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ABSTRACT

Although higher education institutions in the United States have long claimed to teach for civic purposes, only recently have explicit goals related to the development of civic capacity and engagement been included in college and university curricula. The purpose of the study was to advance theoretical and practical understanding of the role of faculty participation in a campus-based professional development group on course planning and teaching for civic purposes. Two research questions guided the study:

• How, if at all, does faculty participation in the Public Scholarship Associates (PSA) group, a multidisciplinary, civic-engagement-oriented group of faculty, influence faculty members’ learning about teaching and/or their teaching practice?

• How, if at all, do faculty members at a research university align their undergraduate teaching practices with their implicit and/or explicit ideas about civic engagement as an educational purpose?

Relying on qualitative research methodologies, the study explored whether and how participation in this voluntary group influenced faculty members’ commitment to civic education as an educational purpose and their abilities to develop course plans congruent with their espoused civic purposes. Faculty members affiliated with the PSA group were invited to participate in the study. A purposeful sampling process sought to include faculty members from different disciplines and academic ranks. Fourteen faculty members representing 16 disciplines agreed to a series of three semi-structured interviews designed to explore personal, professional, and contextual influences on their course decisions regarding teaching for civic capacity and engagement.

The empirical literature on course planning in higher education guided the study. The Contextual Filters Model of Faculty Course Planning (Stark, Lowther, Bentley, Ryan, Martens, Wren, & Shaw, 1990) provided a conceptual framework for the study, and a sociocultural
perspective on learning shaped data collection and analysis (Greeno, 1997; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wertsch, del Rio, & Alvarez, 1995). Analysis occurred iteratively throughout and following the data collection period, and involved a combination of both inductive and deductive coding. Findings from the study yielded propositions for theory development to be tested through further research, and implications for faculty development and reward practices and policies.

Analysis of the interview data indicates that the PSA group influenced participants’ learning about civic education as well as their teaching for civic and community engagement. Many participants identified the important role that their interactions with other members of the PSA group played in the evolution of their understanding of the concept of public scholarship and the use of a variety of instructional strategies to achieve its purposes. Thus they acknowledged that their teaching and learning were mediated by interactions with peers, texts, and ideas from members of the PSA group. Participants’ stories underscored the influence of both formal activities (e.g., faculty seminars) and informal interactions (e.g., unplanned conversations) on their teaching for civic capacity and engagement.

The extent of faculty members’ participation in the PSA group appeared to strongly influence understanding of civic educational purposes and practices; those more centrally and extensively involved in the group tended to articulate the most well-defined and comprehensive visions of civic engagement and more closely aligned their teaching with those beliefs than newcomers to the PSA group. The ways in which participants self-identified – for example, as activists or change agents – also appeared to influence their teaching for civic capacity and engagement both directly and indirectly. Nonetheless, personal experiences and professional backgrounds often served as the motivation or catalyst for their efforts to teach for civic capacity and engagement.
These findings are consistent with the premises of a sociocultural perspective on learning. Members of the PSA varied in their levels of engagement in the group, with some more experienced members taking more central roles and shaping the ideas of the community while newer members generally described themselves or their involvement as more peripheral to the community. Some participants described how they became more involved (and more central) to the group as they learned more about public scholarship and civic education through participation in a variety of PSA activities. Some participants reported changes in their sense of personal identity – for example the development of new identities or the strengthening of identities as individuals committed to civic education and public scholarship – as a result of their membership in the PSA, consistent with the idea that the learning that occurs when individuals join new communities of practice not only changes what they know but who they are (Packer & Goicocchea, 2000; Wortham, 2004, 2006).

Participants in this study actively sought to align their course planning and teaching with the civic-educational purposes to which they ascribed, and did so while navigating a variety of contextual enablers and constraints. Consistent with the assumptions of the Contextual Filters Model, their decisions about course “form” were often influenced by the learning they experienced through their involvement in the PSA as well as their views of their discipline. Striving to embody their ideas about civic educational purpose in their undergraduate teaching, participants made and modified decisions about their courses – including desired learning outcomes or course goals, course content, pedagogy and instructional methods, and course sequence – based on their evolving beliefs about civic engagement.

As might be expected in a research university the influence of the faculty reward systems, particularly the emphasis on research in promotion and tenure, appeared to be a strong influence
on faculty decision making. Participants with long-term community-partnerships and those actively engaging their students in community-based learning were already tenured. Tenure-track participants (as well as their tenured counterparts) believed that by spending time involving students in civic engagement and public scholarship projects, junior faculty reduced the amount of time they spent on research and publication and thus jeopardized their chances for tenure and promotion. As a result, many untenured participants indicated that they were settling for focusing their teaching on fostering students’ civic capacity (their awareness of civic issues); these actions were “laying groundwork” for courses that would include actual engagement in civic activities that they would design and teach after earning tenure.

