the results of the study.

CHAPTER 4. RESULTS

The purpose of this research was to explore the experiences of professors participating in an institution-wide effort to educate students for engaged citizenship at Drake University, a Midwestern, private institution that explicitly claims civic engagement as part of the university mission statement. The study was designed to discover what inspires faculty to take on the additional task of educating students for citizenship, explore how professors describe their efforts to prepare students to act as engaged citizens, examine the type of citizenship faculty are preparing students to practice, and uncover perceptions of faculty regarding the role of co-curricular opportunities in civic education.

The results chapter begins with a series of brief profiles about the interview participants, which are designed to provide comparative information about their relationship to the institution, such as faculty status and years of service, and their relationship to the overall institutional Engaged Citizen effort. Next, the themes that emerged from the data analysis are organized into four main sections. In the first section, *Pathways to Teaching for Engaged Citizenship*, I discuss findings related to why faculty members teach engaged citizen classes, including their initial entry, why they stay, and obstacles faced in their participation. In the second section, *Navigating Tensions in the Pursuit of Educating for Engaged Citizenship*, I explore the way faculty described their experiences teaching an engaged citizenship course, which emerged as a process of navigating various tensions throughout their participation. In the third section, *What Type of Citizenship?*, I look at findings related to the kind of citizenship faculty are preparing students to practice, and discuss themes related to three types of citizenship that emerged. In the final section,

Teaching for Engaged Citizenship: The Role of Co-Curricular Learning, I share findings that reveal a tenuous relationship between co-curricular involvement and the teaching efforts of the faculty participants in this study.

The results in this section are based on my analysis of the following data sources: semi-structured interviews with 11 Drake University faculty members, review of course-related documents provided by the interview participants, and my observations of an Engaged Citizen faculty development workshop. The interview participants contributed to the various themes at different levels; some participants contributed to most or all of the themes, while others' responses may have only addressed three or four themes. However, the perspectives of all of the participants are represented in some way within the results.

Participant Profiles

I constructed brief descriptions of each of the participants in the study, related to their role as a professor at Drake University who is participating in the university-wide effort to educate students for engaged citizenship. The profiles are provided before sharing the findings to provide a clear picture of the background of each participant in the following areas: length of employment at Drake; disciplinary training; research, teaching, and service commitments; as well as an account of their engagement in elements of the Engaged Citizen Experience, such as faculty development opportunities or participation by their students in various aspects of the ECE. I selected pseudonyms for each of the participants in order to protect their confidentiality. In addition I do not identify their specific discipline but rather categorize them in one of four areas: humanities, science, social science, or professional studies.

Amelia

A tenured humanities faculty member, Amelia has been employed at Drake University for nine years. Amelia just completed a sabbatical. In 2012-13, she will teach two courses each semester, rather than the usual three course load due to an administrative assignment. She described her advising load as 20-25 “official” advisees, with quite a few additional students who unofficially seek her out for advice. Amelia finds she also spends a great deal of time meeting with prospective students as requested by the Office of Admission.

In terms of her involvement with the Engaged Citizen Experience (ECE), she teaches one course that is flagged as an Engaged Citizen (EC) course, and has taught that course twice total during the spring semester over the last five years. The EC course she teaches does not fulfill the requirements for a major, and so she finds that students from a wide variety of majors enroll in the course. She does not promote any of the ECE events to the students enrolled in her EC course, and she has not personally taken advantage of any of the faculty development opportunities related to teaching engaged citizen.

Diana

A tenured social science professor, Diana has been employed at Drake University for eight years. Upon returning from sabbatical in the fall, Diana will teach two courses and received a course release for the third class in order to take on some administrative duties. She is very active and productive with her scholarship, and devotes a lot of time to university service, such as faculty senate and serving as a facilitator for faculty development workshops.

She teaches two courses that are flagged as EC courses, and has taught each of them twice over the last five years. One course she describes as including almost all majors, while the other course enrolls a majority of students who are majors, with a few students from other majors as well. Her students have participated in the ECE poster session in the past, and she has attended and presented at an engaged citizen faculty development workshop.

Dorothy

A tenured professor in the social sciences, Dorothy has worked at Drake for 17 years. Dorothy currently teaches two courses each semester and has a course release due to an administrative appointment. She is active in her scholarship, including a recently published article about one of her engaged citizen courses, and is active in university service including faculty senate, a university-wide committee, and a large number of individual visits with prospective students.

She teaches two courses that are designated as engaged citizen, and has taught each of them twice, both during the spring ECE. Both of her courses enroll students from a small number of majors, so there is some diversity of disciplines among the students. In the past, she presented at an engaged citizen faculty development workshop but no longer participates. Students in one of her EC courses participated in the ECE poster session, but she no longer requires that participation.

Ella

Ella is an adjunct and visiting faculty member teaching in an area of professional studies; She has been employed at Drake for five years. She teaches two courses each

semester and also fulfills some administrative duties. Her administrative duties involve individual contact with over 70 students each semester.

She teaches one course that is designated as engaged citizen, and has taught that course three times over the last five years. The course enrolls an equal number of students who are majors and non-majors. The students in her course are required to attend two ECE events during the semester and write a paper about the event, tying it to the topic of the course. She attended the engaged citizen faculty development workshop for the first time this spring.

Jason

A newly tenured professor in science, Jason has been at Drake University for six years. He teaches three courses each semester, and is very active in his scholarship throughout the year, having to travel off-campus to complete his research. He also recently published an article about his civic engagement education efforts. His university service includes chairing a committee, advising two student organizations, and a heavy load of admission responsibilities. He indicated that he sees about 45 percent of the total number of prospective majors in his area.

He teaches two courses that are designated as engaged citizen, and has taught each of them twice over the last five years. One of the courses enrolls students from primarily one or two majors, whereas the other course enrolls students from a much greater variety of majors. He attended one of the early engaged citizen faculty development workshops. His students participate in the poster session if the theme works with his course topic, and he sometimes

gives extra credit to students who attend ECE events, again depending on the ties to the topic of the course.

Johanna

Johanna is a newly tenured humanities professor who has worked at Drake University for six years. She teaches three courses each semester, and in addition serves on two significant campus committees, one of which she chairs. She formally advises about 25 students each year, with many more students seeking her out for informal advising.

She teaches one course that is designated as engaged citizen, and has taught the course twice over the last five years. The course does not fulfill the requirements for any major, so it is taken primarily by students for either a concentration or for their general education requirements. She announces ECE events in her class, and occasionally offers extra credit for attendance accompanied by a reflection paper. She attended the Spring 2012 engaged citizen faculty development workshop.

Lana

Lana is a tenure-track faculty member in one of the professional schools and has taught at Drake for four years. She teaches three courses each semester. In addition, she works closely with a student organization on campus and has served on several university committees. She hopes to present on her work with teaching the EC course at a professional conference, but shared that she struggled with finding an outlet for her scholarship.

She teaches one course that is designated as engaged citizen and has taught it three times over the last five years. The course fulfills a requirement for majors, so they are allowed to enroll in the course first, and then other students are allowed to enroll, which

results in a class that is mostly majors, with students from a few other disciplines included. She does not ask her students to participate in the ECE events, and has not attended a faculty development workshop.

Matthew

A tenure-track faculty member in the social sciences, Matthew has been at Drake University for four years. He teaches three courses each semester, is very active in his scholarship and also is involved with a college committee and several departmental responsibilities. He described his work week as “six days a week.” Matthew advises about 20 students each year, but usually only sees about half of them.

He teaches two courses that are EC designated courses, and has taught each of them twice over the last five years. His course fulfills a requirement for majors, but also includes quite a few students from other majors. The students in one of his courses participated in the ECE poster session this year, and he also occasionally asks students to attend ECE events, but does not award extra credit. He attended one engaged citizen faculty development workshop in the past.

Melinda

Melinda is a tenured social science professor who has been at Drake for ten years. She teaches one or two courses each semester, while also performing administrative duties. She teaches one course that is designated as an engaged citizen course, and has taught it five times over the last five years. The course does not fulfill the requirements for any major, so it enrolls students from a wide variety of disciplines. She offered her students extra credit to

participate in the ECE poster session and also announces ECE events in class. She regularly attends the engaged citizen faculty development workshop.

Robin

Robin is a tenured professor of social science who has worked at Drake University for 11 years. She teaches three courses each semester, and advises around 45 students per year. She is very involved in her scholarship, and has taken on an outside administrative responsibility related to her research. In terms of university service, Robin advises between one and three student organizations during an academic year, serves on one all-university committee, and sees 2 or 3 prospective students per week.

Robin teaches three courses that are designated as engaged citizen, and has taught at least one of them in each of the five years of the Engaged Citizen Experience. One of the courses was designed specifically for non-majors, the other two courses are upper-level courses that generally enroll majors, with a few other disciplines represented. She attended the first engaged citizen faculty development workshop, but has not attended any since. She will include ECE co-curricular events in the class if the event ties in closely with the course topic.

Sara

A tenured professor teaching science, Sara has been at Drake University for 24 years. She teaches three courses each semester, and has carried a heavy service load in the past including chairing several university committees.

Sara teaches one course that is designated as engaged citizen, and has taught the course twice over the last five years. The course generally enrolls students representing

three different majors, with a handful of other areas represented. Sara has attended the engaged citizen faculty development workshop in the past, and also served on the ECE conference planning committee. She does not usually include the theme or any ECE co-curricular events in the class, although she did encourage students to attend the ECE conference.

In summary, the 11 participants included faculty members from four different disciplines: humanities, social science, professional studies, and science. The majority of the participants were tenured or tenure track faculty, with only one participant in a continuous term, non-tenure position. Based on the initial selection criteria, each participant had taught an engaged citizen course at least twice, but the range of experience among the participants extended from meeting the basic criteria, to participants who had taught their engaged citizen course every year for the past five years, as well as participants who taught more than one engaged citizen course and taught them frequently. The participants' involvement with the Engaged Citizen Experience also varied widely. The greatest participation was in the faculty development workshop offered every spring for engaged citizen course development, in which 9 of the 11 participants participated.

Pathways of Teaching for Engaged Citizenship

As I worked on analyzing the data from the interviews and looked at the faculty experience of teaching for engaged citizenship, the first major theme that emerged was the existence of multiple pathways for teaching engaged citizenship. In the following section, I share findings related to several aspects of the pathway. First, I outline five different ways that faculty participants first entered into teaching an engaged citizen course. Second, I

describe the themes that emerged concerning why professors are teaching engaged citizen courses. Third, I describe some university practices that were identified by participants as obstacles. Finally, I describe the solo pathway on which faculty find themselves as they try to teach students to be engaged citizens.

Entry into Teaching for Engaged Citizenship

When I designed this study, I made an assumption that all the faculty participants would have gone through a process of applying to the University Curriculum Committee for the Engaged Citizen Area of Inquiry (AOI)--described in the introduction to this study as the way the University organizes the general curriculum--based on my personal experience of recently applying for the Engaged Citizen AOI for a course I designed. Very early in the interview process, I discovered that there were multiple points of entry for faculty members who were teaching Engaged Citizen courses. As I analyzed the interview data, I found that only 1 of the 11 participants had followed a similar path to mine, in that he designed a course with the Engaged Citizen outcomes in mind.

As I analyzed the transcripts, I found that 4 of the 11 participants came into an existing course that had already been granted the AOI designation. In addition, 2 other participants designed their course, but did not personally apply for the designation, and were not quite sure how the course became an engaged citizen course. Robin, who teaches several E.C. courses, commented, "*Nobody asked me if that would be an engaged citizen class. It was just designated as such.*" When Ella described her start in teaching an engaged citizen flagged course, she said:

I'm not sure how you get to be an engaged citizen or AOI course... and so when I came into the course and understood, you know, that it was an

engaged citizen course and it was an AOI elective, I didn't quite make the connection.

Two participants designed the course first, and then decided to apply for the engaged citizen designation later. As Matthew noted, *"I have not designed a course specifically to be an engaged citizen course. These are courses I designed, and then applied for engaged citizen."* Melinda's interest was primarily in developing a new course about her specific topic, so she made some inquiries with her dean and the curriculum committee. Once the course was approved, Melinda reflected: *"They wanted me to teach it both as a FYS and an engaged citizen."*

Two participants had been teaching their courses for several years, and then added the engaged citizen designation after it became available. Therefore, this pathway is similar to those of Melinda and Matthew in that the course was not designed with the engaged citizen outcomes in mind. However, the experiences were different in that both of these participants had been teaching the course for years before the ECE was founded, unlike Melinda and Matthew. For example, Sara had been teaching the course for seven years prior to the start of the Engaged Citizen Experience:

I don't know that I've systematically sat down and thought about what I would or could do to help students understand engaged citizenship better, and I think the reason is because I started this course and taught it for so many years before I was involved in the basic category, because it already was a part of my thinking in a way. But not in a way that was designed to satisfy a designation, if that makes sense.

Diana teaches two courses that have an EC designation but, like Sara, she had been teaching one of them for several years prior to the start of the ECE. As Diana described her entry process, she remarked: *"I felt like I had already kind of created this unique kind of*

engagement and so when he [the founder of the ECE] started the engaged citizenship, it wasn't a stretch."

As I mentioned, one of the participants had a similar experience to mine, in that he designed the course with the EC outcomes in mind and then applied to the UCC. However, he felt he needed to justify his participation in the effort to educate students for citizenship. As he prepared his application for the UCC, he was very purposeful in connecting his syllabus to the theme selected for that year's ECE:

So for that syllabus what I did is I did my literature search looking for the 10 articles I would use for that class, and I wrote, instead of just writing article 1, article 2, I put the citation straight in the calendar. And I picked only articles that said flat out socioeconomic or poverty or something in the titles, so you were just hit over the head with it. I chose it cause that was the game to play.

Why Teach Engaged Citizenship?

In this section, I discuss reasons why faculty chose to teach engaged citizen courses, as described in the data. The theme with the broadest agreement was the belief that the course topic naturally aligned with the engaged citizen outcomes. A segment of participants also described very basic logistical issues that led them to teach an EC class, and a small number of participants described ways the engaged citizen component enhanced their course.

Course content and engaged citizenship: A natural fit

A theme that emerged very quickly and stayed strong throughout the data analysis, was a belief expressed by participants that the course they were teaching naturally aligned with preparing students to be an engaged citizen. Participants from across the various forms

of entry described in the previous section expressed this belief. When discussing his discipline in general and the courses in particular, Matthew said:

Well there—I mean a number of my courses sort of lend themselves to... the engaged citizen criteria, the engaged citizen goals. The course [specific title omitted] is about participation in public issues and raising questions about the structures that lead a society. Those courses really in their nature sort of fit with the goals of the engaged citizen program. And so it was really kind of a no brainer to submit them for evaluation.

Lana added, “*But the topic lends itself so seamlessly.*” Melinda remarked very simply, “*Because the way I see the class it fits with an engaged citizen, therefore that’s it.*”

Amelia’s comment actually captured the essence of several other participants’ perspectives that the course content or the way they teach inherently supports the outcomes of preparing students for engaged citizenship:

This is interesting for me because it made me sort of think about, you know, I think I just take for granted that everything I do is about making them engaged citizens. And the fact that we just call it that but if someone came up to me like you and said, ‘well what does that mean’ you know I actually have to think about it.

Ella, who taught in one of the professional programs and also inherited her EC designation, described her experience with the course and how it took awhile, but finally became clearer to her how the content is helpful to students as they prepare to be engaged citizens:

So it didn’t really make sense to me until this semester, and that’s three times that I’ve taught it now, of how what we’re teaching them in the course [omitted specific reference] ties into how we’re teaching them to be engaged citizens, and that’s looking at how people use persuasion and persuasive techniques to get issues across or to educate.

Ella’s comment was echoed in her course syllabus, which states under Course Objectives:

“Students should acquire a solid foundation in the basic concepts of communication,

persuasion, motivation and learning which are integral parts of this profession and of use to engaged citizens.”

Engaged citizen component enhances the course

A small number of participants talked about how the engaged citizen component enhances their courses. For example, Diana used the ECE theme as an organizing element for the class, focusing a major project around the topic of the theme. As she discussed the creation of the course, Diana said:

I thought that it would be more stimulating to the students and a richer learning experience if it were connected with engaged citizen and where they were looking at a topic in a body of literature that had to do with something that was supposed to be a larger conversation going on on campus.

Ella’s course requires students to attend two of the events that are part of the ECE and then write a reflection paper about the event. When discussing her experience with reading those papers, she said, “*So I think that the—you know the reactions we get back, it makes doing this [requiring event attendance] as part of this class much more interesting and kind of worth it.*” Johanna also incorporates event attendance into her class, but offers extra credit rather than requiring attendance. Like Ella, she asks students to write a reflection on the experience, and then makes space in the classroom for students to share those experiences. Johanna described how her students’ understanding of event attendance evolved over the semester:

The way students thought about events changed. At least some of the students began to think of attendance as less about extra credit and more about how this would be a really exciting thing to do. Or, I would hear people say “oh I wish I had gone to that because it sounds like it was really fun or really thought-provoking” and so more students were likely to go to more events.

Logistical issues

A number of participants described basic logistical reasons for why they teach an engaged citizen course. The most frequently mentioned reason was that their department needed to provide an additional course in order to fulfill their department's course obligations to the university and the general education curriculum. Since all students are required to take an EC course as part of the general education curriculum, there is a demand for a large number of seats. Jason described his experience in the early years of the Engaged Citizen as a redirecting of his efforts to support the ECE:

So I had planned to teach that very first semester that engaged citizen was supposed to be offered, I was scheduled to teach something else, and [two administrators] were so excited about the engaged citizen they cancelled my other class even though it was enrolled.

The pressure to create seats for students was reinforced by comments made at the ECE faculty development workshop. I heard one participant say, "*Obviously we have to be concerned with the needs of the majors, and ECE can't be cannibalizing from the needs of the department.*" The participant went on to say, "*The chairs would be angry, and I understand why*" (field notes, May 24, 2012). The workshop facilitator shared the information that there is a need for 600-700 seats for EC classes each year, and that is not the problem, but rather finding enough seats that do not have prerequisites. Notably, none of the participants in this study have a prerequisite for the EC course they teach. In addition, the courses taught by these participants, assuming one course per participant, represent about 410 of those seats.

One faculty member shared an additional motivation to apply for an EC designation that was unique among the participants. He designed the course first, and then applied for

the EC designation. He feels his area of study directly relates and did not add any specific elements to the course to address engaged citizen outcomes. Thus, in addition to the “natural fit” of the course content, he described being motivated by the insurance an AOI designation provides for filling the course: *“And—this may or may not be the situation of others, ... applying for an AOI designation for a course can be tempting, but it can also be dangerous. Tempting because it can be a guarantee that your course will fill.”*

Obstacles along the Pathway of Participation

In this section, I describe obstacles encountered by faculty along the pathway of participation to educating students for engaged citizenship. First, I describe responses from faculty participating in this university-wide effort who express either unclear or disputed understanding of how the University defines engaged citizenship. Second, I discuss various ways faculty struggle with determining how they fit within the overall Engaged Citizen Experience effort. Finally, I discuss findings related to workload issues for participants.

What does it mean to be an engaged citizen?

When analyzing the interview data, I found that most of the participants were unclear about how Drake University defines engaged citizenship. Diana said:

I think that we have a sort of fluid definition that I'm not sure that we as a body have a sense of, this is what engaged citizenship is. I think that there's a component of making a difference in the world, and people define that in a variety of ways.

When asked how Drake defines engaged citizenship, Dorothy replied: *“Ahah. Do we? I know we use the language a lot in the mission statement and other places. I'm not sure I've seen a definition written anywhere. So if we've defined it, I don't know where that is.”*

Robin exhibited a similar reaction to Dorothy when she said, “*Hoah. I don’t know how Drake defines engaged citizenship.*” She went on to say:

I think Drake defines, if I had to kind of try to pinpoint it, I would think that it is an awareness of contemporary issues in the context in which they occur. That it is an effort to help students better understand their role as citizens.

Amelia was also not clear on the University’s understanding of engaged citizenship, and further explained that she often feels in tension with how the university defines things compared to her personal understanding:

And well, I would say the answer to that is there’s the way the university defines it, which I don’t even know what that is actually. Maybe this is just cause I’m the way I am, but I always feel like there’s the university’s definition of things, like there’s the mission and then there’s what I think our mission is or should be, and so there’s engaged citizen according to the university, which I could probably look it up, but then there’s engaged citizen according to my definition, and maybe they’re similar. Maybe they’re the same.

Few participants criticized the university’s definition of engaged citizenship, possibly because the definition itself is so unclear. When I asked Johanna to describe her understanding of how the University defines engaged citizenship, she said:

I was worried you’d start with that. Well,--because there’s an engaged citizen workshop tomorrow--I actually went back and was looking at Drake’s definition and was kind of startled to see how much of it was based around the idea of democracy. Which in and of itself I don’t think I find problematic.

Robin echoed Johanna’s observation about a focus on democracy. She had a copy of the engaged citizen learning outcomes available in her office, so she read the first learning outcome from the document:

To learn to evaluate the mix of diverse values and interest that influence democratic decision-making. I don’t know why we’re only interested in democratic decision-making. I mean as citizens we’re a part of any number of organizations that don’t use democratic decision-making.

How do I fit with the Engaged Citizen Experience?