The institutional context influenced PSA newcomers in particular, as they made decisions about how much time and energy to focus on their teaching for civic engagement. For many participants in this study, however, the institution’s mission as a public land-grant university suggested a supportive context for civic engagement and public scholarship. This support was sometimes viewed as hypothetical at best as some of the study participants questioned the level of the university’s commitment to its land-grant mission.

The emergence of the faculty reward system as an influence on course planning is not surprising given the mission of the institution that served as the setting for this study, but does suggest a modification to the Contextual Filters Model, which did not explicitly identify faculty incentives and rewards as a contextual influence on faculty as they plan courses. Connections with agencies and organizations in the communities surrounding the university were additional salient contextual influences on course planning not identified in the Contextual Filters Model. The mission, needs, and activities of these organizations with which faculty sought to partner in order to provide students with civic engagement activities shaped course goals, instructional approaches,
assignments, and how course sessions were sequenced. The numbers of service-learning and civic engagement courses have grown enormously since the research that informed the development of the Contextual Filters Model was conducted, suggesting that modified model of course planning may be needed for these types of courses.

Overall, the premises of the contextual filters model were supported by the findings. Individual faculty described how their prior experiences and personal beliefs interacted with their beliefs about education to influence their decisions about how and what to teach. Beliefs about the place of civic education and public scholarship in participants’ also influenced course planning — although in different ways depending on how participants assessed support for civic engagement in their academic field. Those who did not view their fields of study as supporting this engagement were, accordingly, more cautious about their involvement.

The local (institutional) context also strongly influenced the decisions participants made about their courses, in keeping with the premises of the model. The research setting and the focus on civic engagement as a learning outcome for students, however, revealed influences that were not particularly strong in the studies from which the contextual filters model was derived: institutional mission, reward structures, and the influence of local community characteristics and needs. In addition, the study suggested that there is more interaction among the content and context influences than specified in the original model. The model portrays content influences as stable and unidirectional but this study suggested that professional development (a contextual influence) can affect faculty members’ beliefs about the purposes of education (a content influence), suggesting that a more dynamic model of course planning is needed.

I conclude this dissertation by offering for a series of propositions for theory development and recommendations for future research based on the findings of this study. The
five propositions for theory development are represented in a revised conceptual framework and focus on contextual influences including the PSA, institutional mission, and faculty reward structures as well as the influence of community characteristics and needs on faculty course decisions. Recommendations for future research focus on continuing to test the revised contextual filters model in a variety of institutional contexts and also suggest a revised model is needed for civic and service-learning courses that engage community partners to provide learning experiences for students.

Suggestions for ways for colleges and universities to encourage faculty members to teach for civic capacity and engagement and to enhance their learning to teach for civic purposes are offered in the form of five recommendations for institutional practice: 1) create faculty learning communities like the PSA to provide professional development opportunities for interested faculty; 2) prioritize civic engagement in institutional mission statements, strategic plans, and the curriculum; 3) recognize and reward teaching for civic purposes; 4) develop and enhance community partnerships to facilitate civic engagement activities on campus; and 5) create opportunities for graduate students preparing to be faculty members to consider their views of their academic fields and how these align with civic educational purposes. Two additional recommendations focus on the development of effective institutional policies related to faculty hiring and promotion and tenure processes for faculty engaged in teaching for civic purposes.
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CHAPTER 1: 
INTRODUCTION, BACKGROUND, AND PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY

*Democracy has to be born anew in each generation and education is its midwife.*
– John Dewey (1916)

Civic engagement is framed in the United States largely in terms of crisis; concerns repeatedly surface in both the media and research literature regarding low voter turnout, diminishing civic and political knowledge, and the widespread political apathy of 18 to 25 year olds. Crisis or not, civic engagement is inexorably tied to the American democratic way of life. If democracy is to flourish for generations to come, then, as Dewey suggests, our colleges and universities must play a significant role in building student civic capacity.

In this chapter, I define and present the problem of youth civic disengagement, highlight higher education’s historical and renewed commitment to education for democracy, and review the role of postsecondary faculty members in integrating civic learning outcomes into their undergraduate courses and teaching practices. I then discuss the purpose of this study – to explore how individual faculty members strive to teach for civic capacity and engagement and how their participation in a campus-based faculty development group influences that teaching – and explain its significance.

**Defining Civic Engagement & Capacity**

While civic engagement can be defined by associated values, activities, actors, and outcomes (Battistoni, 2002), researchers and theorists tend to rely on behavioral categories to describe the ways in which individuals are – or are not – civically engaged. For example, Keeter, Zukin, Andolina, and Jenkins’ (2002) “19 Indicators of Civic Engagement” are comprised entirely of the civic and political actions of youth including electoral activities, political engagement, volunteerism, and membership in civic organizations.
Other definitions of civic engagement advance specific outcomes of civic participation, such as social change or cross-cultural understanding. For example, Jacoby (2004) and the University of Maryland defined civic engagement as:

a heightened sense of responsibility to one’s communities that includes a wide range of activities, including developing civic sensitivity, participation in building civil society, and benefiting the common good. Civic engagement encompasses the notions of global citizenship and interdependence where individuals – as citizens of their communities, their nations, and the world – are empowered as agents of positive social change for a more democratic world. (p. 10)

Such outcomes of civic engagement – e.g., “positive social change” – are laudable. They begin, however, with the assumption that individuals – specifically, faculty and administrators in colleges and universities – share common interpretations of civic engagement as an educational goal. There is little empirical support for this assumption; Richard Battistoni (2002), for example, demonstrated a disparity among how faculty members in various disciplines conceptualize civic engagement. Research on civic engagement efforts in higher education, then, should forgo normative definitions – at least until we have a better understanding of how to do this in different disciplines – and seek instead to understand how faculty members conceptualize civic engagement across a variety of disciplinary and institutional contexts.

For the purpose of this study, civic engagement is defined as one’s active participation in the civic or political life of a community. I use it in this study as interchangeable with the term community engagement and as inclusive of, but not synonymous with, political engagement. A civically engaged individual may vote, participate in a community organization, volunteer in a local soup kitchen, write a letter to the editor of a newspaper, protest, boycott or “buycott,”\(^1\) petition a public official, or join a political campaign.

\(^1\) A “buycott,” is the opposite of a “boycott;” rather than avoiding purchasing a product to send a message, consumers buy products from companies with philosophies, missions, or policies (e.g., environmental, political, social) which the consumer endorses.
In keeping with Dewey’s admonition that democracy must be consistently recreated and that education has a key role to play in its renewal, civic engagement should be informed by education. The concrete actions upon which our democracy depends – informed acts of sustained civic engagement – are largely dependent upon the civic capacities of individual actors. Civic capacity, can be understood as a citizen’s skills (e.g., critical thinking, communication), knowledge of democratic and community concepts (e.g., balance of power) and processes (e.g., how to register to vote), agency (an individual’s sense of self-efficacy as a democratic citizen), and personal, emotional, ethical, and/or moral commitment to acting for the common good (see for example, Boyte, 2008; Kahne & Westheimer, 2003; Kirlin, 2003). Education plays a pivotal role in the development of civic capacity – evidence indicates that increased civic knowledge and participation correlate with increases in education (Levine, 2006). As such, education appears to act as a critical catalyst for informed and sustained civic engagement.

**Civic Engagement & Higher Education**

Proponents of civic engagement emphasize U.S. higher education’s historic civic and democratic mission as grounds for further efforts to address the civic engagement “crisis” through campus-based curricular and co-curricular initiatives (e.g., Boyte & Kari, 1999; Giroux & Giroux, 2004; Stanton, 2007). While in college, individuals appear to develop dispositions toward, habits of, and the capacity for civic engagement that may persist throughout their lives (Alwin, Cohen, & Newcomb, 1991; Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont, & Stephens, 2003; Levine, 2007; Loeb, 1994; Jennings, 2002; McAdam, 1988, 1989; Newcomb, Koenig, Flacks, & Warwick, 1967; Plutzer, 2002; Shulman 2003). In fact, college students and graduates are more likely to engage in most acts of civic engagement than their non-college going peers (Dote, Cramer, Dietz, & Grimm, 2006; Levine, 2006; Lopez & Elrod, 2006; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). The

---

2 Research indicates that civic knowledge is the strongest predictor of youth voting – increased knowledge correlates with an increased likelihood to vote in political elections (Torney-Purta, 2002).
undergraduate experience may be important, in part, because many people are first able to participate in local, state, and national elections as full-fledged citizens while in college. Both of these rationales—institutional mission and individual development—are relevant to examinations of civic engagement in postsecondary settings.