Another aspect that presented an obstacle to faculty participants' participation in the University engaged citizen effort was a general sense of not belonging within the Engaged Citizen Experience. This lack of a sense of belonging manifested itself in several ways and seemed to be connected with University practices related to the construction and execution of the ECE. A belief expressed by some participants was that they/their discipline were not welcome as part of the civic education effort and that the role of the ECE theme was either an invitation or deterrent to participation.

Faculty in some disciplines don't feel welcome. As described in the Pathways section of the results, Jason described an experience that was unique among the other participants. He described the process of applying for the engaged citizen designation and explained that he was *"forewarned by somebody, I don't know who, that that class having a science designation is going to immediately send red flags to the UCC 'cause it looks like a strict science course."* Sara, a fellow science faculty member, seemed to share Jason's perspective that science is met with some skepticism in the engaged citizen venue, and wondered if maybe science was less involved: *"I don't know if it's because we're in the sciences and most of the work in this kind of topic goes on in the social sciences and humanities."*

As a humanities faculty member, Johanna shared her perspective that there may be emphasis on certain disciplines in the university's engaged citizen education efforts:

When I think about the way that I see it taking shape in terms of what courses count for the AOI, there's a heavy emphasis on politics and other specific disciplines. In general, it seems the university doesn't think about it as spanning many disciplines or being interdisciplinary.

A discussion by participants at the faculty development workshop provided some additional context to Johanna's observation. Participants at the workshop discussed the representation of disciplines in the engaged citizen effort, and one participant expressed concern that he doesn't "*want it taught by politics, culture and society, and a few scattered courses. I want it as broadly based as possible*" (field notes, May 24, 2012). Participants at the workshop seemed very excited about next year's theme, related to global warming, as a potential invitation for broader representation of disciplines with the engaged citizen courses. One participant said that he thinks this year's theme really provides the opportunity to weave the engaged citizen into a lot of areas because "*it may be the first time the theme speaks well across units, and may even engage the professional schools*" (field notes, May 24, 2012).

Theme as invitation or deterrent. Faculty seem to have a hard time seeing themselves within the ECE overall experience if the theme, which is designed to unite the campus in a conversation of a global topic with local and national implications, does not fit well with the material of the course they are teaching that semester. In this case, the theme becomes an obstacle to participation rather than a unifying tool. Johanna said, "*I have difficulty trying to figure out useful ways to engage with the broader theme.*" Lana's comment echoed Johanna's:

And I take it very seriously, but I'm trying to accomplish what I'm trying to accomplish and I don't always see it as part of a larger thing, other than when we get notice that there are other things happening on campus and we could certainly incorporate those, but the themes are kind of ethereal. And that doesn't always work with what I'm teaching.

The theme also frames the ECE events that take place during the same semester the participants are teaching their engaged citizen course. There was evidence that connecting to

the events was a struggle for professors as well, as they sought to figure out how it fit with their course. Matthew said, *“My experience with the other activities has been, well they’re there, but you know is there--is there really a lot of energy behind them, and do they really fit with what I’m doing in the class?”* Jason described one particular ECE event from a previous semester and indicated, *“That was the only one I’ve ever been to that I thought was worth my time to be there and it really tied into the class.”*

The theme may lead some faculty to not even consider participating, as evidenced by this comment from Melinda as she expressed concern to a university administrator about her course not fitting the theme: *“But the themes have not really fit well with my topic, so the university administrator said, ‘No problem. Teach an engaged citizen class. You’re fine. It doesn’t have to fit our topics.’”* This sentiment was echoed at the workshop when a participant asked, *“The other course I teach (an EC course) has nothing to do with the theme, so do I just not teach it?”* (fieldnotes, May 29, 2012).

Alternatively, several participants identified the theme as a tool. For example, two participants use the theme specifically within the class to design assignments. In Ella’s course, students are provided with the following writing assignment prompt: *“You are required to explore and absorb the engaged citizen theme by attending and writing papers on two campus presentation/discussion events we have approved as being relevant not only for ‘engaged citizens’ [emphasis original] but also for this particular class.”* In addition, Jason described how the theme works with his course: *“I think this year part of the engaged citizen, I think the focus is on technology. Last time it was religion so another thread I try and weave into those classes: this year technology, two years ago religion.”*

Workload concerns

This set of results addresses reflections shared by participants related to the obstacle that workload presents to their participation in engaged citizen education efforts. The issue of workload fell into three categories: (a) the time that teaching, research, and service absorbs, and some of the specific demands on their time as faculty working at Drake University; (b) an increased workload that some participants have found accompanies teaching an engaged citizen course; and (c) challenges related to class size.

The three-legged stool of faculty time. As the participant profiles revealed, each of the participants balance a significant load of teaching, scholarship, and service commitments. Dorothy had not found any big obstacles to her participation, but described Drake's expectations in this way: *"The Drake model seems to be: 'Excel at everything if you can. Be an excellent teacher, but you should be a scholar in your field.'"* Although several participants are only teaching two classes each semester, this load was accomplished due to a course release and therefore that time was more than replaced by the administrative duties they accepted. Student interaction emerged as an important priority for all the participants, as demonstrated, for example, by the large advising loads that most of the participants carry. Many of the participants advise more than 20 students and, in addition, referred to a larger number of "informal" advisees. Another area of commitment that emerged, which was an unexpected finding, was the amount of time that many of these participants spend on duties related to the university admissions process. Over half of the participants mentioned visits with prospective students as taking up a significant portion of their time.

Matthew identified time as his major obstacle to participating in efforts to educate students to be engaged citizens:

As a faculty member with service requirements and with my own research, and with the teaching and grading and so forth, and then the work that I do in the department because in the department we have our own requirements and everything. For thinking about the engaged citizen as a cross-campus activity, I think that the major obstacle for me in participating in the other activities around the engaged citizen program is simply time.

Robin described her experience as a professor at Drake as “*just being overloaded with the day to day.*” She felt very supported by the university the first time she participated in the ECE because, as she described it, she got to “*take the time and think through what I was doing.*”

Engaged citizen courses can be more work. Several participants talked about their EC classes, and described the workload of those classes as greater, or at least significantly different, than their other courses. Two participants talked about the amount of grading and time that comes with the types of assignments they give in their EC class. Lana described the workload for her EC class as “*over the top, terrible, I can’t keep up with the grading. All of that. And yet I can’t let go of any of those projects, because I think they’re so valuable for the students.*” Ella also found the workload in the EC class to be greater, but also echoed Lana’s sentiment that the grading load was worthwhile due to the assignment’s contributions to the course:

At first I thought it was just a pain. Even though, like I said, reading their papers and hearing about their experience really made it interesting, and it added that new dimension. So, yes, it added a lot more grading, a lot more things to keep track of. But it made it interesting. So, for me it balanced out with having it be an interesting course and an interesting way to engage with the students too.

Another source of additional workload comes from the planning that goes into some of the activities participants use in their course. When describing her engaged citizen courses, Diana acknowledged, *“they’re more work and I think the thing about this that’s particularly challenging is that it is kind of creating a new set of relationships every time I teach it.”* Dorothy hosts a significant event in one of her classes that takes a great deal of time and planning, but she felt expanding this type of creativity to her other courses would be difficult:

And could I do these sorts of things in every class? Maybe, but you have to build it pretty slowly because it takes a lot more time....So doing those sorts of things is worthwhile, but could I do that in every class? I don’t know.

Two participants described the type of work that comes along with their EC course as not being less or more, but rather significantly different. Johanna found herself meeting one-on-one with a good number of students from the class:

I spent a lot more time with students one-on-one---students who wanted to talk with me in part because they were being asked to share their experiences more with other members of the class and to talk about those experiences more openly.

Amelia shared the personal toll the course exerts on her, along with the rewards she thought it brings: *“So, I feel in a way it’s draining. It’s more draining for me. Like I would say it’s my favorite class, but it’s also the hardest class. So I don’t feel like I have to do more preparation; it’s just different.”*

Many of the participants described their course as multi-disciplinary, which emerged as another source of additional workload for EC classes. Sara shared that she re-reads all the textbooks along with her students because a lot of the subject matter in the course comes from outside her discipline. *“We do have to learn some history and we do some work on*

economics and so on but basically it's not so much about learning and remembering the facts."

Unwieldy class size. The obstacle of class size seemed to illuminate an issue of needing to think about class size, building manageable class sizes while balancing the need for engaged citizen seats as mentioned earlier in the results. Robin would prefer a class that was *"small enough that we can be creative and try new things."* Johanna specifically used the adjective *"unwieldy"* to describe her class as she talked about the various interactive discussions and activities she facilitates in the class. Two participants expressed concern that the large size of their class could be challenging. Lana said, *"It's a little tough like I said with 70 kids in there."* Ella did not understand why her class was so big and wondered: *"I don't know why we want that many people in it. I suppose just because it's a(n) AOI option."*

The Lone/Lonely Experience of Teaching for Engaged Citizenship

While my analysis revealed that faculty members appreciate being left alone while teaching their engaged citizen class, a competing theme of feelings of isolation while participating in the ECE, a university-wide initiative, also emerged. I started to think about this idea as the challenge of balancing autonomy, which was described by many participants as an important way they feel supported, with feelings of isolation. Basically, most of the participants in this study just wanted to be left alone. For example, Jason said, *"Now I'm left alone so I consider that a good thing."* Dorothy described her preference for autonomy in this way: *"I kind of want people to stay out of my way. The fewer impediments that people put in my way, then I want to run with this stuff."* Amelia stated, *"I feel like, in a way I just sort of do what I do and if it fits in the university theme great, if not...."* In addition to the

comments by Dorothy, Jason, and Amelia, Matthew added, “*Drake is really wonderful in its willingness to sort of respect faculty autonomy.*”

Despite the broadly acknowledged theme that the participants felt very supported when they were left alone to teach their courses, participants also described feeling alone and disconnected from the overall ECE effort and from fellow faculty participants. Toward the end of our interview, Matthew reflected on my previous question about university support for his participation:

And you know you asked the question earlier do I feel supported in doing the engaged citizen classes, and I think, I mean not really at this point. Simply because I have the sense that there’s stuff going on, but I don’t have a sense that this is a program that people are participating in and developing and that it’s closely related or complementary to what I’m doing in the classes that I’m teaching.

Lana talked about her participation in a different university-wide initiative, and compared it to the ECE, saying, “*That was another one of those university-wide, ‘we’re all in this together, now go away and be by yourself’ kind of a deal.*” Diana described her experience this way:

Drake has an interesting model of encouraging participation in everything, which I see as paying an incentive for developing the course and then you are on your own. And there are really good financial incentives to participate in new things.

Diana and Lana both described their perspective on a University practice that allows for the recruitment of faculty to new curriculum efforts, but then does not provide on-going support.

Ella expressed her interest in feeling more connected to other faculty members teaching EC, and offered a possible strategy:

And it would be helpful to have a website or webpage, too, that maybe explained more about the topic. How it was chosen, and then even maybe

listed what courses are covering it. We could network with other faculty and find out what they were doing.

Lana suggested ways for faculty teaching EC classes to connect as well: *“As people toggle in and out of teaching this, it should be revisited in some way. To come up with a definition or come up with some strategies or whatever it might be.”* Thus, while faculty expressed desire for, and appreciation of, autonomy in teaching their EC course, there was also an equally strong theme of feelings of isolation or disconnection from other faculty and the overall ECE.

Summary

In the first section—*Pathways of Teaching for Engaged Citizenship*—I traced the varied ways that the faculty participants first entered into teaching engaged citizen courses and why they chose to participate in teaching for engaged citizenship. Three main reasons for teaching an engaged citizen course emerged from my data analysis: (a) a natural fit between the course content and perceived engaged citizen outcomes, (b) an understanding that the engaged citizen component enhances the course, and (c) operational issues related to including engaged citizen courses as part of the general education curriculum. Then I outlined the obstacles encountered by the faculty participants, which included challenges such as an unclear understanding of engaged citizenship, searching for a place in the overall university effort, and workload concerns. Finally, I described the experience of faculty participants that seems to be a mix of desires to act independently but also be connected to other faculty and the institution.

Navigating Tensions in the Pursuit of Educating for Engaged Citizenship

The focus of this section is to share the findings related to how participants described their efforts to educate students for engaged citizenship. Faculty described these efforts as navigating a series of tensions related to the following: the right way to teach for engaged citizenship, balancing pragmatism versus idealism, competition between delivering course content and accomplishing engaged citizen outcomes, and examining the roles of teachers and learners.

The Right Way to Teach for Engaged Citizenship

A theme that emerged in my analysis of the interview data as well as the course documents was that faculty participants felt there was a message at the university about the right way to teach for engaged citizenship, and several cited specific examples and sources of these messages. The participants did not all agree on “one” right way to teach but, rather, their responses fell into the general areas of service-learning and classroom strategies such as experiential learning and active learning. When speaking about his choice not to attend any more engaged citizen faculty development workshops, Jason felt that the same group of people were always selected to talk about *“the right way to teach”*: *“I don’t go to all the workshops ’cause it seems to be the same voices at the workshops.”*

Service-learning as the best practice

Several participants felt there was a strong university message that service-learning is a best practice in teaching for engaged citizenship. At the beginning of our interview, before we even really started with any questions, Sara said, *“I’m probably not going to be a great participant because I don’t have them doing any sort of service-learning projects or anything*

like that.” I assured her that the focus of my study was not on service-learning but, rather, learning more about faculty perspectives on educating students for engaged citizenship.

Dorothy talked about her feeling that service-learning has been pushed to the forefront at

Drake:

There’s some value in service-learning, but then students are going off in different directions so it’s a different kind of experience, but in any case the way I heard lots of people talking about it, and through my bias almost in a scolding way, “if you’re not doing that, then you’re too traditional, too bookish, too this, too that.”

Jason echoed Dorothy’s sentiment: *“If I look at what they highlight in the Drake Homepage, for instance. All the classes that get attention are the service-learning classes. All the classes that are held up as exemplary classes are the service-learning classes.”* Lana also commented, from her perspective, on the high level of visibility afforded service-learning opportunities at Drake: *“Like climbing Mt. Kilimanjaro, you know the football team’s trip, and the Uganda trip. ... You know there’s some high profile things that are kind of our go-to examples.”*

As Jason described his efforts to prepare a proposal for the University Curriculum Committee to have his course approved for an Engaged Citizen AOI, he shared that it was his impression that part of the resistance he encountered to approving his course was the lack of service-learning:

And that was the number one thing people kept coming back to was there was no service-learning here or the kids aren’t going and volunteering or you know they’re not talking about what can I do at the Red Cross or something and that wasn’t the goal in my mind.

Robin's comments echoed Jason's in that sometimes she feels service-learning does not fit with the goals of the course, but it seems to be a highly valued option at the University:

I think sometimes we hang onto the latest fad without really thinking about how it might help our students. I'm not sure in my class [specific reference omitted], that volunteering in Des Moines, Iowa is going to do a lot for you, in terms of studying the topic" [specific topic omitted to protect confidentiality].

Alternatively, two participants integrated service-learning into their courses, and several other participants expressed an interest or desire to use service-learning in the future. Ella thought *"it would be great if we could tie it [the ECE] together through service-learning. Ideally, if we had a topic and we bring it into the classroom and then we send them out into the community."* Johanna indicated that she has *"never tried a service-learning component to the course where they might use service as a way to reflect on their own position"* but said she might like to do so in the future with the help of the new service-learning coordinator on campus. Logistics seemed like part of Johanna's challenge, and that was part of Sara's challenge as well: *"I would love for students to do something like that, although I don't know how many places or placement there would be for as many students as I have that are really directly connected to this course."*

Contested classroom strategies

Across most of the interviews, participants were grappling with the idea that different learning strategies might be expected in their engaged citizen classroom. Several syllabi I reviewed specifically explained that active learning was part of the course. Under the section on Course Philosophy, Jason's syllabus stated: *"This course is designed to be a conversation among students and instructor. It is not a lecture course where students sit and passively*

absorb material.” Later in the syllabus, in the Attendance section, Jason indicated that “*active learning exercises are employed during most class sessions.*” In Dorothy’s syllabus, a reference to active learning was found under the Class Attendance and Participation section. Johanna also referred to the use of active learning under the Participation section of her syllabus, where she stated: “*This class is based on a collaborative learning style in which active participation is essential.*”

Throughout our interview, Robin shared some active learning strategies that she uses in her classroom, but also pushed back against active learning: “*Not all active learning strategies need to be used all the time. We need to be thoughtful and purposeful in how we do it.*” Robin and Matthew both expressed the concern that lectures are not valued anymore at Drake. Matthew feels like he is “*one of the five percent of the population when I say I enjoy a good lecture.*” Robin thinks “*we’re losing sight of [the] fact that a good lecture can be really good. And can be far more effective. And I fear that some faculty members are losing the ability to lecture effectively.*”

Robin cited faculty development workshops as one place where the message that active learning is expected at Drake is conveyed: “*These faculty development workshops say like, group work is good for the sake of group work. Or student presentations are good for the sake of student presentations.*” During the faculty development workshop I attended, the structure of the breakout sessions that occur during the annual ECE mini-conference and their active learning component were highlighted for participants. The breakout sessions were described as “*designed to introduce in a deeper way issues raised in the keynote presentation, and most involved role play or scenario building or game playing. It wasn’t about giving a talk, but rather having students grapple with issues themselves*” (field note,

May 24, 2012). Matthew also highlighted the role that University expectations played for him in navigating the types of classroom strategies he might employ. He described Drake as having *“not an entirely healthy sense, I think, of content as being not really good teaching, transmission of content being not really good teaching.”*

Experiential learning also came up as faculty participants grappled with various learning strategies and what the expectations and outcomes for its use might be for them as teachers of an engaged citizen course. Several participants expressed concerns about maintaining academic rigor while integrating experiential learning. Sara shared her mixed reaction when she said, *“So while I applaud the integration of these areas, I just hate to see the academics erode and become only experiential learning.”* Dorothy developed an experiential learning assignment in her courses in order to give students the tools to be active. She described the project as *“still just as academic and rigorous. And the books and reading and the writing and the deep thinking and research are all there.”* Lana seemed to be defending the rigor of one of her course assignments, which involves students taking on different social identities for several weeks and journaling about the experience: *“As ... gameish as it sounds, they learn a lot. They come back to that project constantly as kind of the baseline for when we start talking about misrepresentation or stereotyping especially.”* Based on data from the interviews and documents provided by participants, half of the participants in the study included an experiential learning project in their engaged citizen course.

Pragmatism versus Idealism

Faculty participants described a struggle with balancing how to teach students to be pragmatic, while also supporting their sense of idealism. It seems they are trying to help students wrestle with the impact of individual contributions and making a difference, maintaining some of their idealism while also tempering it with a pragmatic, critical perspective. Robin was very specific in her observation of the tension between pragmatism and idealism as she teaches students to be engaged citizens: *“I think the critical and pragmatic go together.... To me, an active steward for the common good is somebody who recognizes that idealism, while well intentioned, is not necessarily going to get you anywhere.”*

Dorothy described her struggle as she teaches students in this way:

If we can't prevent it overall, we can try to at least minimize the harm that we do. And maybe make things better at the margins. Maybe that doesn't sound idealistic enough for some people, but I think, that's the reality....They're young people.....they're supposed to be idealistic. Crush their spirit at age 20, that's not what I wanted to do. So I was really struggling with how do I teach them a really hard subject that is depressing without immobilizing them.

Matthew was grappling with balancing pragmatism and idealism for himself, right along with his students. He knew that several of the students enrolled in his EC course were also members of a student organization, Students in Free Enterprise (SIFE). While talking about one of the group's projects, he observed: *“It [SIFE community garden] is a great project, a worthwhile project. But when you look at the scope of worker abuse in agriculture more generally you sort of get the sense of, well, is this project really worth doing?”* Later in the interview, Matthew reflected on the role of individual action and his discussions with students

and said, *“I think that’s sort of essential to the notion of engaged citizenship. That there is a possibility for an individual to have an impact on the community at large.”*

Diana shared a more personal story related to her own role as an engaged citizen that reveals how she has navigated the tension between idealism and pragmatism:

I think that in some ways I’m highly influenced by kind of leftist or radical theories of social justice, but...I think of myself sort of as a moderate and that I’m always thinking about, ‘Well, what kind of institutional transformations can we actually achieve?’ I’m very political. And sometimes some of my colleagues who are more embedded in social theory see me as a sellout. But I feel like I’m very clear in what I’m doing.

During the engaged citizen faculty development workshop, two different participants shared comments that echo this struggle with helping students tackle big issues in a hopeful, yet pragmatic way. One participant made the comment that he doesn’t want students to just feel like there are these huge problems, *“and so what can I do about it?”* (fieldnote, May 24, 2012). When reflecting on next year’s theme related to climate change, another workshop participant said that students need to feel like there are things they can do if it is going to mean something. He went on to state that this is a real issue with the topic of climate change. Students’ attitude can be, as he stated, *“I can’t do anything, so screw that.”* (fieldnote, May 24, 2012).

Course Content in Competition with Engaged Citizen Outcomes

Another struggle that faculty participants described was the feeling that the content of their course can sometimes be in tension, or competition, with the engaged citizen expectations. Many of the participants further described instances where the content will win out if there is significant tension, while a few others acknowledged the tension, but chose some of the engaged citizen related outcomes over content. In this section I first explore how

a large number of faculty participants described either a pressure or desire to honor the course content, and then I present an alternative point of view from participants regarding how engaged citizen outcomes interact with the other elements of a course.

The sources of the tension between course content and engaged citizen outcomes seemed to arise from several sources. The first source was the individual faculty member's greater comfort with and interest in the course topic. For example, at the very beginning of our interview, Melinda caught herself focusing on the topic of the course: *"And so I am veering off of engaged citizen already. Into my topic."* During the faculty development workshop, one participant described his reason for attending the workshop as his interest in students *"getting it right"* regarding their knowledge of global warming. He talked about how students describe global warming as the build-up of carbon dioxide and stated, *"No, it is the infrared that gets trapped"* (fieldnote, May 24, 2012). Later in the workshop, this same participant commented that he thought the level of misinformation about this topic [global warming] is high and asked, *"Can it be part of the goal [of the ECE] to dispel misinformation?"* (fieldnote, May 24, 2012).

A second source of this tension seemed to come from professors' dedication to imparting a certain knowledge base. Sara described her class as a very intense course:

It's a very busy course for students. I mean they are pushing to get this information in, and of course people complain but then talk about how much they're learning and, you know, if I say 'help me figure out what to take out' they all disagree.

She went on to acknowledge the content tension, and also added her voice to the perspective that there is a right way to teach for engaged citizen at Drake when she said: *"I know the trend in education is not to focus on content, but honestly there's certain things you just can't*

learn without seeing patterns, and if you're going to see patterns you have to somehow be exposed to those." Dorothy dedicates the latter part of her class to an experiential project, and so she described her method for dealing with content delivery: *"I have front-loaded, there is content, content, content."*

Several participants discussed the responsibility they feel their course carries for majors who are fulfilling requirements. Ella said, *"It's because our majors take it, it has to be a little more in depth for them. Because they can't go on to their next course and not know the basics"* [specific outcome omitted for confidentiality]. Lana outlined the tension she feels between the larger Engaged Citizen Experience and the content she feels beholden to convey in the course in this way:

What makes that [connecting to the ECE] hard is I'm focused on what I need them to get out of my class with, and my hope would be from what we learn in there they would go out and apply all of that to everything else they do.

Amelia and Johanna represented an alternative perspective, compared to the majority of participants who favored course content over engaged citizen-related outcomes. Amelia and Johanna acknowledged the tension they believe their fellow faculty members feel regarding the delivery of content, but went on to state that they sometimes choose other outcomes over content. Johanna shared that she often makes space, about 10 minutes of class time, for students to talk about events or activities and how they relate to the course. When I asked her what she would say to fellow faculty members about the value of that time, she said, *"It's difficult because I know some people are much more content oriented than I am."*

I asked Amelia about the knowledge she hoped students would gain in her class to help support their practice as engaged citizens, and her reply also speaks to the idea of content tension:

Well, see knowledge to me is the least important part because, I mean, what does that even mean, knowledge? I don't know what that means anymore. But maybe the knowledge part is knowing how to think. I guess--to me knowledge implies facts. Or information. When you think about knowledge and information that's just something that's accessible, but what's important is the skill to be able to critically think about something or to analyze something and to not just let it sort of wash over you or invade your house without being critical about it.

The Role(s) of Teacher and Learner

Another area of tension that was related to the teaching of an engaged citizen course from the perspective of the interview participants was the evolving roles of teacher and learner in the classroom. I am not sure if this tension is specifically related to teaching an engaged citizen course; it could be that talking about teaching this particular course sparked a more general reflection on teaching for the participants. However, we were speaking within the specific context of educating for engaged citizenship and, so, I think the themes from their reflections are relevant. The thoughts from participants fell into three general areas: thinking about their role as the teacher in the classroom, discovering that students could be teachers as well, and creating a sense of student ownership in the class.

The role(s) of the teacher

Several participants grappled with the idea of control in the classroom, and shared ways that they were either able to give up control or found themselves still striving for control. Robin admitted:

It is scary to give up control...So it's easiest to do it in a small group where you have a sense of the students and the students have a sense of you, and you know that you can step in if they need you and hopefully monitor what they're doing.

While Robin recognized the challenges of giving up control, she found that “*good students will do their best work when you give them a long leash.*” Matthew seemed to be wrestling with issues of control as he discussed the ways that his students are involved in the broader ECE initiative. He explained why he does not choose to give extra credit to students for attending ECE events: “*Because I don't like the idea that students can not do the work that I assign in class and then make it up through other things that I have not actually assigned.*” Johanna recognized that issues of control might be a factor for her fellow faculty members, as she thought about the time that she sets aside in class for students to share about outside activities:

I would also say that it's not giving up control of the classroom. I think some faculty could be worried about that, too, because there is a need for flexibility in that situation that is uncomfortable for a lot of faculty.

Related to issues of control was the commitment by some of the participants to de-center themselves as the expert in the classroom. Amelia described her desire to

continually break down the wall that I am the one with all the knowledge and information and the power and they are the ones who are getting that from me. I want it to be much more egalitarian than that, and I know it's hard to erase that because I am the professor. I give the grades, but I try. I try to do as much as I can. I try to be a facilitator.

Both Dorothy and Johanna described scenarios in their classroom where the role they play is more of an observer and quiet facilitator, rather than being at the center of the discussion. Dorothy explained that sometimes when students are having a good discussion she could “*quietly back out of the room and I think they might not even notice I was gone.*”

Johanna described times in her classroom when the discussion may be student driven, based on prompts written by the students, and yet she feels that she still *“shaped that space already by my presence as a teacher.”* Johanna stated that she does not *“totally disappear”* during the discussion, but she said, *“I don’t really talk. I just let them talk to each other.”*

Robin struggled in one of her EC classes, a class that was based on a contemporary topic, when the content of the course became more complicated than she initially expected. She was concerned because *“I found myself being the expert. And my goal for the course was to have them take on the role of expert.”* Matthew’s struggle with his role as expert in the classroom was revealed as he talked about how his teaching has evolved over time. His comments are also reflective of previously described struggles regarding the primacy of content in the engaged citizen courses. He stated: *“A lot my work with teaching has been trying to work out that sort of balance between reflective learning and student driven or student guided learning and learning that I think is important because I’m a teacher of this discipline” [discipline omitted for confidentiality].*

Student as teacher

As participants were grappling with their role as teacher in the classroom, they were also in the process of discovering the ways that students could be co-teachers in the process. Dorothy referenced issues of control again when she talked about a personal experience of having a student teach her about blogging, *“And so that is what’s really cool, if the faculty could let go of control a little bit. I’m never embarrassed about not knowing something, and so they’re going to teach me. I can learn from the students.”* Johanna also described how

she learns from students, *“Students know so many things that I don’t, and they have so many kinds of experiences that I don’t.”* Johanna wants to encourage fellow faculty members to:

Acknowledge that there is a lot that we don’t know and that we may have had more time to accumulate experiences and to hone our skills and our knowledge, but we still have vast gaps and the students can fill those gaps in ways that we can’t.

Some participants indicated that not only can they learn from students, but students can also teach each other. Johanna described a class discussion where students applied a theoretical framework from the course to representations of a current pop star, and Johanna noted, *“It’s a discussion that I never could have facilitated ’cause I didn’t know anything about that artist.”* Lana’s course includes an experiential component, and she talked about the ways that students teach each other in that setting: *“It is all their own discovery outside of class....It’s not instructed. It’s self-instructed. It’s group-instructed.”* Matthew shared that he assigns small groups of students to lead discussion for an entire class session, and he has found *“that’s been a really useful way of bringing students into the process of teaching.”* Robin discovered, through a conversation with a student who was taking two of her courses at the same time that covered related topics, that he was reflecting on his experience in the two classes and described the engaged citizen course as a *“citizen-led understanding about the topic” [reference to specific topic omitted].*

Developing student ownership

Another role that faculty participants were grappling with as part of their teaching was that of the student as owner of their experience. Johanna shared that one of her primary goals is to *“facilitate creating classrooms where there is a lot of student ownership of the class.”* Robin finds that students do great work *“when you let them go and let their*

creativity and their innovations just go....they have ownership of it and they can come up with amazing things.”

Dorothy and Lana described projects in their class, and highlighted the role of student ownership in the process. Dorothy shared a story about when she had to miss class due to some conference travel, and so she asked the students to meet and come up with a preliminary plan for the project that they were going to complete, a project for which she had already laid out some basic expectations. Dorothy said that she received an email from the students, which explained that they wanted to totally change the project, and outlined how and why they made the changes. Dorothy agreed to the changes, and furthermore she said, *“It’s just frickin’ fantastic ’cause I love it when they are the ones that are driving it.”*

The project in Lana’s course involves students getting out into the community. I asked her about the logistics of getting students set up to do this experience and she explained, *“I don’t do very much for them.”* She sets the expectation that students will take ownership over implementing and completing the project. Furthermore, she does not set any specific expectations for how the project must be completed, other than providing a rubric for how the project will be graded. She said, *“They can do it any way they want.”*

Summary

In this section, *Navigating Tensions in the Pursuit of Educating for Engaged Citizenship*, I outlined results that revealed a series of tensions faculty participants described while participating in the university’s effort to educate students for engaged citizenship. First, the participants described a sense that the university promotes one way to teach for engaged citizenship, in particular privileging service-learning as a pedagogical choice and

promoting active learning strategies. Second, I shared how participants described a struggle between helping students examine big, tough issues and develop pragmatic solutions without losing hope and idealism. Third, I found that many of the participants felt a struggle between the content of the course and engaged citizen outcomes, and most often the course content was chosen in that struggle. Finally, all of participants grappled with one or more aspects of the role they and their students play in the classroom.

What Type of Citizenship?

Thus far, I have discussed findings related to the pathways faculty follow in teaching engaged citizenship, including their initial entry point, why they teach an engaged citizen class, and obstacles encountered. Next, I explored how participants described their teaching efforts and the various tensions they navigate in that process. In this section, I look at the findings related to the type of citizenship faculty are preparing students to practice. Three overall themes emerged in this part of the data analysis. Participants are preparing students to act as one or more of the following types of citizen: (a) the academic citizen, (b) the emotionally knowledgeable citizen, and (c) the active citizen. A set of characteristics and dispositions are described within each overall theme.

The Academic Citizen

The academic citizen emerged as faculty described preparing students to be informed and aware individuals who could think critically about issues while maintaining some intellectual distance, and who would ultimately engage with the world as a citizen through the lens of their discipline and profession. Robin summed up her vision of a Drake

University-prepared citizen: *“I want them to be vocal. I want them to be curious. I want them to be pragmatic, and I want them to be critical.”*

A citizen is informed and aware

A shared theme among most of the participants was an understanding that students need to be informed and aware of contemporary issues in order to be an engaged citizen. I found it difficult to determine a distinction between informed and aware, and so I am trying to honor both terms since participants used them explicitly. According to Jason, *“I think for the kind of curriculum I have, its more getting information that you can use to be an informed citizen and to make smart decisions.”* Ella seeks to train knowledgeable students: *“To train students to be knowledgeable about what is going on in the world beyond the Drake bubble.”* According to Lana, the heart of her course is very simply to help students learn how to be informed, *“There there’s only one lesson. Did you learn what you needed to learn as a citizen to understand what’s going on in the world?”*

For one of the assignments in Lana’s course, students attend two engaged citizen presentations, as designated by the instructor, and then write a four to five page paper. One of the elements of the paper must be an analysis of the impact of the presentation. In the written assignment prompt, Ella asks students to *“take some time to think about what the issues raised mean to an engaged citizen.”* She describes the assignment as an *“opportunity to expand your knowledge of the world and your ability to shape it!”*

Sara specifically referred to the importance of awareness as students seek to be engaged citizens, and used the term throughout our interview. She said:

The first thing is for people to just be and stay aware of what’s happening at different levels in their own communities or however you define your local

community, you know it can be the state. It could be national. It could be international.

Later in the interview, she described being aware as *“a huge job in and of itself.”*

Two participants also identified that, from their perspective, Drake as an institution emphasizes students’ need to be informed in order to be engaged citizens. After Robin’s initial response that she did not know how Drake defines engaged citizenship, she went on to say:

Drake defines, if I had to kind of try to pinpoint it, I would think that it is an awareness of contemporary issues in the context in which they occur. That it is an effort to help students better understand their role as citizens.

Diana expressed the opinion that being informed is the way Drake specifically defines the *“engaged”* part of engaged citizenship: *“Engagement I think a lot of times at Drake becomes defined as informed. An informed citizen. Do you know about what’s happening in the elections in 2012? Do you know about social problems in society, for example.*

A citizen is a critical thinker

A second broadly shared theme that emerged as I analyzed how participants’ described their goals for students to develop as citizens was the importance of developing critical thinking skills. Dorothy wants students to *“ask questions. To take nothing for granted. We have lots of discussions about that.”* She further described the skills of a citizen as *“research, writing, critical minds, skepticism, and not being afraid to disagree.”*

When Robin shared her definition of engaged citizenship, she said, *“I think it is a willingness to think critically about your community.”* Amelia was talking about some of the discussions and debate about issues that occur in her classroom, and she described her goal for students to become *“people who can hold their own, you know, but engage in sort of*

analysis and critical thinking about it.” Diana wants her students to be able to think critically about their work in her class and how it relates to the scholarship of the field. When talking about one of the major projects in her class, she said, *“Being able to say ‘what about my data is in dialogue with what’s in the literature?’ To me that’s the practice of engaged citizenship from the point of a scholar.”*

Johanna, who I described earlier as one of the participants who tended to favor the broader engaged citizen outcomes over content when grappling with course content and engaged citizen outcomes tension, talked about her hopes for the outcome of the class she teaches:

I am not really concerned with whether or not we cover all of the content and whether they know all of these different disciplinary conventions really well. I’m concerned with, whether, in 10 years are they going to be able to think critically about something else because of what we’ve done in that class.

A citizen uses her voice

A good proportion of the interview participants were also interested in helping students realize the value and worth of using their voice to enter into discussions about issues, in addition to being informed and aware citizens who are able to think critically. Robin wants her students to start *“seeing that your voice can make a difference. That your voice has a role to play.”* Later in the interview, she returned to this point and emphasized her commitment to helping students find their voice *“and recognize that their voice matters. Some of us [faculty in her discipline] do it better than others. This is kind of at the heart and soul of why we do what we do.”* Sara is very committed to helping her students develop awareness, but then also wants to see that awareness turn into something more. She hopes

her students, *“feel empowered to organize and to let people know, talk to people through institutions and through just citizen outreach.”*

Dorothy uses her classroom as a space for students to use their voice: *“Everybody gets to speak. Everybody has something to contribute, and we don’t rush to judgment. We take our time. We all listen.”* Lana also designs her classroom space to help students learn to use their voice, and thinks it is very important for students to learn how to enter the conversation, in whatever way makes sense for them: *“It’s like, I’ve got an idea and now I can get it out on paper or in a Tweet or somewhere. Get it out of yourself and into the conversation.”* As Melinda described herself as an engaged citizen, she provided an example of the use of voice that Lana hopes to develop in her students: *“I write my ‘2 Cents Worth’ to the Des Moines Register, not letters to the editor, though I have done one letter to the editor.”*

A citizen maintains intellectual distance

A foundational perspective underlying the attributes of the academic citizen I described above seemed to be an interest in helping students approach citizenship from a cognitive, rather than personal or emotional perspective. Matthew described his approach to the engaged citizen course he teaches as, *“It’s not so much about the students necessarily practicing engaged citizenship, but much more about reflecting on this concept.”* Later in our conversation, Matthew was discussing the challenge of helping students think about difference in his course, and so I asked him about his approach with students in helping them learn to work across difference as engaged citizens and he replied, *“Well, one thing that I do is assign books that really focus on those themes.”*

Jason's approach seemed to mirror Matthew's, as he also emphasized critical reflection and analysis over personal engagement. During our conversation, Jason used the term dialogue several times. When I asked about how he might help students practice the skills of dialogue in the classroom, he said they do not practice dialogue, but instead examine dialogues: *"What we do is we look at the dialogues that have occurred. So one thing, like going back to the minority populations, who's included in the dialogue? Who's excluded? Who had a voice? Who didn't?"*

Two of the participants emphasized the importance of research in addition to analysis as described by Matthew and Jason. Dorothy was describing the purpose of one of the assignments in the class and its ties to engaged citizenship when she said:

I want them to be able to engage in research. So they have to do a research piece. They pick a priority and they have to be able to go into depth to know where to find valuable resources, how to read those resources critically.

Robin ascribed this intellectually distant form of civic engagement to the way the institution sets up the ECE co-curricular opportunities:

Partially because a lot of the activities that I see going on within the engaged citizen on campus are things like a poster session. And a poster session to me is a very academic, distant way to promote engaged citizenship. It's actually in some way the antithesis of engaged. It's do some research.

Be a citizen of your profession

Previously in the study I mentioned that one of the most often expressed reasons shared by participants for teaching an engaged citizen course was that the topic they were teaching just naturally fit with engaged citizen outcomes, and participants further explained that they did not really do anything different or additional in order to facilitate student learning about engaged citizenship because of this "natural alignment." Under the broad

theme of the academic citizen, and aligning clearly with participants' perspectives on the natural fit of the course material with engaged citizen outcomes, I saw the theme of preparing students to be citizens of their profession emerge during data analysis. Describing her perspective on how the university defines engaged citizenship, Diana said, "*There's an idea I think of engagement from the disciplinary perspective that a student comes from.*" In Diana's syllabus, under the section Course Goals, she stated, "*Students will develop their ability to contribute as engaged citizens and future professionals.*"

One of two participants who represent a professional studies area, Lana shared the critical conversations she has about the profession in her classroom:

If it's not being done right, it's your responsibility as a person in this profession [specific reference omitted] to fix it. I said, 'Here you are going into an industry, what are we going to do about this?' And it comes down to, you know, doing your job better.

Johanna, who teaches in the humanities, described the experience of business students taking her course: "*The business students, they would say things like, 'Well that's not really my area of business but, you know, I can realize now that it's important to think about.'* And *I think well, that's good.*"

Sara mentioned several times that she is not pushing students to enter a certain profession based on their experience in her class, but rather to be a better citizen in whatever profession they choose. She shared this story, based on one of the issues they discuss in the course:

If somebody wants to have a chemical company, great. If one of my students says I just wanna run a good chemical company, if I can just reach them to the point where they're willing to lose some profit. Not to, you know, throw a fit when we're going to sanction a country because they're using gas on their own people. That's a great victory. They don't have to go be a peace worker.

They could be a great CEO of a chemistry company. That's the critical piece for me, of that engaged citizen.

The Emotionally Knowledgeable Citizen

In seeming contrast to the academic citizen, who maintains intellectual distance and operates in an individual manner, I also heard a commitment from some participants to help students grow in personal ways that will lead them to be self-reflective citizens who operate as empathetic members of a community. Sometimes it was even the same participant who was grappling with multiple outcomes for his or her students.

Knowledge of self

In contrast to the cognitive, intellectual engagement of the academic citizen, faculty who are preparing students to be emotionally knowledgeable citizens encouraged and welcomed the emotional and personal engagement students needed in order to develop a deeper knowledge of self. Robin, as we were talking about the potential for student organization involvement to contribute to engaged citizen outcomes, noted her observations of some students as they participated in student organizations:

Watching Jane go through that experience of leading the Student Organization [actual organization omitted to protect confidentiality], she learned a lot. I have no doubt that she learned a lot. You know and I watch other students go through similar circumstances and they learn a lot about themselves.

Later in the interview, Robin again emphasized the importance of students “*figuring out who [they] are.*” Sara described one of the specific ways that she tries to help students learn more about themselves, which then impacts how they participate as an engaged citizen:

“The issue is that each person has skills and interests and they’re going to be best if they

follow what energizes them.” She asked students to consider, “What is it that energizes you that you could give to the world?”

Part of helping students figure out who they are so they can go out and practice engaged citizenship, according to some participants in this study, includes helping students examine and test their own beliefs and values. In her syllabus, under the Introduction to Our Course section, Johanna told students that they *“must be willing to examine the reasons for your beliefs and attempt to understand perspectives that may conflict with your own.”*

Amelia described her goals for the course as *“trying to get them to really just challenge their own belief systems.”* She went on to say, *“Everything we do in the class, I try to get them to really just sort of challenge what they already believe.”*

Johanna described the journey that some of her students take throughout the course as they examine previously unexamined beliefs and values, and how their new awareness of this growth affects them personally: *“I think there’s this kind of narrative of progress where students think, ‘I was this person at the beginning of the semester and I had all these stupid beliefs and now I can’t believe I thought those things.’”* She went on to say:

Part of the challenge is to help students understand that their earlier beliefs weren’t “stupid” and to learn to be compassionate to their former selves. After all, they’ll encounter other people who still hold those beliefs, and I hope they’ll engage with those people without just dismissing their values as “stupid.”

When I asked Diana to discuss the knowledge, skills, and dispositions she sought to develop with students, she described another aspect of self-knowledge that she saw as important to students preparing to be engaged citizens: *“I think an ability to see their own positionality and recognize how that shapes their perspective as citizens.”* She then echoed Amelia and Johanna’s comments about facilitating a process of values examination with

students and added an additional thought about the impact of understanding one's own positionality: *"To be able to both act from their own sense of values and also recognize that those values aren't normal or typical, but are rather created through their own social location and positionality."*

One of the methods, described by several participants, for facilitating students' personal growth in knowledge of self is the practice of reflection. Dorothy said, *"I'm always trying to connect the academic with observations of experience with personal reflections on their own experience and, like, that's just standard."* Diana wants her students to constantly be asking themselves: *"How am I making a contribution to this organization and also what am I learning from the experience?"* Johanna asked students to write what she described as an exploratory reflection after they attended events on campus. She asked students to write something *"that talks about what connections [they] may have found, what difficulties [they] had."* One of the assignment options in Johanna's class, as described in the syllabus, is a reading journal. She asks students to *"make connections between [the] class texts and [their] academic, activist and intellectual interests."* Johanna's, Dorothy's, and Diana's comments illustrate how the process of reflection they facilitate is designed to connect the cognitive and the emotional and help students learn more about themselves.

Member of a community

In contrast to the generally individualistic aspects of the academic citizen, faculty who seek to prepare emotionally knowledgeable citizens emphasized connecting students as individuals with a broader community. Matthew spoke of helping students build a bridge between the individual and the group: *"So it is sort of connected in some ways to that notion*

of the connection between one's own self-interests and the community." As Lana shared her personal definition of engaged citizenship, it became clear her main focus was on the idea of community and helping students find their membership in a community:

How do I define engaged citizenship? Well, first of all it's off campus into the community. I mean we have campus community, which is a nice little bubble, far from the reality of the real world. So for me engaged citizens are in the community, understand the makeup of their community, are meeting people in the community, are actively involved in community.

Two participants described helping students recognize and understand citizenship as having some individual components while also connecting to a larger group. Diana said, "*Well to me citizenship is both in a political sense the idea of rights and duties and it's also a sense of belonging.*" Johanna also tries to help students locate themselves as an individual, but then work to develop relationships in the broader community:

In engaged citizen courses and co-curricular activities I would like to see work toward helping students to locate themselves within a broader context and then to find meaningful ways to create relationships with that context that are going to be of mutual benefit.

Role as member of the community

A small segment of the participants described helping students understand their membership in a community through investigations of their privileged identity in relation to others and exercises in working across difference. Matthew framed the challenge of helping students explore their role in this way:

Any notion of engaged citizenship has to deal with different experiences and it's unfair and really unethical to say, "Well people should be more like us and then you know be good engaged citizens or good members of society." I think that that's a challenge to think of how to work that into classes.

Lana described the "*pretty privileged environment*" she encounters as she teaches her class:

I've had students say you know, "Before we did this [class project]...I'd never even seen a homeless person." I'm like oh, oh, oh. Never talked to a, never seen a Native-American. Never talked to anybody who's Jewish. Total bubble. So this pops the bubble.

Several participants, like Lana, who sought to facilitate conversations with students about working across difference, mentioned that the homogenous environment found at Drake University was an obstacle.

Johanna shared a class assignment she uses at the beginning of the semester that is designed to help students try to understand somebody, or some group, they are "*afraid of,*" and Diana echoed Johanna's desire to get students working across difference when she said one of the most important dispositions for students to develop for engaged citizenship is "*the courage and confidence to interact with people that they don't know.*"

Several participants ask students to consider the question of "who participates?" as they think about engaged citizenship. Lana asked students to consider, "*Can we have these hidden pockets of people that we ignore in some way or discount in some way? What happens when groups like this are left out of the conversation through language or availability?*" Matthew wants students to consider, "*Who has the opportunity to do engaged citizenship, historically why has that been the case?*"

Empathetic listener

Faculty participants described a set of skills and dispositions they sought to develop in students as preparation for their roles as members of a community. I grouped these comments together within the theme of helping students become empathetic listeners. Empathetic listeners grow to understand the importance of listening, seek to be open to other points of view, and develop the complex ability to exhibit empathy.

Dorothy described the importance of listening in her classroom: *“I want them to have dispositions of candor, respectful interaction, democratic disposition. Everybody gets to speak. Everybody has something to contribute, and we don’t rush to judgment. We take our time. We all listen.”* Robin also tries to help students develop their listening skills and learn *“to be open to other viewpoints.”* She described how the process looks in her classroom: *“Students who at the beginning of the semester are clearly skeptical of one another because of their comments, you can see they begin to soften. Which is exactly what I want to see.”*

Lana echoed Robin and Dorothy’s emphasis on listening and openness to other points of view as important skills for engaged citizens. In her syllabus, Lana explained the class format and told students, *“We cannot grow as professionals or citizens by closing the door on ideas that differ from our own.”* Lana then added another priority in addition to being open to others: *“Empathy’s the big one. The ability to see beyond my own personal needs to the needs of a larger group.”* She re-emphasized her point later in the interview: *“Number one, empathy, open mind, the ability to take in viewpoints from all sides.”*

Johanna also described one of her desired outcomes for students as developing empathy, saying: *“In terms of dispositions, I can usually see progress in terms of empathy towards others.”* As an example, she described a student interaction she will usually observe towards the end of the semester:

Students suddenly have a sense that they can empathize with people they couldn’t before. “It’s a choice,” is usually the way that they put it, but they also say, “I can see why somebody would make that choice if they were in situation X, Y, or Z.”

An emphasis on developing empathy and an interest in learning from others’ perspectives is evident in this comment from Amelia:

The students I like the most are the ones who can say, “Well I am” --well I like all of them, but –“I’m Catholic and I am anti-abortion, but I really want to understand why a woman would have an abortion.”

Sara discussed helping students develop compassion as well as empathy,

I’m not trying to tell people how to think about various groups of people, but certainly want to have conversations about the fact that people who end up engaging in behaviors that we wouldn’t think are particularly helpful or good may also deserve our compassion.

The Active Citizen

The previous two themes described (a) an intellectual and academic or (b) intrapersonal kind of citizenship. The third theme, the active citizen, is focused on some of the ways that faculty talked about the role of participation in preparing students to be engaged citizens. The first area connects to the previous discussion of the academic citizen in that the action that faculty described must be informed action. The second area highlights the action of a citizen as centered on individually responsible choices. The third theme looks at some of the activities of a citizen that were described by the participants.

Importance of informed action

Diana acknowledged the difficulty of moving students out of thinking and reflection to action, while also discussing the importance of informed action:

It’s a struggle to kind of move beyond that [preparing students to be an informed citizen] to say, part of belonging is action, beyond knowledge, although that knowledge is important to be an informed actor. To be an actor with efficacy. But I think that that there needs to be sort of the practice of reflection and action that’s involved in engagement and that’s hard to find an entrée.

Ella also talked about the move from being informed to active, and her hope for students as they prepare to be engaged citizens:

Being motivated to take action or do something, based on what you learn about the issue, and then you know how to take action, you know how to do it effectively and how not to do it. Maybe not just from getting angry about it, but from how you can make change, positive change. So I hope that's something that they're getting out of it.

Matthew said he tries to encourage students to move beyond using their voice:

So I asked them to think about the fact that engaged citizenship maybe isn't just saying something, but it's being able to sustain something over time. So again I think that's part of what I'm trying to do there is complicate or challenge the notions that citizenship or participation, activism, involves maybe just saying something once in a very dramatic way. It involves really the sustained campaigns that develop over time.

Thoughtful choices

The greatest agreement among participants on ideas about action occurred in the area of helping students make thoughtful choices, and live daily lives of responsible citizenship.

Dorothy's comment illustrates how she finds it difficult to combine the academic citizen with the emotionally knowledgeable citizen who makes thoughtful choices:

I always wanted students to connect the intellectual stuff, which I think is really important to building a deep knowledge base, but with reflections on how they live, how they behave as citizens. You know, the choices they make as consumer citizens, individual, so on.

Amelia talked about moving students from passive habits of daily life to thinking about their daily participation, and in addition she highlighted what she sees as the incredible opportunity afforded to college students to stop and think reflectively, and the opportunity for faculty to help students stop and reflect:

I think that a lot of people just kind of go along, and it's hard when you're trying to earn a living. I feel like this is the one time we're going to get them to step back from things and say, "Is it okay to participate in this? What am I doing to myself?" You know people eat things all the time. How do they know where that food comes from? Do they know what happened to that pig before

it became bacon?...so that's the way I see it. I see it as engaged citizen. It's like, are you a citizen of the earth or not?

Amelia also described her personal practice of engaged citizenship in similar terms of daily, thoughtful choices: *"I would say the way I'm an engaged citizen is that I really try to live my life every single day in a way that it's conscious and probably annoying to a lot of people."*

Several participants acknowledged that this active engagement can be a difficult task for students to tackle or they are unsure of its long-term effects. According to Matthew, *"And I think it's a lot to ask for students to think critically and reflectively about choices that they make every day."* Johanna shared the struggle of one of her students as he sought to be intentional in his interactions with fellow students. She shared her student's reflection:

"So I want to be engaged with all these ideas and ways of being in the world that we're talking about. But I'm also a football player and I don't want the rest of the football team to judge me when I call them out on making a joke about race." And that's a legitimate concern—he had to work as a team with the rest of these folks.

Melinda thought that her students were much more aware of their individual actions as a result of taking her class, but was less sure about the follow-through:

I would argue that any of my students who are awake during the class--most of them were--recognize more about what they are doing than they did a semester ago. Now whether that's going to stop their actions or not, I don't know.

Lana was also unsure about what happened after students completed her course, *"My hope would be from what we learn in there they would go out and apply all of that to everything else they do. Whether they do, you know, then I don't have track of them."*

Activities of a citizen

When asked how she thinks Drake defines engaged citizenship, Dorothy responded, *“What I think the implicit meaning is [is] students being active in their communities.”* She went on to state, *“I mean I think most faculty teaching an engaged citizenship course could probably agree at that level. It might be more than that.”* The idea that citizens are active, and have activities was affirmed in the faculty development workshop. During the workshop, there was a conversation about next year’s topic, and one participant asked, *“Do we ever do actions? Like Bike to Work day?”* A second participant then stated that Earth Day would be an opportunity to do something on campus and build in action. Her comment was, *“We [Drake] do lots of scholarly work”* (field notes, May 24, 2012), implying that more action was needed.

The workshop participant’s observation that Drake does a lot of scholarly work related to engaged citizenship was illustrated by the participants in this study. Out of the 16 courses represented among the 11 participants in this study, only 5 courses had an identifiable “action” component in which students were engaged in an activity. Dorothy and Robin created an experiential component that resulted in a final product or artifact; Lana and Diana integrated service-learning into their course. Two other participants described ways they build an “action” component into the course. For example, one of the questions Amelia asks her students on their final examination is, *“What are you going to do about this [what they have learned in class]? What are you going to do?”* Matthew described how action is presented in his classroom: *“So I do bring in people from the community...into classes to talk about being involved or being active in some way.”*

Volunteerism. Several participants named activities that they hoped students would engage in as citizens sometime in the future. Volunteerism was one example. Robin expressed that she hoped her students would *“actively participate in the community. And by ‘actively participate’ I don’t just mean have a job. Like, but volunteer your time in some way that you believe will improve the community.”* Sara said, *“I just hope they will care enough to be aware and to do what they can do through their own families. Their own volunteer time.”* Lana, as I previously described, discussed some of the service-learning activities, such as the football team’s recent trip to Tanzania to climb Mt. Kilimanjaro and volunteer in a local orphanage, which seemed to get a lot of attention at Drake. She described the kind of volunteerism she hopes her students will engage in as part of being a citizen: *“You know if you’re an engaged citizen not everything you do is gonna be something that makes the front page. It’s gonna be cleaning up somebody’s yard ‘cause they can’t do it.”*

As participants described themselves as engaged citizens, many of them immediately went to action, and more specifically volunteerism. Robin said, *“I let my students know that I volunteer, and I think over time my goal is always to take them out of ideological space and into kind of a broader understanding.”* Sara described herself in terms that echo the academic citizen, but seemed apologetic about that approach when she said, *“I am probably not a very engaged citizen. I’m pretty aware of things, but I often don’t do anything about it. I feel badly about that.”* Later in the interview, Sara described some of her volunteer activities in the community, one of which she had engaged in for over 10 years.

Politics. Despite Jason’s perspective that the emphasis in the ECE is politics, as evidenced by his observation: *“When I look at the list of speakers, what departments they*

come from. *What they're talking about, I see a lot of politics,*" and Johanna's comment that *"I think there's a heavy emphasis on politics"*; very few participants talked about political involvement as an activity of a citizen. Sara returned to her theme of developing awareness in students as citizens, and further described the political activity she hopes students will pursue: *"If people are just aware and just do something small about it. Just really hammering their congressmen and women. And making their views quite clear."* Matthew said, *"What I try to do in the course is to think about how to give the students ways to think about engaging in political processes or voice."* When asked to describe himself as an engaged citizen, he mentioned *"participating in community activities and political issues,"* but then went on to apologetically explain his lack of personal activity, similar to Sara's reaction: *"But again the struggle really is time, and so I think that you know part of the difficulty of practicing these ideas is the professional requirements that so many of us have."*

Summary

In the section, *What Type of Citizenship?* faculty participants described skills and dispositions related to preparing students for engaged citizenship. I grouped various skills and dispositions together under three main types of citizenship: academic citizenship, emotionally knowledgeable citizenship, and active citizenship. According to some of the participants in this study, an engaged citizen is a critical thinker who is informed and aware of current issues, who uses her voice to enter into the conversation, but maintains intellectual distance while engaged in issues of the day—this is the academic citizen. Other participants sought to help students develop self-knowledge in order to be an effective member of a community, one who is an empathetic listener and examines her role in the community—

together these skills and dispositions contribute to the development of the emotionally knowledgeable citizen. Some participants sought to help students be active citizens by emphasizing the importance of informed action--making daily, thoughtful choices, and engaging in activities of a citizen such as volunteering and political engagement.

Teaching for Engaged Citizenship: The Role of Co-curricular Learning

The fourth overarching theme that emerged as part of the data analysis process was the role of co-curricular learning in teaching for engaged citizenship. In this section, I focus on sharing several findings related to this theme. First, I describe the challenges of discussing co-curricular learning with the participants, as I discovered misconceptions, lack of awareness, and a general state of invisibility regarding the nature and meaning of co-curricular opportunities. Next, I outline the findings related to obstacles for integrating co-curricular and curricular efforts to educate students for engaged citizenship. Finally, I describe several findings that illustrate possibilities for future partnerships between curricular and co-curricular learning.

What is Co-curricular?

The first common theme regarding the contributions of co-curricular learning to engaged citizen education efforts underscored a general lack of understanding among participants about co-curricular involvement and what it means. It was difficult to enter into a conversation about how co-curricular opportunities could contribute to professors' efforts to facilitate student learning about engaged citizenship when many participants struggled with even providing a short definition of co-curricular. Ella joked, "*That's a good question. Can you define co-curricular for me?*" Another participant said, "*Hum. Anything sponsored*

by student affairs.” Lana also seemed challenged when asked to define co-curricular and explained the source of her confusion: *“Co-curricular always throws me off. Because co to me means two things coming together, you know what I mean? Cooperation of some kind. So, I’m always suspicious as to whether I really understand what that word means.”*

Three participants described co-curricular learning opportunities as collaborations across departments or colleges. For example, Jason said, *“So when you say co-curricular the thing that immediately comes to mind is collaboration between departments. We want people talking across departments.”* Three other participants described co-curricular in terms of what it is not. Matthew said, *“Well, I would define sort of co-curricular is the learning stuff that is not actually going on in a classroom so not as part of the formal curriculum.”* Amelia stated, *“So to me it’s anything that the students are involved in that is not pure classroom academic stuff.”* Dorothy also ascribed co-curricular to not being in a classroom, but then added this thought: *“I’m trying to take the term literally; it means learning that takes place alongside classroom learning, and I guess I would define it as different then experiential learning. Like experiential learning is built into the class.”*

Two participants shared a similar perspective on what co-curricular learning is, and saw co-curricular as the social interactions in which students participate. Robin said, *“I think the most important learning that happens on this campus happens outside of the classroom. It happens in their social interactions with their peers, with their professors, with staff.”* Johanna echoed Robin’s understanding, but then really honed in on the interactions between students when she said:

All of students’ interactions with each other outside of the classroom are all co-curricular. A bulk of what they do is not in class and it’s not at an event. They’re sitting around with each other, talking, watching something, and it

may be related to something that's happening in a class, or it might be something totally different. But those are co-curricular experiences, and those are the ones that make up the biggest portion of students' daily lives.

The Invisibility of Co-curricular Opportunities

Possibly contributing to, and intertwined with, participants' varied levels of understanding about co-curricular involvement, was the idea that co-curricular involvement is invisible to the faculty participants. From both the faculty development workshop observation and the interviews, I heard faculty saying that co-curricular opportunities are not really a part of their teaching and daily work at Drake and, in effect, these opportunities are invisible to these professors at Drake. Robin talked about her perspective on faculty culture, which I think illustrates one possible source for the invisibility of co-curricular involvement evidenced by most of the participants in this study. Robin said:

Part of the negative aspects of faculty culture is that we are arrogant enough to believe that the learning that happens on our campus happens in the classroom, and that that's the most important, that 90 percent of the learning that students are doing in college is happening in our classroom. And they're getting graded for it, and we're leading them on this grand expedition towards education.

During the faculty development workshop, several participants discussed a program they sent their students to as part of the ECE co-curricular events that was planned by resident assistants. A comment from that discussion provides further illustration of the invisibility of co-curricular involvement for faculty members. One participant said, "*Their [Office of Residence Life] programs, and other student programs, involve students in ways that faculty don't see unless students write papers about it.*" He went on to comment, "*I often know when they have gone to programs because of assigned writing. Some, once they*

have met their quota, I think keep going but I don't know about it. It is below the surface" (field note, May 24, 2012).

During the interviews, given the limited information many of the participants possessed regarding co-curricular involvement, I would sometimes provide examples in order to prompt their thinking. One example I used in every interview was the ECE grant process. The grant process has been in place for all five years of the ECE and it provides funds to students and student organizations that propose to plan and implement an event that supports the engaged citizen learning outcomes and ties to the theme. For the 2012 ECE, eight different students and student groups were awarded funding. None of the 11 interview participants had heard about or knew of the ECE grant process.

Matthew acknowledged, *"But that side [outside of the classroom] of students' lives is not one that I know a great deal about."* In addition, Diana admitted, *"You know, what happens in the residence halls is largely a mystery to me."* Robin offered this suggestion for communicating with faculty regarding co-curricular opportunities: *"So I don't know how you foster that knowledge aside from kind of strapping faculty to a chair."* Sara may represent one of those faculty members Robin was describing when she said, *"I mean some of it is just my lack of paying attention and thinking about it and maybe seeking some advice."*

Obstacles to Integration

Despite the initial challenges in discussing co-curricular learning opportunities with the participants, I was able to discover some productive critiques among the participants of efforts to integrate co-curricular learning opportunities. The three main obstacles that emerged were: (a) participants' emphasis on the importance of connecting co-curricular

involvement to the content of the course; (b) the framing of ECE co-curricular opportunities as university-sanctioned events to attend; and (c) ineffective communication between faculty and individuals, both administrators and students, responsible for implementing co-curricular opportunities.

The need for connections

As we continued to discuss co-curricular involvement and how it might contribute to learning about engaged citizenship, participants expressed the idea of connections, and these connections included either finding connections between the students' co-curricular involvement and the course content or helping students make connections for themselves among the curricular and co-curricular environments.

Two participants described their impression that curricular and co-curricular learning are not connected, and cited either university practices or fellow faculty members as sources of that disconnection. Amelia described how she sees her fellow faculty members' perspective on co-curricular involvement: *"I think, somehow, a lot of faculty think 'oh that's what they do in their spare time. It's separate.'"* Matthew also referenced faculty, but spoke in broader terms about the university as a whole when he described the challenge of making connections between curricular and co-curricular learning, *"But I think that in a lot of ways the way the roles and the structures of the university are set upmake it difficult to make those connections."*

Matthew and Amelia talked about faculty roles and how the way they are structured and enacted may lead to the disconnection between curricular and co-curricular. Ella centered her comments on the students and the challenges they may face in making

connections between curricular and co-curricular opportunities that inform their learning about engaged citizenship, but also talked about the responsibility of faculty in helping make those connections: *“They’ve done a bunch of stuff and then they don’t know how to talk about it...maybe we’re not connecting them, helping them see how to connect the dots.”*

Johanna creates an opportunity for students to share their co-curricular involvement during class, but does so in a way where she tries to help students start to make connections:

I try to make a space for them to talk about their co-curricular experiences and sometimes that will lead to connections to what they are doing in class or to connections between what different student organizations are doing, or to connections to their classmates’ experiences. There have been times when the first 15 minutes is just open to people sharing their co-curricular experiences that they feel are pertinent to the class.

Two participants mentioned the same event, an event sponsored by a student organization, and their comments about that event and how it connected to the content of their course provide an illustration of faculty perceptions regarding the need for connections in co-curricular involvement. According to Dorothy, some of the students taking her class were involved in planning the event, and she said: *“The event that’s tonight would be a great example where again students play a leading role. It’s separate from, they’re not doing it because it’s an assignment, but it’s clearly connected and they can make connections.”*

Matthew’s students displayed some of their research at the event, and he said, *“Part of their work was related to the event that took place. They had done some research and they displayed their research at that event. And so there was a good example of co-curricular activities I would say.”*

University framing of the ECE co-curricular

The Engaged Citizen Experience (ECE) includes a component that is labeled co-curricular events, and that university initiative seems to frame the way the faculty participants view co-curricular involvement. First, the ECE co-curricular component is understood by participants as sanctioned, university-planned opportunities. For example, when I asked Johanna to provide her definition of co-curricular involvement, she said:

So I know that I tend to think of them [co-curricular opportunities] as university-sanctioned. These sanctioned experiences--the ones that are created by the institution in some way--are the ones I think of first, and its hard to move beyond that thinking, that these are the only engaged citizen programs or events that we're going to have.

Robin used a similar descriptor, “*it’s officially sanctioned in some way,*” when she shared her definition of co-curricular opportunities. I asked for clarification on what she meant by officially sanctioned and Robin responded: “*Meaning some administrative person puts up posters.*” The university representation of co-curricular, through the ECE co-curricular component, hides the other types of co-curricular involvement occurring on campus for these participants.

Second, participants understood the ECE co-curricular component, and then more broadly co-curricular involvement, as event attendance. Several participants mentioned that they share the announcements of events that are provided to them via email as faculty teaching an EC class. A copy of a sample ECE event announcement email is included in Appendix D. Jason said, “*So [the program administrator] sends out tons of emails giving the list of what’s going on. Sometimes we participate, sometimes we don’t.*” Lana described the co-curricular opportunities on campus as, “*Fabulous opportunities for students.*” She went on to share that, “*I do make my students go to the Bucksbaum.*” The Bucksbaum is a

lecture series on campus that features major public figures. For example, the 2011-12 Bucksbaum speakers were Garrison Keillor and Vicente Fox (www.drake.edu/bucksbaum/index). During the faculty development workshop, the group discussed options for co-curricular opportunities, and all of the suggestions were event related. One participant suggested a documentary film series; Several others provided names for potential speakers.

Ineffective communication

Participants commonly shared that they had a difficult time connecting their course with the ECE co-curricular events, and in addition to other obstacles I described previously, a sense of ineffective communication was also expressed. Johanna said:

Yeah. It's been hard, especially because I don't know in advance what a lot of the co-curricular events are going to be. And I don't know whether that's because of my negligence--because I haven't taken the time to find that information--or whether it's poor communication, or both.

Diana spoke about the ineffective communication she sees regarding the student-directed events on campus, and in her particular case she discussed programming that happens in the residence halls:

And so I'm aware that those things happen. I guess I think that those things, I don't have a good sense of what they are. I don't get invited to them very much and when I do, they start at 9 o'clock at night. I think this sounds a little whiney, but students don't recognize that when we come in at nighttime it's really, it's a difficult thing. It's like asking them to come in for an 8 o'clock meeting.

Two participants talked about a strategy they would like to see implemented to address the issue of ineffective communication. As Ella described it:

The one obstacle I would say though is a lack of that kind of central calendar. In emails we got that said a presentation's gonna be such and such day, and it

was like two days before that and then it makes it look like we didn't get them [the students] the correct information.

Opportunities for Partnerships

In spite of a general lack of understanding of co-curricular learning among participants, the relative invisibility of co-curricular opportunities to faculty participants, and the obstacles described above blocking efforts to integrate curricular and co-curricular efforts, several findings emerged that could provide the springboard for future partnerships. In particular, participants noted how highly dedicated students are to their co-curricular involvement and began to envision possibilities for future contributions by co-curricular learning to their efforts to educate students for engaged citizenship.

Student dedication to co-curricular involvement

Several participants described involvement outside of the classroom as playing an important role in students' lives. Amelia described several of her students as "crazy" about their student organization involvement. Robin shared her observation of students' feelings about co-curricular involvement:

Their priorities are the student organization.90 percent of their learning, I wouldn't say 90 percent, but half the amount of their learning is not happening in the classroom. One of the reasons we know this is 'cause all you have to do is ask a student what their priorities are. Their priorities are not necessarily their classes. You know we can argue about whether or not that is good or bad, but it's important.

Diana echoed Robin's perspective that many students prioritize their co-curricular involvement when she said, *"I guess you have to feel envy sometimes because the students feel so much excitement about those things in a way that they don't feel always about intellectual endeavors."*

Vision for possibilities in the future

Many of the participants, as they thought about their work educating students for engaged citizenship, expressed some thoughts about how co-curricular involvement holds possibilities for the future of their efforts. For example, Matthew said:

I can see, you know, as we've been talking about this, interesting possibilities and opportunities for a class that involves reflecting on work that students do in other organizations, or reflecting on other aspects of their lives here at Drake.

During the faculty development workshop, the facilitator talked about the signature events that are part of the ECE co-curricular component, the poster session and the ECE conference, that are administratively planned, and he added that student groups will plan other events. He described those events as adding “richness” to the ECE: “*They plan some things I never would have thought of—but students found interesting, so that’s enough for me*” (field notes, May 24, 2012).

Several participants spoke positively about the student-initiated aspect of co-curricular involvement. Amelia said, “*One of the things I like most about the student groups is that it seems really, really student centered, student directed, student oriented. It’s not us following them around and telling them what to do.*” Diana described a time when she learned more about one of the organizations her student assistant was involved in and acknowledged it “*can be very powerful because it’s peer to peer.*”

Two participants shared stories of specific instances where they had heard about or witnessed a powerful learning opportunity for students as a result of co-curricular involvement. Diana described a conversation she had with a student who she characterized as a “*real student leader on campus*” about an issue he was visibly advocating for on campus.

And I just thought, you know, that's not an issue that I had really thought about very much, ...he had sort of thought about power hierarchies to some extent in creating his service, and that wasn't something that came from a teacher telling him he had to do it.

Johanna described a time when some of her students went to a movie together, and then talked about the experience in class and how it related to the topic of the course:

It was not anything of my doing. It was not a school-sponsored activity. It was not affiliated with a student organization. But it was something that they did that informed how they were thinking about the kind of work we were doing in class.

A small number of participants described co-curricular involvement as a potential site for learning the skills of a citizen. Matthew described student organizations as “*an important part of thinking about engaged citizenship, and it is a way that students are involved in the community in some form.*” Robin talked about one of the contributions of co-curricular learning to teaching about engaged citizenship when she compared the ECE planned co-curricular events to other involvement she sees on campus: “*I think in many ways, for example, a fraternity service project is probably more directly engaging students in learning about and understanding the practicalities of their world.*”

In the literature review I prepared prior to conducting this study, co-curricular learning was described as a learning laboratory, a safe place for students to try things and practice the skills of engaged citizenship. Amelia described the laboratory in this way:

I think that [student organization involvement] is a huge opportunity for them to fail, to make mistakes, to succeed, to do things that extend beyond the university, you know, when they raise money for organizations. To embarrass themselves, to do good things, to do bad things, all that crap.

Summary

The findings in the section, *Teaching for Engaged Citizenship: The Role of Co-Curricular Learning*, revealed a shaky relationship between co-curricular learning and the classroom efforts of the faculty participants in this study. When used to describe out-of-the-classroom opportunities, the term co-curricular seemed unfamiliar to many of the participants, and then once the vocabulary was established, involvement in these types of opportunities was not noticed or recognized by the faculty members. In terms of combining curricular and co-curricular efforts to educate students for engaged citizenship, three main obstacles emerged, but several areas for possible future partnerships also emerged.

Summary

My presentation of the findings started with a series of profiles, designed to provide information that serves as the backdrop for the professors' participation in a university-wide effort to educate students for engaged citizenship. Such information included length of employment and employment status at the institution, institutional commitments related to teaching, service, and research; and level of participation in elements of the Engaged Citizen Experience, such as faculty development opportunities or inclusion of the ECE theme or events into courses.

In the first section, *Pathways of Teaching for Engaged Citizenship*, I identified multiple points of entry for faculty participants teaching engaged citizen courses and described three main reasons why they chose to participate in teaching for engaged citizenship. Then I outlined the obstacles encountered by the faculty participants. Finally, I shared the mixed feelings expressed by faculty participants of the lonely experience of

participating in the university's engaged citizenship effort combined with the desire to remain autonomous in their efforts.

The second section, *Navigating Tensions in the Pursuit of Educating for Engaged Citizenship*, revealed a series of tensions faculty participants described while participating in the university's effort to educate students for engaged citizenship. These tensions existed at the personal level, as they grappled with the roles of teachers and learners, and then as teachers how to balance supporting student idealism with a pragmatic perspective. They also existed within the classroom setting, where participants described an invisible tug of war between the course content and engaged citizen outcomes. In addition, tensions were present at the insitutional level, with many participants describing a sense that the university was promoting one, "right" way to teach for engaged citizenship.

The third section, *What Type of Citizenship?*, outlined three types of citizenship described by the participants: (a) academic citizenship, (b) emotionally knowledgeable citizenship, and (c) active citizenship. An academic citizen has critical thinking skills, is informed and aware of current issues, and maintains a level of distance when examining social issues. An emotionally knowledgeable citizen has developed knowledge of self and then thinks about the role of self in community. Finally, an active citizen makes thoughtful choices in daily life and may engage in activities of a citizen such as volunteering and political engagement.

The final section, *Teaching for Engaged Citizenship: The Role of Co-Curricular Learning*, revealed a tenuous relationship between co-curricular learning and the classroom efforts of the faculty participants in this study. The term co-curricular activity itself was problematic, and then, upon further discussion and clarification, involvement in these types

of opportunities was relatively invisible to faculty members. As participants discussed integration of curricular and co-curricular efforts to educate students for engaged citizenship, three main obstacles emerged, but several areas for possible future partnerships were also identified.

In Chapter 5, I will revisit my positionality as a researcher and reflect on the process of conducting this research study. I will discuss the findings in light of the guiding research questions and link the findings back to the conceptual framework as well as the existing literature. I will also explore implications for future research as well as practice in student affairs and higher education administration regarding the continued pursuit of holistic approaches to educating students for engaged citizenship.

CHAPTER 5. SUMMARY, FINDINGS, IMPLICATIONS AND REFLECTIONS

The purposes of chapter 5 are to: (a) provide a brief summary of the study, including problem statement, initial research questions, and methods for the study; (b) share some discoveries during the research process that led me to further clarify my approach to the methodology; (c) discuss the results of my study and consider how they help to answer the initial research questions; (d) consider how the results of the study contribute to the existing literature related to faculty participation in civic education and the inclusion of co-curricular learning in those efforts; (e) offer my thoughts on the implications the findings from this study have for student affairs practitioners and other higher education administrators who are trying to develop partnerships in support of university initiatives to educate students for civic engagement; and (f) my personal reflections on the research process and what it meant for me.

Summary

The purpose of this qualitative case study was to explore the experiences of professors participating in an institution-wide effort to educate students for engaged citizenship at Drake University, a Midwestern private institution that explicitly claims civic engagement as part of the university mission statement. Qualitative inquiry was the best fit for my study since I was interested in the perceptions of faculty and how they make meaning of the experience of participating in an institution-wide effort to educate students for engaged citizenship, both inside and outside the classroom.

The study was significant for several reasons. First, implementing civic education across the curriculum is a widely advocated strategy in higher education (Colby et al., 2003;

Hollander, 2011; Hoy & Meisel, 2008; Spiezio et al., 2006; Terkla, et al., 2007). The National Call to Action, compiled in 2011 at the request of the U.S. Department of Education, urged that “the knowledge, skills, and experiences students need for responsible citizenship should be part of each student’s general education program” (p. 29).

Nevertheless, the current literature in higher education about efforts to integrate civic learning into the general education program does not explore faculty perspectives on participating in such an effort. The current study sought to begin to address that gap by looking explicitly at the experiences and perceptions of faculty who currently teach a course with engaged citizen outcomes that is part of the general education curriculum at their institution. Second, the study was significant because the recent literature on civic education in higher education calls for intentional and connected learning to take place both inside and outside the classroom (Fiarriolo, 2004; Keeling, 2004; Knefelkamp, 2008; Wildman, 2005). The site for the study, in addition to implementing an approach to civic education that is enacted across the general education curriculum, also offers a connected set of co-curricular opportunities united by a common theme. Once again, the perspectives of faculty were relatively absent in the research literature, in this case regarding the integration of co-curricular experiences in teaching for engaged citizenship.

I used several methods to collect data for the case study. First, I conducted interviews with 11 faculty members who have taught an engaged citizen flagged course at least twice, during the spring semester, over the last five years. This time period was selected because the ECE was founded five years ago. I contacted each participant to request an interview, and then engaged in semi-structured interviews that lasted approximately 90 minutes. The interviews were audio-recorded and then sent to a professional transcriptionist. I asked

interview participants to share course documents, such as syllabi or assignment prompts, and these documents served as a second source of data. I also attended a four-hour engaged citizen faculty development workshop, which was attended by 18 faculty and staff members, including three interview participants, and took detailed field notes. I analyzed the interview transcripts, course documents, and workshop fieldnotes, along with my analytic memos, in order to produce the four broad themes reported in Chapter 4: (a) *Pathways of Teaching for Engaged Citizenship*, (b) *Navigating Tensions in the Pursuit of Educating for Engaged Citizenship*, (c) *What Type of Citizenship?*, and (d) *The Role of Co-Curricular Learning in Educating for Engaged Citizenship*, which helped inform my understanding of how faculty understand, support, and promote civic engagement both inside and outside the classroom.

Methodological Discoveries

My first discovery emerged as a consideration during my field work, and developed as I engaged in open coding. I originally proposed my research as a single case study about the faculty experience teaching an engaged citizen AOI class within the larger engaged citizen experience. Framing the case in this way initially made sense to me, and met one of the major criteria of a case study—that the case occur within a bounded system (Jones, et al., 2006; Merriam, 1988; Stake, 1995). The bounded system included the fact that all the participants taught a class that had been approved by the UCC for EC designation, were teaching during the spring semester when the ECE events were also occurring, and had the opportunity to attend the same faculty development workshops.

As I spoke with the study participants and analyzed the data, what I found was that I might be dealing with 11 case studies of individual faculty members and their experiences of

teaching students to be engaged citizens. All the participants work at the same institution, and are part of the same campus-wide initiative. However, as described in the results presented in Chapter 4, participants entered into teaching for engaged citizenship along different pathways, and then had varied experiences as “participants” in the ECE. For example, very few of the participants followed the pathway I thought would be standard for everyone—getting their course approved for the engaged citizen AOI designation—based on the information available on the university website as well as my personal experience proposing an engaged citizen flagged course. Rather than a linear path from course design to presentation to a university curriculum committee to awarding designation, the routes were almost as numerous as participants. Through my analysis of the data and reporting the results, I did make the decision to stay with my original understanding of the case, with faculty participants serving as the case, but the case is very complex and there was not a lot of broad agreement across participants.

My second discovery served to confirm one of my methodological decisions. I used purposeful sampling in order to identify participants, and set my sampling criteria to identify professors who had taught their engaged citizen designated course at least twice during the spring semester, to coincide with the all-university ECE. Purposeful sampling is designed to allow for the greatest opportunity to select “information rich cases that hold the greatest potential for generating insight about the phenomenon of interest” (Jones, et al., 2006, p. 66). As I considered my selection criteria, I knew the baseline criteria would be individuals who teach an engaged citizen course. I narrowed the criteria to include only faculty who teach the EC course during the spring semester, in order to connect the course and professor with the larger ECE initiative and its co-curricular component. The final narrowing criteria I added

was to select faculty who had taught the course at least twice, because I thought those individuals were demonstrating a level of commitment and therefore embodied the “early adopters” with whom I sought to speak. Identifying faculty who had taught the course at least twice proved important, but not for the reason I originally imagined. Rather, many of the faculty reflected that they had learned from teaching the EC course the first time, or that things became clearer after teaching it at least once. For example, Ella said, “*So it didn’t really make sense to me until this semester....how what we’re teaching them in the course [omitted specific reference] ties into how we’re teaching them to be engaged citizens.*” The process of reflection, just as participants described its importance for their students, was important for the faculty to be able to serve as “information-rich cases” for my study.

Findings and Discussion

For the findings and discussion section, I return to the original set of four research questions. I discuss the results of the study and address how they help to answer the research questions, as well as consider how the results of my study are in dialogue with the current literature and the theoretical framework. The overall question guiding my research study was: How and why do faculty members participate as teachers in an institutional effort to teach students to be engaged citizens? This question was then divided into a subset of four guiding questions.

I will examine the results from my study and compare them to the existing literature that informs the current understanding of faculty participation in institutional civic engagement efforts. My interest in this area is twofold: first, it is not necessarily a

requirement to teach an engaged citizen course at Drake University and, second, there is a deficit in the literature regarding faculty motivation to participate in civic education efforts.

Research question 1: How did professors come to include educating for engaged citizenship as a part of their teaching?

The first research question was designed to examine the stories of faculty participants about their entry into the university civic engagement effort to better understand why they participate. The civic voluntarism model helped frame the findings regarding how faculty came to their participation.

Developed by Verba, Schlozman, and Brady (1995), the civic voluntarism model was initially designed to describe the process by which citizens come to be active in politics. For the current study, it was applied in a new way to provide a tool for examining how faculty came to include educating for engaged citizenship as part of their teaching, as a corollary to participation in politics. Verba et al. (1995) presented three participatory factors that were shown to lead to civic engagement: (a) resources, (b) engagement, and (c) recruitment networks. This framework has not been applied in previous studies to examine how faculty become active in efforts to educate students for civic engagement.

Resources

Verba et al. (1995) identified resources as the most critical component of the civic voluntarism model because resources make individuals “more likely to participate and more effective” (p. 271). The issue of time emerged as an obstacle for some of the participants as they described feeling that their interest in participating in the engaged citizen education initiative competed with teaching, research, and service responsibilities. As Robin revealed,

she is *“just overloaded with the day to day.”* Creating time for faculty may be a currently overlooked resource as institutions seek to expand participation in civic education efforts.

The resources component of the civic voluntarism model also provided some additional insight to the finding that participants believed their course content and civic outcomes were a natural fit. Rather than being motivated to participate in a civic education effort for its own sake, participants expressed that their course accomplished the objective of preparing students for citizenship simply by the nature of the course content. As Lana described her engaged citizen class, *“the topic fits so seamlessly.”* Amelia found it very artificial to talk about her course and engaged citizen outcomes separately because *“everything I do has some component of that [engaged citizen].”* Therefore, the model helps frame those results as faculty feeling they have the capacity and skills to participate in the civic education effort because of their comfort level with the course content. This understanding of how faculty members came to participate in civic education presents possibilities for a way to help other faculty see a natural fit between their courses and civic education outcomes and, therefore, feel comfortable and more likely to participate.

Appealing to faculty members' sense of skill by drawing connections between their course content and preparing students for engaged citizenship in order to recruit professors' participation in civic education efforts may be a useful strategy identified by the results of the current study. Nevertheless, it could also present a challenge if an institution is trying to work towards common outcomes for engaged citizenship, like Drake University with its four engaged citizen learning outcomes. Many of the participants in the study felt a tension between their discipline-specific content and engaged citizen objectives, and most of those

who reported such tension also shared that often the course content won out over engaged citizen objectives.

Engagement

During the interview, I asked participants to describe why they started teaching an engaged citizen class, in order to discover the various sources of interest or engagement—the second of three participatory factors. As I searched for studies to inform my understanding of the faculty experience in civic education as part of the literature review, I discovered that the research on faculty motivation to participate in civic education was limited. Five themes of faculty motivation for participating in civic education efforts were identified, most from the literature related to service-learning: (a) conviction that undergraduate education should address the “whole person” and include the broader goals of a liberal education, (b) civic education was a way to bring work and personal values together, (c) teaching civic education led to the development of a network of fellow scholars with whom to talk about teaching, (d) a desire to develop satisfying relationships with students that could be satisfied through teaching civic education; (e) civic education was a method to further enhance student learning (Abes & Jackson, 2002; Banerjee, 2007; Colby, et al., 2003).

I found several areas of agreement between the findings in my study and the current understanding of faculty motivation to participate in civic education efforts. First, several participants talked about how the engaged citizen experience enhanced the course: for instance, Diana said, “*I thought that it would be more stimulating to the students and a richer learning experience if it were connected with engaged citizen.*” Second, my findings may seem contrary to the notion of networking with fellow scholars as a motivating factor to

participate, since many participants found the experience to be isolating. However, the fact that several participants also expressed interest in connecting with other faculty participating in the engaged citizenship effort supports networking as a potential motivator for faculty that may be a missed opportunity in the current case. Third, a small number of my participants expressed that teaching an engaged citizen course brought together their work and personal values. As Amelia described, “*The way I’m an engaged citizen is that I really try to live my life every single day in a way that it’s conscious*” and she tries to impart similar habits of daily life in teaching the engaged citizen course. The other two motivational factors identified in previous research, the opportunity to develop satisfying relationships with students and a belief in the importance of undergraduate education addressing the “whole person,” were not evident in the results of the current study.

Recruitment networks

The third component of the civic voluntarism model, recruitment networks, informs the interpretation of several aspects of the results of the study. First, it seemed tied most strongly to the reason many participants gave for teaching an engaged citizen course for the first time--the need for engaged citizen courses as part of the general education curriculum. Since Drake University is attempting to build the ECE program within the general education curriculum, every student needs an engaged citizen flagged course and that creates demand for seats. As I previously described in the literature review, there are many reasons cited for the importance of including civic learning in the general education curriculum (Colby et al., 2003; Hollander, 2011; Hoy & Meisel, 2008, Spiezio et al., 2006). Such a curriculum provides an opportunity to reach out to all students, rather than just those who would self-select into such courses; it creates a space for bringing multiple disciplines together to

consider civic engagement; and it involves the greatest number of faculty and staff supporting an institutionally based, mission driven commitment to civic learning. Drake University, the site of the case study, by including its engaged citizen courses into the general education curriculum, seems to be leveraging all the advantages cited in the literature. However, the results of this study contain some caution with regard to that strategy, in that faculty then are recruited to the effort simply due to the need for seats in courses, or as part of their department's commitment to the general education curriculum, rather than because they feel they have the skills and capacity or an interest in educating students for engaged citizenship.

The recruitment component of the civic voluntarism model also helped inform my interpretation of the finding that faculty described the experience of participating in the engaged citizen effort as a lonely one: they enjoyed the autonomy and freedom provided by the university, while at the same time pushing back against the isolated nature of their work. It seems that rather than the experience of a network of fellow teachers and being recruited by like-minded colleagues that was suggested in the literature, the practice of participating in a university effort for these participants was lonely—and some of the professors actually like it that way.

Summary

Across all 11 participants, three main reasons for participating in the engaged citizenship effort were described: it either fit naturally with their course, the engaged citizen component enhanced their course, or they were fulfilling an obligation to the university to provide a general education curriculum course that met engaged citizen designation. The

concept of a course's content fitting naturally with engaged citizenship outcomes is a new contribution to the current literature about faculty motivation to participate in civic learning efforts and could be helpful when considering recruitment strategies, but it may create challenges when trying to implement civic learning across the curriculum as some disciplines will easily find affinity while others may not.

Research question 2: How do professors describe their efforts to teach students to be engaged citizens as part of the larger university initiative?

The second research question was designed to better understand, from the faculty perspective, how professors try to teach students to be engaged citizens. The current literature has already established the importance of dedicated, committed faculty in any civic learning effort (Hoy & Meisel, 2008; Hollander, 2011; Spezio, et al., 2006). In addition, a series of best practices for facilitating civic learning has been put forward in the literature (AAC&U, 2007; O'Neill, 2012). However, much of what is known about civic engagement education comes from the service-learning literature, as identified by Finley (2011), and the perspective of faculty as practitioners of civic education is not well understood, yet it is vital to the future growth and development of civic education efforts (Colby, et al., 2003; Dey, et al., 2009; Hollander & Burack, 2009). The findings from the current study shed some light on faculty perspectives about teaching for engaged citizenship outside the lens of service-learning.

A set of educational practices has been found to be related to positive student growth in relation to a set of learning outcomes supporting preparation for civic engagement. For example, O'Neill (2012) identified a set of five practices, which she described as engaged learning practices: (a) talking about course content with students outside of class and

communicating with professors outside of class, (b) active and collaborative learning, (c) challenging academic classes and high expectations, (d) integrative learning, and (e) participation in interdisciplinary courses. Evidence, at varying levels of intensity, of all five engaged learning practices was found among the faculty participants in this study. In addition, AAC&U (2007) found that civic-minded faculty generally incorporate a set of approaches, described as the Principles of Excellence, which include: (a) teaching the arts of inquiry and innovation, (b) engaging the “Big Questions,” (c) connecting knowledge with choices and action, and (d) assessing students’ ability to learn and apply complex problems. Two of the four Principles of Excellence, engaging the “Big Questions” and connecting knowledge with action, were found to be present in the civic education efforts described by the participants.

Active and collaborative learning was the engaged learning practice most often identified among the participants. The most frequently mentioned methods included discussion, role-playing, simulations, and small group projects. Matthew, for example, assigns small groups of students to lead a session of class discussion and found *“that’s been a really useful way to bring students into the process of teaching.”* However, Matthew is also an example of an important finding from this study: the struggle with the role of active learning in the classroom, and within the university’s approach to civic education overall. Matthew described Drake as having a *“not entirely healthy sense of content as being not really good teaching”* and has spent much of his teaching career at the institution *“trying to work out a balance between... student-driven learning”* and learning that he thinks is important *“as a teacher of [this discipline].”* This finding—the tension between active learning and the faculty role as expert—is important as higher education institutions think

about working with faculty to expand the integration of engaged learning practices, such as active learning in service of engaged citizenship outcomes.

A second engaged learning practice that was evident among the participants in this study was a commitment to providing a challenging academic class with high expectations. Sara described her course as *“a very busy course for students.”* Sara’s commitment, echoed by many of her fellow participants, to academic rigor exposed another area of tension that institutions many need to address as they partner with faculty in expanding civic education efforts. Sara stated that while she applauded the integration of practices like service-learning and co-curricular involvement, she would *“just hate to see the academics erode and become only experiential learning.”* Dorothy built an experiential learning component into her course but was careful to describe the project as *“still just as academic and rigorous.”* One of the ways that faculty members described their effort to provide a challenging academic class was the introduction of difficult issues, or “Big Questions,” as identified in the Principles of Excellence. This approach led to faculty members grappling with a tension between teaching students to be pragmatic as they consider big issues and questions while also supporting students’ idealism and hope. Dorothy hopes her students can think about the fact that if big issues cannot be prevented, then *“we can try to at least minimize the harm that we do. And maybe make things better at the margins.”* For example, every year the ECE picks a theme, and it is always based on a big issue like global warming or sustainable development. Dorothy recognized that *“maybe that doesn’t sound idealistic enough for some people, ... but that’s the reality.”* The finding that faculty grappled with balancing pragmatism with idealism provides some additional insight to the challenges of asking

faculty to engage students in the “Big Questions” as called for in the Principles of Excellence.

Approximately half of the participants explicitly described their engaged citizen course as interdisciplinary or multi-disciplinary. Among the participants, the interdisciplinary aspect of their course was often cited as a source of increased workload. Faculty described the necessity of reading the text along with the students, balancing multiple majors in the class, and even re-inventing the class each time it is taught as side effects of creating an interdisciplinary course. Nevertheless, bringing multiple disciplines into consideration was also described as a benefit to students and to professors. As Lana said, “*I like it because you get different viewpoints.*” Her perspective directly echoes Astin, Astin, and Lindholm’s (as cited in O’Neill, 2012) emphasis on the importance of teaching students about appreciating multiple perspectives.

Only two participants described speaking with their students about the course content outside of class. Johanna and Amelia both described meeting with many students one-on-one throughout the semester. Johanna attributed the large number of individual student interactions to the way she structured the class, asking students to “*share their experiences more and to talk about those experiences more openly.*” She structured the class in this way in order to help students examine their own positionality as well as learn to work with others who seem very different. Amelia also met with a large number of students outside of class and found the experience to be “*draining,*” but she also described her engaged citizen class as her favorite class. Thus, to Amelia, the larger number of one-on-one interactions was not necessarily more work but, rather, “different” work. Amelia shared a similar goal with Johanna, to help students think critically about their own identity in the world and their

engagement with others. The minimal evidence of this type of engagement with students among the participants in this study--individual meetings in which students are struggling with the personal application of course material as they think about how to be an engaged citizen--echoes Kezar and Rhoads (2001) assertion that civic-mindedness has been placed in the category of affective learning, a dimension of learning that many faculty are not prepared to support (Fish, 2003; Wong(Lau), et al., 2011). Most of the participants in the current study much preferred to help students develop as engaged citizens by maintaining academic distance from issues and social problems; for instance: having students read a book about difference instead of working across difference or examine dialogue rather than engage in dialogue.

The educational practice of integrative learning was found to a much lesser degree among the faculty participants than the other Principles of Excellence as they described their efforts to educate students for engaged citizenship. Integrative learning was defined by AAC&U as “an understanding and a disposition that a student builds across the curriculum and co-curriculum, from making simple connections among ideas and experiences to synthesizing and transferring learning to new, complex situations within and beyond the campus” (<http://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/pdf/integrativelearning.pdf>). This finding echoes the assertion from The Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement (CIRCLE) and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (2006) that “few colleges and universities today have thought through an overall framework for civic and political education that is comprehensive, coherent, conceptually clear, and developmentally appropriate” (p. 3). Some evidence of integrative learning can be observed in faculty members’ efforts to help students

make thoughtful choices and engage in informed action as a citizen. These goals are echoed in the Principles of Excellence approach to having students connect knowledge with choices and action. Dorothy described her desire to help students “*connect the intellectual stuff ... with reflections on how they live, how they behave as citizens.*” Several participants acknowledged how difficult the task of helping students connect their learning with their actions can be. As Matthew stated, “*It is a lot to ask for students to think critically and reflectively about choices that they make every day.*” As will be further discussed in the findings related to the fourth research question regarding the integration of curricular and co-curricular learning for civic learning, efforts to connect civic education across the curriculum and co-curriculum are structurally in place because of the Engaged Citizen Experience program, but are not always put in practice by individual faculty members, which hinders efforts to engage in integrative learning.

Summary

All of the best practices currently identified in the research on teaching for engaged citizenship (AAC&U, 2007; O’Neill, 2012) were found among the participants in the current study. However, the findings also illuminated some challenges, from the faculty perspective, as they tried to use those best practices. First, nearly all of the participants described some form of active learning taking place in their engaged citizen classrooms but, despite great participation, many of the participants were also struggling with their role as expert as they thought about the use of active learning strategies. Second, when engaging students in big social issues of the day, or “Big Questions,” as identified by AA&U (2007), faculty participants navigated a tension between helping students develop a pragmatic approach

while also supporting their sense of youthful idealism and hope. Third, while participants identified multi-disciplinarity in the engaged citizen courses as an enhancement, it also proved to be a source of greater workload. Finally, integrative learning was most obvious in professors' efforts to help their students learn how to critically think about their daily actions, but a more general integration across the curriculum and co-curriculum was relatively absent, as will also be further discussed in the findings related to the role of co-curricular learning in educating for engaged citizenship.

Research question 3: What type of citizenship are faculty preparing students to practice?

As I consider the findings, in context with the current research literature, that help address the third research question, it is important to recognize that the work of Westheimer and Kahne (2003, 2004) prompted the initial framing of this research question. Westheimer and Kahne (2004a; 2004b) first posited that institutions are preparing students to be different types of citizens, which they named the personally responsible citizen, the participatory citizen, and the justice-oriented citizen. Their work is important because, as they described, “decisions educators make when designing these programs often influence politically important outcomes regarding the ways that students understand...that they should act as citizens” (p. 238). In order to further discuss the findings from my study in response to this research question, I will use the good citizen model as a lens for examining the type of citizenship that participants in the current study are preparing their students to practice. During the interview, I asked participants what knowledge, skills, and dispositions they hoped to help students develop so students would be prepared to practice engaged citizenship. In the results section in Chapter 4, I grouped the most commonly named

knowledge, skills, and dispositions into three main categories: academic citizen, emotionally knowledgeable citizen, and active citizen. I re-examined the emergent themes related to knowledge, skills, and dispositions for engaged citizenship within the good citizen model (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004a; 2004b) to further explore what type of citizenship the participants in the current study are preparing their students to practice within the context of the Westheimer and Kahne (2004a; 2004b) model.

Personally responsible citizen

Westheimer and Kahne (2004b) found in their research that the most prevalent focus among the citizenship education programs they studied centered on personally responsible citizenship. The core assumptions of personally responsible citizenship are that in order to solve social problems and improve society, “citizens must have good character; they must be honest, responsible, and law-abiding members of the community” (p. 240). The themes that emerged in the current study that link to the personally responsible citizen included: an emphasis on students learning to be informed and aware; seeking to help students become a citizen of their profession and guiding students to consider making thoughtful choices in their daily lives.

Like Westheimer and Kahne’s (2004b) findings, the participants in the current study seemed to place the most emphasis on facilitating opportunities for students to develop as personally responsible citizens. The theme of helping students learn to be informed and aware was one of the most strongly agreed upon themes in the study, with every participant voicing it as a priority.

Participatory citizen

According to the good citizen model, a participatory citizen “actively participates and takes leadership positions within established systems and community structures” (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004b, p. 240). Westheimer and Kahne (2004b) also found that educators who support this vision of citizenship emphasize the importance of teaching students to form relationships and common understandings. Several emergent themes demonstrate a segment of the participants in the current study were focused on helping students prepare to be participatory citizens. A small number of participants talked about the activities of a citizen, particularly related to volunteering, which is directly related to the participatory citizen. Another way that participants in the current study encouraged students to be active was to learn to use their voice and, as Robin described, “*seeing that your voice can make a difference. That your voice has a role to play.*” In terms of a commitment to building relationships and collective understanding, some participants in the study described a desire to help students develop knowledge of themselves as a member of a community, or in Johanna’s words, “*helping students to locate themselves within a broader context and then to find meaningful ways to create relationships.*” One of the skills that participants described as important for engaged citizens, which also contributes to an ability to build relationships and form collective understanding, is the ability to listen with empathy. In Dorothy’s classroom, she emphasizes that “*everybody has something to contribute, and we don’t rush to judgment. We take our time. We all listen.*”

Justice-oriented citizen

Westheimer and Kahne (2004b) found that educators in their study were least likely to engage in civic education aimed at producing justice-oriented citizens. Westheimer and Kahne (2004b) described the justice-oriented citizen as one who “*must question, debate, and change established systems and structures that reproduce patterns of injustice over time*” (p. 240). An emphasis on developing knowledge, skills, and dispositions that would serve a student as a justice-oriented citizen were, as in the Westheimer and Kahne (2004b) study, the least in evidence among the participants in the current study. Only two themes related to the justice-oriented citizen, but notably one of the themes was broadly supported across participants, and that was an emphasis on critical thinking skills. Robin wants her students to “*think critically about [their] community.*” A small segment of participants also talked about helping students examine their role as a member of a community, and particularly about how challenging this was within the homogenous, or “*pretty privileged*” environment, as described by one of the participants. Johanna stated that one of the most important dispositions for a student to develop in order to be an engaged citizen is to work with people who they might be “*afraid of,*” and find common ground for working together despite differences.

Two of the skills and dispositions identified by participants in the current study-- academic distance and knowledge of self--did not fit well into any of the three types of citizenship described by the good citizen model. Both represent the intrapersonal dimension, but in very different ways. Participants’ description of helping students engage with social issues by teaching them to maintain a sense of intellectual distance, supports claims that civic education has been placed in the realm of affective learning, an area that faculty are uncomfortable engaging (Fish, 2003; Wong(Lau), et al., 2011). Those participants who

sought to help students gain a better understanding of self in order to prepare them to engage as citizens demonstrated a very deep and sincere willingness to assist students in their emotional and personal development, quite unlike the intellectually distant. The good citizen model seems to be missing an element of intrapersonal development that might be important for students to act as a “good citizen.”

Research Question 4: What are professors’ perceptions of co-curricular learning opportunities and their contributions to educating for engaged citizenship?

The literature suggests co-curricular learning plays an important role in providing a comprehensive, holistic approach to civic education (Colby, et al., 2003; Fiarriolo, 2004; Haste, 2004; Hoy & Meisel, 2008; Keeling, 2004; Knepfkamp, 2008; Thomas & Hartley, 2011; Vogelesang, 2008), but part of the challenge in creating comprehensive civic education efforts in higher education may be due to the lack of research dedicated to understanding the connections between curricular and co-curricular civic education efforts. The results from this case study confirmed that, among faculty participants, curricular and co-curricular civic education efforts remain separate and unconnected.

Obstacles that block or hinder faculty-student affairs collaborations have been well-documented in the literature (Bourassa & Krueger, 2001, Schroeder, 1999) and can provide a helpful context for interpreting the results of the current study, even though the ECE co-curricular component may not be the typical collaboration depicted between faculty and student affairs professionals. This research was unique in that the collaboration under study originates in a traditional “academic” area rather than in student affairs, and then encompasses student affairs professionals as well as students.

Several previously documented obstacles were confirmed by the results of the current study. First, the historical separation between the formal curriculum and the informal curriculum has been a long-standing obstacle to academic and student affairs collaboration (Schroeder, 1999). The findings that co-curricular opportunities were not well understood or recognized by faculty members who participated in the current study is a demonstration of how this obstacle can be observed in daily practice at the site for the case study. As I described in the overview of the case study site, co-curricular events are built into the overall Engaged Citizen Experience, and each of the study participants was situated as a teacher of an engaged citizen course that took place during that timeframe. Despite being surrounded by co-curricular opportunities that correlated with their courses because all the co-curricular offerings are tied to the engaged citizenship learning outcomes, these “university sanctioned” (in the words of several participants) ECE events were viewed as separate, not connected, and not useful to participants. Matthew described his experience with the co-curricular events as, *“Well, they’re there, but...do they really fit with what I’m doing in the class?”*

A further consequence of the historical separation between the formal and informal curriculum, as demonstrated in the results of the study, is that other types of co-curricular involvement on campus, particularly opportunities designed and implemented by students, were invisible to the faculty participants. As Matthew described his perspective, *“That side [outside of the classroom] of students’ lives is not one that I know a great deal about.”* Of the four categories of co-curricular initiatives identified by The Diverse Democracy Project (2005), participants in the current study named variations of only one consistently-- workshops and retreats. Student organizations, rituals and celebrations, and diversity initiatives went unrecognized by almost all of the participants. This finding is particularly

concerning in the context of the site for the case study because, based on unpublished assessment data collected by the University, approximately 90% of the respondents in a recent survey indicated they were involved in at least one student organization (Wise, 2008, unpublished raw data).

The second documented obstacle in academic and student affairs partnerships that was partially affirmed by the results of this study was different and competing understandings about learning among faculty and student affairs professionals (Schroeder 1999). The Engaged Citizen Experience grant process provides one example of how student learning might be facilitated in a co-curricular environment. This grant process was unfamiliar to all 11 participants, but it is based on the concept that students can design and implement a co-curricular learning opportunity for their fellow students. Part of the grant application asks students to describe how their program will meet one or more of the engaged citizen learning outcomes. The finding that faculty participants were grappling with their role as teachers, and the possible role of students as teacher, is an illustrative example of these competing understandings and how they may be evolving in the context of the current case study. Many of the participants described situations where students brought a set of experiences to the classroom that contributed to the learning experience. Johanna acknowledged, *“Students know so many things that I don’t, and they have so many kinds of experiences that I don’t.”* A small number of participants in the study also described their desire to, as Johanna described, *“facilitate classrooms where there is a lot of student ownership.”* Participants who recognized students as co-teachers and sought to develop student ownership display very similar understandings about learning as demonstrated by co-curricular opportunities such as the ECE grant process. However, the finding regarding

faculty issues of control shows that there are still issues around understandings of learning that may stand in the way of collaboration between academic and student affairs.

Strengths and Limitations

I made significant efforts to ensure the goodness and trustworthiness of the data through triangulation by employing multiple methods of data collection, providing participants the opportunity to complete a member checking process, and engaging in peer debriefing (Cresswell, 2009). However, despite these efforts, it is still important to recognize limitations in the study. As I indicated in Chapter 3, one limitation of the study was related to the size and scope of the study. The case study was limited to one institution with a specific set of characteristics, and is home to a unique program, the Engaged Citizen Experience, which may present idiosyncrasies that may not be present within any other institutions' efforts to create a university-wide initiative focused on engaged citizenship. I hope that the rich description I was able to produce in this case study, augmented by Drake University's willingness to be named as the site of the study, will assist the reader in finding application and meaning from the study (Merriam, 1998). A second limitation of the study did not emerge until after data collection was completed. One area of interest in this study was the implementation of a civic engagement effort within the general education curriculum. Although I was able to include participants from every general academic discipline of the institution (humanities, social science, science, professional studies), due to non-responses from some potential participants I was only able to represent one segment of professional studies at Drake University, which meant that two of the colleges were not represented in the study.

One strength of the current study was the selected focus on understanding how faculty

members describe their efforts to enter and participate in an institution-wide effort for educating students for engaged citizenship. According to Finley (2011),

With so many conceptual and working definitions of what it means to be civically engaged ... the evaluation of civic engagement may be more accurately identified through the practices that accompany it than by identification through a single name or program label. (p.18)

A second strength of the study was a result of my insider status at the institution. An important characteristic of case study research is the production of thick, rich description, and the access I was able to secure to participants and data sources made it possible for me to craft a detailed description of the case as well as understand the institution specific references used by interview participants.

Implications for Practice

One of the reasons I designed this study was to inform the efforts of higher education administrators and student affairs professionals who seek to expand the central role that faculty members could play in acting as the connection point between the curriculum and co-curriculum. As a result of conducting the study, I found that there was not a great understanding of co-curricular learning. In addition, co-curricular involvement was generally invisible to the faculty participants. The findings from this study, centered in professors' perspectives, could help inform efforts by student affairs professionals and academic administrators to work with faculty more carefully and intentionally to integrate curricular and co-curricular learning for civic responsibility. Student affairs practitioners may be more successful in their effort to integrate curricular and co-curricular initiatives for civic education if they start to identify connections and promote them to faculty—or even, more effectively, help students learn to promote the connections they are making between their

classroom work and out-of-class work. Findings from the current study about professors' desire to facilitate critical thinking skills and help students develop an understanding of their role as members of a community are two themes that could help inform what connections might be meaningful to faculty when trying to build partnerships. Several participants recognized that involvement outside of the classroom plays an important role in students' lives and identified possibilities for students' co-curricular involvement as a site for enhancing their efforts in the classroom to prepare students to be engaged citizens. Creating greater awareness of student passion for co-curricular involvement among faculty members could be a way to start building collaborations between in-class and out of class learning opportunities as well as provide an opportunity to begin educating faculty about the benefits of co-curricular involvement.

As institutions of higher education pursue their renewed commitment to prepare students for engaged citizenship and potentially enact recommendations to integrate those initiatives across the general education curriculum, the results of this study help to emphasize for academic administrators the importance of considering the pressure that comes from including civic education in the general education curriculum. When a course is included as part of the general education curriculum, it becomes a requirement for all students, which then leads to the need for an institution to provide a certain number of seats every year. As a result, institutions may find themselves needing to heavily recruit faculty, or put requirements on departments to provide a certain number of courses that fulfill the engaged citizen requirement. This pressure can lead to forcing faculty who are reluctant or uninterested to incorporate engaged citizen outcomes into their course and as a result may harm the overall institutional goal. The findings from this study can help academic

administrators think about a communication strategy that will help frame civic education as a desirable component of a course and motivate faculty to participate proactively.

In order to make civic education efforts sustainable in higher education, not only will faculty need to be recruited to participate, but also the results of this study along with the current literature emphasize the importance of providing faculty development to support the professors who do choose to participate. The participants in the study described tensions regarding the role of teachers and learners in the classroom and classroom strategies that felt uncomfortable or ill fitting. These participants' struggles illustrate the assertion that many faculty members were not prepared by their graduate training or previous collegiate teaching experience to integrate broader skills or cross disciplinary lines (Bloss, Handstedt, & Kirby, 2010; Fish, 2003). As higher education administrators seek to implement civic education efforts across the general education curriculum, it will be important to provide faculty development opportunities to support and encourage pedagogical experimentation and collaboration within and between disciplines.

Finley (2011) found that, for many faculty members, civic engagement is interchangeable with service-learning and, indeed, one of my participants expressed concern that she would not be a very good participant for my study because she does not use service-learning. It is important that service-learning and civic education not become synonymous, as exemplified by several participants in this study who really pushed back against service-learning as a pedagogical choice, and still found other ways to achieve their engaged citizen goals. It would be important for administrators who are seeking to support faculty participation in civic education and draw in faculty from across the institution, to recognize and reward faculty who are engaging in any of the practices that have been identified as best

practices in civic education. Service-learning is often very visible, as several of my participants noted, and so it will take a greater effort to find and recognize other civic education efforts that are taking place in individual professors' classrooms. I certainly learned many new things about the teaching practices of professors at my own institution by conducting individual interviews, and I have worked at the university for 11 years.

Related to the ties between service-learning and civic education that lead to some confusion and misunderstanding both institutionally and nationally, the literature on civic education as a whole does not offer a clear definition of engaged citizenship or civic learning (Finley, 2011). An unclear understanding among participants of what engaged citizen means emerged as a finding in the current study, and further seemed to present somewhat of an obstacle to participation. Administrators charged with advancing or improving their institution's efforts to educate students for engaged citizenship may want to consider providing a space and a means for faculty to discuss and understand how the university defines engaged citizenship prior to those faculty participating in the civic education effort. In thinking about implications for the site of this case study in particular, the results from the study indicate a lack of common understanding across campus about Drake University's concept of engaged citizenship and also prompt consideration of a re-evaluation of Drake's definition of engaged citizenship in comparison with current teaching and learning practices.

Recommendations for Future Research

This study attempted to address a gap in the literature related to faculty perspectives on participating in a larger university initiative to educate students for engaged citizenship through the integration of general education curriculum and co-curricular opportunities.

Since this was a case study of one institution, it would be interesting to expand the study to a multi-institutional case study that seeks out participating institutions that have similar characteristics of trying to integrate curricular and co-curricular efforts towards the goal of educating for engaged citizenship and using a general education curriculum approach.

In the current study, I did not examine specific disciplines and how they approached civic learning but, rather, took the perspective of participation as part of a general education curriculum initiative due, in part, to confidentiality issues as well as my general concern with implementation of civic education outcomes across the curriculum. Future research might address the way various disciplines approach civic education and create a conversation among faculty of the same discipline about their approach. The literature revealed that discipline-specific approaches are an effective way to move faculty into new initiatives, such as service-learning (Abes & Jackson, 2002).

Future research might also look at some of the obstacles to faculty participation in institution-wide efforts to implement civic education, as identified in the current study. For example, a study might examine the intersections of content tension, as demonstrated by professors' feelings of divided loyalties between their home departments, the institution, and their discipline at large, with professors' stated preference for autonomy when considering recruitment of faculty to university-wide civic engagement efforts. How can institutions effectively make room for faculty autonomy and honor course content demands while also implementing civic education outcomes across the institution?

Finally, future research could be expanded to include a comparison of the perspectives of students and faculty about their understanding of engaged citizenship. How would the desired knowledge, skills, and dispositions of an engaged citizen be similar and

different among faculty and students? How might students view the role of co-curricular learning in civic education? The findings from such a study could help shape curriculum and co-curriculum to be more inclusive of both faculty and student perspectives.

Personal Reflections

In the first part of this reflection I reconsider my positionality as a researcher in the study. First, and most significantly, I found my role as a student affairs practitioner played an even larger role in my approach and understanding of the research project than I initially expected. I wrote several journal entries trying to unwind my personal feelings about the value of student learning outside of the classroom from the data and how I was conducting the analysis. Before I even began the process, I recognized that I value co-curricular involvement and deeply believe that it contributes to student learning and can be a place where students continue to practice and prepare for their role as a citizen. Through the process of journaling, I discovered that I wanted one of the results of this study to reveal that co-curricular involvement, particularly student organization involvement, can and does serve as a site for students to learn the skills for the role of a citizen, particularly related to student organization involvement. Instead, what I found was that faculty members were very unclear about what co-curricular involvement is, and what it means for student learning. They were not connecting it with their teaching and did not even see the potential connections. Most disheartening for me was that student organization involvement, as an example of co-curricular learning, was only mentioned by three of the participants.

Another aspect of my student affairs professional identity became more visible to me when I found myself journaling about feeling that some ways of teaching for engaged

citizenship were “right” or “best.” I felt an internally negative reaction when participants described various aspects of the academic citizen, such as facilitating an intellectual distance during class discussion and exclusion of opportunities for personal engagement that many faculty members described. My student affairs perspective informs my view that providing students with opportunities to practice will enhance their self-efficacy, and it is my belief that self-efficacy leads to a greater chance that students will then go out and perform the functions of a citizen. Alternatively, I internally nodded my head in agreement when some participants described aspects of the emotionally knowledgeable citizen, and particularly the processes for developing self-knowledge and understanding one’s role in a community. These concepts are at the heart of my practice, and generally valued in the field of student affairs as well. Thus, once again, I spent some time examining the value I was mentally assigning to different ways to teach students to be an engaged citizen.

I also learned more about the implications of my insider/outsider status as I engaged in the research process. My insider status as a member of the Drake community did not seem to particularly assist me in securing interview participants. I had five potential participants fail to respond, even after multiple attempts to contact them. Given the smaller pool of participants with whom I was working, it was vital to get as many responses as possible. I processed through feelings of discouragement during my interviews when we discussed co-curricular involvement and co-curricular learning. I discovered how much of an “outsider” I was during those conversations. Based on the results of the study from the faculty participants’ perspective, students’ involvement outside of class was invisible and separate from what they do in the classroom; whereas I see connections every day between the co-curricular involvement I support and the work those students are doing in the classroom. I

talk with students about their coursework and help them think about ways it connects with their co-curricular involvement. I did not find that the same types of conversations were happening with students and the faculty participants in my study. I had to work very hard during the analysis process to name those feelings—discouragement, frustration, annoyance—and put them aside in order to try to discover faculty perspectives on co-curricular involvement, and then how those perspectives may inform future opportunities for collaboration.

It was a privilege to learn more about the work of these faculty members, and I greatly appreciate the time that Amelia, Donna, Dorothy, Ella, Jason, Johanna, Lana, Matthew, Melinda, Robin and Sara took to speak with me and share various documents from their courses. The way they talked about their students, their teaching, and their service to the university confirmed what I already felt as a member of the Drake community—these individuals care about their work, about their students, and about their institution. I was honored when several participants thanked me for the opportunity to talk about teaching for engaged citizenship and further shared that our interview had led them to new insights and ideas.

As a person who chooses to work at liberal arts institutions, I appreciate the effort of the university to embed its civic engagement effort across the curriculum, and despite some of the challenges, it is a worthwhile task. As a person who is embarking upon a career in higher education administration with a focus on integrating the work of faculty with students' outside of the classroom experiences, the findings from my research were challenging and insightful.

APPENDIX A. INSTITUTIONAL APPROVAL

A-1a. Iowa State University Institutional Review Board

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY

OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Institutional Review Board
Office of Research Assurances
Vice Provost for Research
1138 Pearson Hall
Ames, Iowa 50011-2207
515 294-4566
FAX 515 294-4267

Date: 2/22/2012

To: Melissa Sturm-Smith
2507 University Ave
Des Moines, IA 50310

CC: Dr. Nancy Evans
N247 Lagomarcino

From: Office for Responsible Research

Title: Faculty Perspectives on Facilitating Holistic Learning for Engaged Citizenship

IRB ID: 21-047

Approval Date: 2/21/2012

Date for Continuing Review: 2/20/2013

Submission Type: New

Review Type: Full Committee

The project referenced above has received approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Iowa State University according to the dates shown above. Please refer to the IRB ID number shown above in all correspondence regarding this study.

To ensure compliance with federal regulations (45 CFR 46 & 21 CFR 56), please be sure to:

- **Use only the approved study materials in your research, including the recruitment materials and informed consent documents that have the IRB approval stamp.**
- **Retain signed informed consent documents for 3 years after the close of the study**, when documented consent is required.
- **Obtain IRB approval prior to implementing any changes** to the study by submitting a Modification Form for Non-Exempt Research or Amendment for Personnel Changes form, as necessary.
- **Immediately inform the IRB of (1) all serious and/or unexpected adverse experiences** involving risks to subjects or others; and **(2) any other unanticipated problems involving risks** to subjects or others.
- **Stop all research activity if IRB approval lapses**, continuation is necessary to prevent harm to research participants. Research activity can resume once IRB approval is reestablished.
- **Complete a new continuing review form** at least three to four weeks prior to the **date for continuing review** as noted above to provide sufficient time for the IRB to review and approve continuation of the study. We will send a courtesy reminder as this date approaches.
- Upon completion of the project, please submit a Project Closure Form to the Office for Responsible Research, 1138 Pearson Hall, to officially close the project.

A-1b. Drake University approval

Dissertation

**Arthur B Sanders**

Monday, January 09, 2012 4:53 PM

To: Melissa R Sturm-Smith

- You replied on 1/9/2012 4:57 PM.

Melissa,

I do not think I ever sent you the email you needed concerning permission to identify Drake as the site of your study. (I also checked with Sue Wright to make sure my answer was acceptable - and it was.)

You have permission from the Provost's Office to identify Drake University as the site of your research for your doctoral dissertation.

Arthur Sanders
Associate Provost
Ellis and Nelle Levitt Distinguished Professor of Politics
Drake University
2507 University Avenue
Des Moines, IA 50311
(515) 271-3172
arthur.sanders@drake.edu

APPENDIX B. CONSENT DOCUMENTS AND PARTICIPANT COMMUNICATION

B-1a. Participant Recruitment email

Dear (*insert name*),

My name is Melissa Sturm-Smith, I am a doctoral student in Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at Iowa State University, and I am also a staff member here at Drake. I have completed my coursework, and am currently in the process of preparing for my dissertation research. I will be conducting a qualitative case study focused on the experiences of faculty members who are participating in Drake University's efforts to prepare students to be engaged citizens. The title of my study is, "Faculty perspectives on facilitating holistic learning for engaged citizenship."

I am interested in exploring what motivates faculty to include the engaged citizen AOI as a component of their courses, how the engaged citizen learning outcomes are enacted in the classroom, and faculty perceptions of the contribution of co-curricular opportunities to teaching students to be engaged citizens. The research on civic engagement in higher education has generally focused either on the student experience or institutional culture, very little research has sought to understand the faculty perspective, particularly regarding civic engagement efforts that include both a curricular component embedded in the general education curriculum and a co-curricular component (i.e. the Engaged Citizen Experience).

I will be interviewing faculty members who have taught an Engaged Citizen AOI course for at least two semesters, and since you meet the criteria I am interested in having you participate in the study. Your participation would involve one semi-structured interview, lasting between 90 minutes and two hours. In addition, I would like to request a copy of the syllabus for the Engaged Citizen courses you have taught, and any accompanying materials. The interviews will take place at a time and location that is convenient for you.

As a student life staff person and a former member of the Engaged Citizen Experience committee, I am very interested in learning more about your perspective on teaching civic responsibility, and the role co-curricular opportunities play in those efforts. I would greatly appreciate your participation in this study.

Please know that your participation in my study is voluntary and confidential, and you may withdraw at any point. Further, you may choose not to answer any questions that make you uncomfortable or you otherwise wish not to address.

If you are interested in participating, please contact me at <mss@iastate.edu> or call 515-423-1679.

Sincerely,

Melissa Sturm-Smith

B-1b. Participant Informed Consent Document

Title of Study:	Faculty perspectives on facilitating holistic learning for engaged citizenship
Investigators:	Melissa Sturm-Smith, doctoral student in Educational Leadership and Policy Study at Iowa State University.

This is a research study. Please take your time in deciding if you would like to participate. Please feel free to ask questions at any time.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study is to explore the experiences of professors participating in an institution-wide effort to educate students for engaged citizenship at Drake University. You are being invited to participate in this study because you have taught an Engaged Citizen AOI flagged course for at least two semesters.

DESCRIPTION OF PROCEDURES

If you agree to participate, you will be asked to participate in a one-on-one interview, lasting between 90 minutes and two hours. The design of the study includes a single interview during which you will be asked questions about your experiences participating in an institution-wide effort, which involves both the general education curriculum and co-curricular opportunities, to prepare students to be engaged citizens. In conjunction with the interview, the researcher will request copies of course syllabi for the engaged citizen flagged course and lesson plans. You will also be provided with the opportunity to review the preliminary analysis of the interview to check for accuracy or provide additional information.

The interview will be audio recorded and then transcribed by a professional transcriptionist. The audio files will be erased immediately following transcription. A pseudonym will be assigned to your data prior to sending it to the transcriptionist, so only the researcher will know your identity.

RISKS

There are no foreseeable risks at this time from participating in this study. Drake University has chosen to be named in the study because university officials believed it would be helpful to those reading the report to be able to place the findings in context. You will be asked questions about your institution, and the researcher may seek information of a personal nature, so you may opt out of questions at any time. Given that the focus of the study is not on connecting teaching for engaged citizenship to specific academic disciplines, but rather a more general understanding of its place in general education curriculum, specific names of courses will not be used, and in addition descriptions of course content will be generalized to broad categories such as humanities, social science, professional studies, etc.

BENEFITS

If you decide to participate in this study there will be no direct benefit to you. It is hoped that the information gained in this study will benefit faculty members and higher education administrators who are looking to support the civic mission of their institution through faculty efforts to incorporate civic engagement into the curriculum and co-curriculum.

COSTS AND COMPENSATION

You will not have any costs from participating in this study. You will not be compensated for participating in this study.

PARTICIPANT RIGHTS

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary and you may refuse to participate or leave the study at any time. If you decide to not participate in the study or leave the study early, it will not result in any penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. During the interviews, you can skip any questions that you do not wish to answer.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Records identifying participants will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by applicable laws and regulations and will not be made publicly available. However, federal government regulatory agencies, auditing departments of Iowa State University, and the Institutional Review Board (a committee that reviews and approves human subject research studies) may inspect and/or copy your records for quality assurance and data analysis. These records may contain private information.

To ensure confidentiality to the extent permitted by law, the following measures will be taken: First, the researcher will not discuss with others who is being interviewed for the study. Second, the researcher will assign each participant a pseudonym and any names the participant uses in an interview will either be changed (if in a quote) or will be omitted completely. All collected data to include transcriptions, syllabi, and lesson plans will be stored in a file cabinet at the researcher's locked home or on a password protected computer. The audio files will be destroyed immediately following the transcription by both the researcher and the transcriptionist. During the data analysis process, the preliminary findings from your data will be shared with you via email. If you see any potential identifiers in the findings, they will be deleted. All data will be kept for three years following completion of the study in December 2012, and then will be destroyed. All data collected is subject to be used for publication, specifically, a doctoral dissertation. If the results are published, your identity will remain confidential. Drake University has agreed to be named as the site for this research study.

QUESTIONS OR PROBLEMS

You are encouraged to ask questions at any time during this study.

- For further information about the study contact investigator Melissa Sturm-Smith (515-270-2411) or Dr. Nancy Evans (515-294-7113).
- If you have any questions about the rights of research subjects or research-related injury, please contact the IRB Administrator, (515) 294-4566, <IRB@iastate.edu>, or Director, (515) 294-3115, Office for Responsible Research, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa 50011.

PARTICIPANT SIGNATURE

Your signature indicates that you voluntarily agree to participate in this study, that the study has been explained to you, that you have been given the time to read the document, and that your questions have been satisfactorily answered. You will receive a copy of the written informed consent prior to your participation in the study.

Participant's Name (printed) _____

(Participant's Signature)

(Date)

INVESTIGATOR STATEMENT

I certify that the participant has been given adequate time to read and learn about the study and all of their questions have been answered. It is my opinion that the participant understands the purpose, risks, benefits and the procedures that will be followed in this study and has voluntarily agreed to participate.

(Signature of Person Obtaining Informed Consent)

(Date)

B-2a. Recruitment email – Participant observation

Dear (*insert name*),

My name is Melissa Sturm-Smith, I am a doctoral student in Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at Iowa State University, and I am also a staff member here at Drake. I have completed my coursework, and am currently in the process of preparing for my dissertation research. I will be conducting a qualitative case study focused on the experiences of faculty members who are participating in Drake University's efforts to prepare students to be engaged citizens. The title of my study is, "Faculty perspectives on facilitating holistic learning for engaged citizenship."

I am interested in exploring what motivates faculty to include the engaged citizen AOI as a component of their courses, how the engaged citizen learning outcomes are enacted in the classroom, and faculty perceptions of the contribution of co-curricular opportunities to teaching students to be engaged citizens. The research on civic engagement in higher education has generally focused either on the student experience or institutional culture; very little research has sought to understand the faculty perspective, particularly regarding civic engagement efforts that include both a curricular component embedded in the general education curriculum and a co-curricular component (i.e., the Engaged Citizen Experience).

I will be conducting a direct observation of the Engaged Citizen Experience faculty development workshop. You recently registered to participate in the May 2012 ECE workshop, and so I am writing to invite you to participate in the study. If you agree to participate in the study, you are granting me permission to use anything you say or do during the workshop. I will be taking detailed notes on the content and process of the workshop.

As a student life staff person and a former member of the Engaged Citizen Experience committee, I am very interested in learning more about your perspective on teaching civic responsibility, and the role co-curricular opportunities play in those efforts. I would greatly appreciate your participation in this study.

Please know that your participation in my study is voluntary and confidential, and you may withdraw at any point. I will be attending the workshop and will be present to answer any questions and obtain your consent to participate in the study. If you have any questions about the study prior to the workshop, please contact me at mss@iastate.edu or call 515-423-1679.

Sincerely,

Melissa Sturm-Smith

B-2b. Informed Consent Document – Participant Observation

Title of Study: Faculty perspectives on facilitating holistic learning for engaged citizenship

Investigators: Melissa Sturm-Smith, doctoral student in Educational Leadership and Policy Study at Iowa State University.

This is a research study. Please take your time in deciding if you would like to participate. Please feel free to ask questions at any time.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study is to explore the experiences of professors participating in an institution-wide effort to educate students for engaged citizenship at Drake University. You are being invited to participate in this study because you are a participant in the Engaged Citizen Experience faculty development workshop.

DESCRIPTION OF PROCEDURES

The researcher will be acting as a participant observer during the Engaged Citizen Experience workshop. If you agree to participate, anything you say or do during the workshop can be noted and used by the researcher as data in the study. You will be provided with the opportunity to review the preliminary analysis of the data to check for accuracy or provide additional information.

RISKS

There are no foreseeable risks at this time from participating in this study. You may withdraw your participation from the study at any time.

BENEFITS

If you decide to participate in this study there will be no direct benefit to you. It is hoped that the information gained in this study will benefit faculty members and higher education administrators who are looking to support the civic mission of their institution through faculty efforts to incorporate civic engagement into the curriculum and co-curriculum.

COSTS AND COMPENSATION

You will not have any costs from participating in this study. You will not be compensated for participating in this study.

PARTICIPANT RIGHTS

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary and you may refuse to participate or leave the study at any time. If you decide to not participate in the study or leave the study early, it will not result in any penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. During the interviews, you can skip any questions that you do not wish to answer.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Records identifying participants will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by applicable laws and regulations and will not be made publicly available. However, federal government regulatory agencies, auditing departments of Iowa State University, and the Institutional Review Board (a committee that reviews and approves human subject research studies) may inspect and/or copy your records for quality assurance and data analysis. These records may contain private information.

To ensure confidentiality to the extent permitted by law, the following measures will be taken: First, the researcher will assign each participant a pseudonym and any names the participant uses will either be changed (if in a quote) or will be omitted completely. All collected data (i.e., fieldnotes) will be stored in a file cabinet at the researcher's locked home or on a password protected computer. During the data analysis process, the preliminary findings from your data will be shared with you via email. If you see any potential identifiers in the findings, they will be deleted. All data will be kept for three years following completion of the study in December 2012, and then will be destroyed. All data collected is subject to be used for publication, specifically, a doctoral dissertation. If the results are published, your identity will remain confidential. Drake University has agreed to be named as the site of this research.

QUESTIONS OR PROBLEMS

You are encouraged to ask questions at any time during this study.

- For further information about the study contact investigator Melissa Sturm-Smith (515-270-2411) or Dr. Nancy Evans (515-294-7113).
- If you have any questions about the rights of research subjects or research-related injury, please contact the IRB Administrator, (515) 294-4566, IRB@iastate.edu, or Director, (515) 294-3115, Office for Responsible Research, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa 50011.

PARTICIPANT SIGNATURE

Your signature indicates that you voluntarily agree to participate in this study, that the study has been explained to you, that you have been given the time to read the document, and that your questions have been satisfactorily answered. You will receive a copy of the written informed consent prior to your participation in the study.

Participant's Name (printed) _____

(Participant's Signature)

(Date)

INVESTIGATOR STATEMENT

I certify that the participant has been given adequate time to read and learn about the study and all of their questions have been answered. It is my opinion that the participant understands the purpose, risks, benefits and the procedures that will be followed in this study and has voluntarily agreed to participate.

(Signature of Person Obtaining Informed Consent)

(Date)

APPENDIX C. INTERVIEW GUIDE

The interview guide is the set questions that will serve as the starting point for the interview. I may want to ask additional follow-up questions to clarify responses. The topical questions are tied to one of the four research questions guiding the study.

A. General questions that may be used to initially establish rapport and set the tone of the interview. Background questions:

1. How many years have you worked at Drake University?
2. How many years have you had tenure at Drake?
3. What is your current teaching load?
4. What are your university service responsibilities?
5. Can you describe your current research interests?

B. Review the Research Project

1. Review informed consent form. Emphasize confidentiality and the option to end the interview at any time or skip a question.
2. Review purpose of the project.
3. How do you define engaged citizenship? How do you think the University defines it?

C. Faculty Involvement in Civic Education

1. Tell me about the first engaged citizen course you taught. (RQ1)
2. What elements did you include in the course to meet the engaged citizen learning outcomes? For example, reading assignments, writing prompts, active learning activities, etc. (RQ1)
3. How did you decide to teach a course that meets the requirements for an engaged citizen designation? (RQ1)
4. How does your engaged citizen course compare to your other courses in terms of workload? (RQ1)
5. How has the university supported your participation in the Engaged Citizen Experience? (RQ1)
6. What challenges have you faced during your participation in the Engaged Citizen Experience? (RQ1)

D. Understandings of Civic Responsibility

1. What do you think it means to prepare Drake students to be responsible global citizens? (RQ2)
2. Describe the qualities of an engaged citizen. (RQ2)
3. What knowledge do you want students to develop in your course that will support their ability to act as an engaged citizen? (RQ2)
4. What skills do you want students to develop in your course that will support their ability to act as an engaged citizen? (RQ2)
5. What dispositions do you want students to develop in your course that will support their ability to act as an engaged citizen? (RQ2)

E. Teaching for Engaged Citizenship

1. Describe a classroom activity you conducted that developed students' knowledge, skills or motivation to act as an engaged citizen. (RQ3)
2. Describe an assignment you designed that developed students' knowledge, skills or motivation to act as an engaged citizen. (RQ3)
3. How does the engaged citizen component complement the other aspects of your course? (RQ3)
4. How does the engaged citizen component compete with the other aspects of your course? (RQ3)

F. The Role of Co-Curricular Learning in Civic Education

1. How do you define or describe co-curricular learning? (RQ4)
2. Can you give an example of a co-curricular learning experience a student described to you? (RQ4)
3. Tell me about any co-curricular learning opportunities officially sponsored by the Engaged Citizen Experience that you have been aware of? (RQ4)
4. How have you incorporated co-curricular learning opportunities into your Engaged Citizen course? (RQ4)
5. What are the obstacles to linking your teaching with co-curricular opportunities? (RQ4)

APPENDIX D. ECE EVENTS ANNOUNCEMENT SAMPLE

Engaged Citizen Experience Events Spring 2012

February 1: Political Engagement: The Iowa Caucuses. 7:00, Meredith 101. A panel of students who participated in the Iowa Caucuses, both in political and media roles, will lead a discussion of their experiences during the caucuses. Moderated by Associate Professor Rachel Caufield, Department of Politics and International Relations.

February 17-18: Engaged Citizen Mini-Conference: Technology and Democracy: Dialogue and Dissent: The focus of the conference is on the democratic potential of emerging technologies, both as benefit and hindrance. The Friday evening session (7:00–9:00) will focus on the Arab Spring revolution in Egypt. On Saturday (9:00 – 1:15), we will begin with a series of sessions. Participants will choose a session that will allow them to explore different aspects of issues raised on Friday evening. That will be followed by a session where participants will interact with those who chose different morning sessions, followed by lunch.

March 29: Kevin Haggerty, Professor of Criminology and Sociology, Surveillance and Democracy. Sheslow Auditorium, 7:00 pm. The Annual Hawley, Sponsored by the Honors Program.

April 12: Maged R. Aboulmagd, Consul General of the Egyptian Consul in Chicago. Egypt: One Year After the Revolution. Bulldog Auditorium. 7:00 pm. Sponsored by the Principal Financial Group Center for Global Citizenship.

April 17: Engaged Citizen Poster Session: 4:00-8:00. Olmsted 310-313. We will have a poster session where students in engaged citizen classes can display their work (either individual or group projects). Details about the session and how to sign up will be forthcoming.

April 23: George Saunders: Humanities, Science and Technology. A reading by author George Saunders, whose fiction and essays address these issues. Co-sponsored by The Writers and Critics Series and the Center for the Humanities.

Film Series (co-sponsored by the Principal Financial Group Center for Global Citizenship):

1. February 15: “How Facebook Changed the World: The Arab Spring” (documentary film) Bulldog Auditorium, Olmsted Center: 7:00 p.m. -9:00 p.m.

This timely documentary investigates how social media influenced the Arab Spring and fanned the winds of political and social change from Tunisia to Egypt, Bahrain to Libya. Using video and still photographs shot on mobile phones, How Facebook Changed the World reveals how revolutions of the 21st century are being

driven by the blogging, Facebooking and tweeting generation. For the first time in history, world-changing events were recorded hour by hour by the man and woman on the street. A unique filmed record now exists charting the downfall of tyrants in Tunisia, Egypt and Libya, and exposing the unimaginable brutality of embattled regimes in other parts of the Arab world.

2. February 21, “Secrecy” (documentary film) Bulldog Auditorium, Olmsted Center, 7:00 p.m. - 9:00 p.m.

The "classification universe" is invisible to most of us, yet the production of governmental classified secret documents involves millions of people. And government secrecy is growing, vastly outpacing the circulation of open information. Now, 70 years after the builders of the bomb created a national information security system and just a few years after 9/11, a government secrecy crisis is looming. The combination of a declared war on terrorism and the curtailment of civil liberties sets the stage to ask some critical questions. When does security erode, rather than enhance, democracy? Can burying too much information actually undermine national security? Secrecy, the stylistically elegant and provocative new film by Robb Moss and Peter Galison, explores the hidden world of national security policy by examining the many implications of secrecy, both for government and individuals. Combining animation, installations, a mesmerizing score, and riveting interviews, the film takes us inside the inverted world of government secrecy as we share the experiences of lawyers, CIA analysts, and the ordinary people for whom secrecy becomes a matter of life and death.

3. April 2, “Contagion” (film) Bulldog Auditorium, Olmsted Center. Time: 7:00 p.m. - 9:00 p.m.

Contagion follows the rapid progress of a lethal airborne virus that kills within days. As the fast-moving epidemic grows, the worldwide medical community races to find a cure and control the panic that spreads faster than the virus itself. At the same time, ordinary people struggle to survive in a society coming apart.

Residence Life Engaged Citizen Series:

February 13: A Wired World: 7 pm GK Oasis Room: Kyle Glaser and Sarah Birkholz:

Students will understand how the Internet is a controlled medium and how governments and private corporations can throttle and control access to this service.

February 22: Wiki This: 7 pm, Morehouse Living Room: Hannah Ridgewell, Andrew Nystedt and Sarah Thornburgh: An open forum discussion based upon wikipedia, but extending to topics of censorship and public information, but also having fun seeing how easy things connect. This will allow for us to talk about how technology allows access to mass information and how it relates to democracy.

March 1: American Idiots: Teaching America's Future Leaders: 6 pm, Jewett Dan

Park and Aaron Dicket: We will hold a discussion about education in America. Topics highlighting the relatively low rank of the American education system compared to other countries, how education shapes society and democracy, and how technology plays a role in education.

March 3: Discourse with Occupy Des Moines. 4 pm, Oasis Room Brian Johansen and

Jared Hanel: The Occupy Wall Street movement has had a profound effect on media and civil discourse. Much of the organization's success is a result of social media. Active members of the Occupy Des Moines movement will speak about their experiences with the movement and what it stands for.

March 12: Twitter Controversies: A Look at Social Media's Impact on Hot Button

Issues. Starting at 11am. GK Front Desk: Shelby LaTona and Yvette Mitchell: An interactive "Twitter feed" with pre-made topics where you can post anonymously about controversial issues.

March 26: Hot Off the Press: Engaging in Social Media. 7 pm, Ross: Lauren Horsch,

Hannah Reichert and Jared Freese: We're having a barbeque at Ross and we will discuss responsible Internet advocacy. There will be food and games!

April 4: MUGS: Many Unite for Global Servicemen. 8:30 pm, Morehouse Becca

Mataloni and Elena Clark: Through the MUGS Engaged Citizen program, you can send thank-you letters to our troops through the organization "A Million Thanks." We will be enjoying homemade "Cake-In-A-Mugs!"

April 9: HE'S A SNITCH!!!!? The Wikileaks Controversy: 7 pm, GK Lobby Umesh

Veerasingham and Nolan Scott: A discussion regarding the controversy surrounding WikiLeaks. Is it appropriate to have a website like Wikileaks? Should the government ban Wikileaks? Is the banking blockade relevant?.

April 17: Technology and Democracy Bingo. 7:30 pm, Oasis Room: Alicia Atwell and

Amanda Steele: Come play Technology and Democracy BINGO where each space will contain an answer to a question related to the theme. Groceries will be awarded to all BINGO winners.

REFERENCES

- Abes, E., & Jackson, G. (2002). Factors that motivate and deter faculty use of service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Service Learning*, 9(1), 5-17.
- About AAC&U (n.d.)*. Retrieved from <http://www.aacu.org/about/index.cfm>
- Adelman, C., Ewell, P., Gaston, P., & Schneider, C. (2011). *Degree Qualifications Profile*. Indianapolis, IN: Lumina Foundation. Retrieved from http://www.luminafoundation.org/publications/The_Degree_Qualifications_Profile.pdf.
- Anfara, V. A., Brown, K. M., & Mangione, T. L. (2002). Qualitative analysis on stage: Making the research process more public. *Educational Researcher*, 31(7), 28-38.
- Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U). (2007). *College learning for the new global century: A report from the National Leadership Council for Liberal Education and America's Promise*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Astin, A. (1999). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Development*, 40(5), 518-529.
- Banerjee, M. (2007, Fall). Faculty use of service-learning: Perceptions, motivations, and impediments for the human sciences. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 32-45.
- Bloss, A., Hanstedt, P., & Kirby, S. (2010, Fall). Creating a culture of integrative faculty development. *Liberal Education*, 12-117.
- Bogdan, R.C. (2003). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods*. Boston, MA: Pearson Education Group.
- Boland, J. (2011). Positioning civic engagement on the higher education landscape: Insights from a civically engaged pedagogy. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 17(2), 101-115.
- Bourassa, D. M., & Kruger, K. (2001). The national dialogue on academic and student affairs collaboration. In A. Kezar, D. J. Hirsch, & C. Burack (Eds.), *Understanding the role of academic and student affairs collaboration in creating a successful learning environment* (p. 9-38). New Directions for Higher Education, No. 116. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Boyte, H., & Hollander, E. (1999). *Wingspread declaration on renewing the civic mission of the American research university*. Providence, RI: Campus Compact.
- Brabant, M., & Braid, D. (2009). The devil is in the details: Defining civic engagement.

Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 13(2), 59–88.

Campus compact membership. (2010). Retrieved from <http://www.compact.org/membership/>.

Campus compact: Who we are. (2012) Retrieved from <http://www.compact.org/about/history-mission-vision/>.

Chronicle Survey of Public Opinion of Higher Education (2003, May 2). *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 49(34), A11. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/stats/higheredpoll/views.htm>

Colby, A., Ehrlich, T., Beaumont, E., & Stephens, J. (2003). *Educating citizens: Preparing America's undergraduates for lives of moral and civic responsibility*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Colby, A., Ehrlich, T., Beaumont, E., & Stephens, J. (2004). The role of higher education in preparing undergraduates for lives of civic responsibility. In K. Ferraiolo (Ed.), *New directions in civic engagement: University Avenue meets Main Street* (pp. 52–57). Charlottesville, VA: Pew Partnership. Retrieved from <http://www.pew-partnership.org/resources/newdirections.html>

Cresswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dalton, R. (2009). *The good citizen. How a younger generation is reshaping American politics (Revised edition)*. Washington, DC: CQ Press.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York, NY: Touchstone.

Dey, E., Barnhardt, M. A., Antonaros, M., Ott, M., & Hopsapple, M. (2009). *Civic responsibility: What is the campus climate for learning?* Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Diverse Democracy Project. (2005). *Typology of campus inventory*. Retrieved from <http://www.umich.edu/~divdemo/typologytable.html>

Drake University ECE website (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.drake.edu/dc/EngagedCitizen.php>

- Ehrlich, T., & Hollander, E. (1999). *President's fourth of July declaration on the civic responsibility of higher education*. Retrieved from <http://www.compact/Org/presidential/declaration/html>.
- Fiarriolo, K. (2004). Introduction. In K. Fiarriolo (Ed.), *New directions in civic engagement: University Avenue meets Main Street* (pp. 1-23). Charlottesville, VA: Pew Partnership. Retrieved from <http://www.pew-partnership.org/resources/newdirections.html>.
- Finley, A. (2011, May 24). *Civic learning and democratic engagements: A review of the literature on civic engagement in post-secondary education*. Paper prepared for the U.S. Department of Education (Contract: ED-OPE-10-C-0078). Retrieved from http://www.civiclearning.org/SupportDocs/LiteratureReview_CivicEngagement_Finley_July2011.pdf.
- Fish, S. (2003). Aim low: Confusing democratic values with academic ones can easily damage the quality of education. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. [Electronic Version]. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com.cowles-proxy.drake.edu/article/Aim-Low/45210>
- Guido, F. M., Chávez, A. F., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2010). Underlying paradigms in student affairs research and practice. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 47(1), 1–22.
- Gurin, P., Nagda, B., & Sorensen, N. (2011). Intergroup dialogue: Education for a broad conception of civic engagement. *Liberal Education*, 97(2), 46-51.
- Harkavy, I. (2006). The role of universities in advancing citizenship and social justice in the 21st century. *Education, Citizenship, and Justice*, 1(1), 5-37.
- Haste, H. (2004). Constructing the citizen. *Political Psychology*, 25(3), 413–439.
- Higher Education: Civic Mission & Civic Effects. (2006). The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and CIRCLE (The Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement).
- Hollander, E. L. (2011). Civic education in research universities: Leaders or followers. *Education + Training*, 53(2/3), 166–176. A report sponsored by the Spencer Foundation. Retrieved from: <http://www.mncampuscompact.org/vertical/sites/%7BE34AF879-F177-472C-9EB0-D811F247058B%7D/uploads/%7B46C5CFF3-1C6D-43E1-B5AA-F1314D61B212%7D.PDF#page=83>
- Hollander, E. L. & Burack, C. (2009). *How young people develop long-lasting habits of civic engagement: A conversation on building a research agenda*. Washington, DC: Spencer Foundation.

- Hoy, A., & Meisel, C. (2008). *Civic engagement at the center: Building democracy through integrated cocurricular and curricular experiences*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Jones, S., Torres, V., & Arminio, J. (2006). *Negotiating the complexities of qualitative research in higher education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Kahne, J., & Westheimer, J. (2003). Teaching democracy: What schools need to do. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 85(1), 34-66.
- Keeling, R. (Ed.). (2004). *Learning reconsidered: A campus-wide focus on the student experience*. Washington, DC: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators & American College Personnel Association.
- Kezar, A. (2003). Achieving student success: Strategies for creating partnerships between academic and student affairs. *NASPA Journal*, 41(1), 1-22.
- Kezar, A., & Kinzie, J. (2006). Examining the ways institutions create student engagement: The role of mission. *Journal of College Student Development*, 47(2), 149-172.
- Kezar, A., & Rhoads, R. (2001). The dynamic tensions of service learning in higher education: A philosophical perspective. *The Journal of Higher Education*, (72)2, 148-171.
- Knefelkamp, L. (2008). Civic identity: Locating self in community. *Diversity and Democracy: Civic Learning for Shared Disciplines*, 11(2), 1-3.
- Kuh, G. D. (2003). *The National Survey of Student Engagement: Conceptual framework and overview of psychometric principles*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research and Planning.
- Levine, P. (2011). What do we know about civic engagement? *Liberal Education*, 97(2), 1-4.
- Maxwell, J. A. (1996). *Qualitative research design*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Meacham, J., & Gaff, J. (2006). Learning goals in mission statements: Implications for educational leadership. *Liberal Education*, 92(1), 6-13. Retrieved from http://www.aacu.org/liberaleducation/le-wi06/le-wi06_feature1.cfm.
- Merriam, S. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement. (2012). *A national call to action. A crucible moment: College learning and democracy's future*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

- O'Neill, N. (2012). *Promising practices for personal and social responsibility: Findings from a national research collaborative*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Palmer, P. (2007). *The courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Prasad, P. (2005). *Crafting qualitative research: Working in the postpositivist tradition*. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.
- Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.
- Rossmann, G., & Rallis, S. (2003). *Learning in the field: An introduction to qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Rubin, H., & Rubin, I. (1995). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Saldana, J. (2009). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Schroeder, C. (1999). Collaboration and partnerships. In C. S. Johnson & H. E. Cheatham (Eds.), *Higher education trends for the next century: A research agenda for student success* (pp. 44-49). Washington, DC: American College Personnel Association.
- Schudson, M. (1998). *The good citizen: A history of American civic life*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Sherrod, L., Torney-Purta, J., & Flanagan, C. (Eds.). (2010). Research on the development of citizenship: A field comes of age. In *Handbook on civic engagement in youth* (pp. 1-20). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley & Sons.
- Spiezio, K. E., Baker, K. Q., & Boland, K. (2006). General education and civic engagement: An empirical analysis of pedagogical possibilities. *The Journal of General Education*, 54(4), 273-292.
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Swanborn, P. (2010). *Case study research: What, why, and how?* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Tellis, W. (1997). Introduction to case study. *The Qualitative Report*, 3(2). Retrieved from <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR3-2/tellis1.html>

- Terkla, D., O'Leary, L., & Wilson, N. (2007). Civic engagement assessment: Linking activities to attitudes. *Assessment Update*, 19(3), 1-3.
- Thomas, N. L., & Hartley, M. (2011). Higher education's democratic imperative. In N. Thomas (Ed.), *Educating for deliberative democracy* (pp. 99-107). New Directions for Higher Education, No. 152. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Thornton, C., & Jaeger, A. (2006). Institutional culture and civic responsibility: An ethnographic study. *Journal of College Student Development*, 47(1), 52-68.
- Verba, S., Scholzman, K., & Brady, H. (1995). *Voice and equality, civic voluntarism in American politics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Vogeleang, L. J., & Astin, A. W. (2005, April). *Post-college civic engagement among graduates*. (HERI Research Report No. 2). Los Angeles, CA: Higher Education Research Institute.
- Vogeleang, L. (2008). Memo to the field: What do we know? In E. Hollander & C. Burack (Eds.) (2009), *How young people develop long-lasting habits of civic engagement: A conversation on building a research agenda* (pp. 14-19). Washington, DC: Spencer Foundation.
- Westheimer, J. & Kahne, J. (2004a). Educating the “good” citizen: Political choices and pedagogical goals. *Political Science and Politics*, 37(2), 241-247.
- Westheimer, J. & Kahne, J. (2004b). What kind of citizen? The politics of educating for democracy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 41(2), 237-269.
- Wildman, T. (2005, March/April). From the outside in: Lessons in learning beyond the school walls. *About Campus*, pp. 16-22.
- Wise, J. (2008). [Results from administration of multi-institutional study of leadership]. Unpublished raw data.
- Wilhite, S., & Silver, P. (2005). A false dichotomy for higher education: Educating citizens vs. educating technicians. *National Civic Review*, 94(2), 46-54.
- Wong(Lau), K., Walker, T., & Landrum-Brown, J. (2011). (Re)training ourselves: Professionals who facilitate intergroup dialogue. In K. Maxwell, B. A. Nagda, & M. Thompson (Eds.), *Facilitating intergroup dialogues: Bridging differences, catalyzing change* (pp. 85-101). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (4th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Ziotkowski, E., & Williams, D. (2003). The faculty role in civic engagement. *Peer Review*, 5(3), 9-11.

Zukin, C., Keeter, S., Andolina, M., Jenkins, K., & Carpini, M. X. D. (2006). *A new engagement? Political participation, civic life and the changing American citizen*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.