Institutions of higher education frequently invoke civic engagement as a key element of their missions (Morphew & Hartley, 2006). Public and private institutions attest to the value they place on “service” to community and instilling in students a sense of “civic duty.” The common sense of purpose that such statements can evoke may serve to motivate increased institutional actions aimed at alleviating the current “crisis” in youth civic engagement. In fact, a large number of institutions have taken direct steps toward institutionalizing civic education on their campuses. More than 1,100 colleges and universities have partnered with Campus Compact3 to incorporate a community service ethos on their campuses.

Other colleges and universities are institutionalizing civic engagement through their curricula. For example, Portland State University, whose motto is “Let Knowledge Serve the City,” instituted a university-wide service-learning4 requirement as the core of its commitment to furthering the civic engagement of its students and faculty. At California State University, Monterey Bay, civic engagement is a core campus mission and a graduation requirement in the form of specific civic-learning outcomes, topical course work, and service-learning classes which are integrated into general-education requirements and students’ coursework in their majors (Driscoll, 2008). Other institutions (e.g., The Pennsylvania State University, The University of

---

3 Campus Compact, founded in 1985, is a non-profit organization dedicated to advancing “the public purposes of colleges and universities by deepening their ability to improve community life and to educate students for civic and social responsibility” (Campus Compact, n.d., ¶ 5).

4 Service-learning is defined as “a credit-bearing, educational experience in which students participate in an organized service activity that meets identified community needs and reflect on the service activity in such a way as to gain further understanding of course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of civic responsibility” (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996, p. 222). For further information on Portland State University’s unique civic-engagement oriented undergraduate curriculum, see White (1994).
California Los Angeles, Wagner College) have developed interdisciplinary minors or certificates in civic engagement (for more examples, see Hoy & Meisel, 2008). Most institutions are involved in more episodic initiatives such as federally-mandated celebrations of Constitution Day (September 17th) or voter-registration and other – often isolated – curricular or co-curricular initiatives.

In 2005 the Carnegie Foundation for the advancement of Teaching, with input from Campus Compact, Campus Community Partnerships for Health, and the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges among other non-profit higher education organizations, launched a new, and voluntary, “community engagement” classification for colleges and universities (Driscoll, 2006, 2008). Schools selected as community-engaged institutions can be classified for their “curricular engagement” or their “outreach and partnerships,” or both. A total of 196 institutions were awarded these distinctions over the course of two application cycles in 2006 and 2008, respectively. This elective classification is intended to “encourage a reflective inquiry and self-assessment process” for colleges and universities, and to “affirm good work while urging even better” institutional efforts to engage students, faculty, and staff in civic engagement efforts.

Regardless of the specific methods of promoting civic engagement, there is a growing trend in the prevalence of civic engagement as an intended student learning outcome. Existing research indicates that hands-on, active, and experiential learning pedagogies (e.g., service-learning, community-based research) are “high-impact educational practices” (Kuh, 2008) – practices which increase student retention and learning – that teach important facets of civic capacity and engagement (Astin & Sax, 1998; Ehrlich, 1998, 2000; Strand, Marullo, Cutforth, Stoecker, & Donohue, 2003). Manuals and guidebooks serve to demystify these teaching approaches by

---

5 The National Association for State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC) changed its name to the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities or APLU on March 30, 2009. I still refer to it as NASULGC, however, as all discussion of the organization in this study refers to initiatives and publications that pre-date the adoption of its new name.
providing “how-to” instructions for faculty members who frequently lack basic pedagogical training (Golde, Walker, & Associates, 2006; Wulff, Austin, & Associates, 2004). Existing research also reveals some of the personal characteristics and experiences that motivate faculty members to incorporate civic engagement into their work (see for example, Colbeck & Weaver, 2006; Janke & Colbeck, 2006). Little research, however, has focused on how faculty members purposefully incorporate civic learning outcomes into their course designs and teaching practices.

In this study, I explore how individual faculty members – who comprise the backbone of any successful attempt to ingrain civic education into college and university classrooms – integrate civic engagement-focused content or pedagogy into their undergraduate courses. Although I concentrate this study on individual faculty members, I also examine the impact of participation in a multidisciplinary group, itself focused on civic engagement in the form of public scholarship, on faculty thinking about civic engagement. (I describe this group in detail later in this chapter.) Findings from this study contribute to the growing literature on civic engagement in higher education by 1) expanding its focus to the faculty role in promoting the development of civic capacity and engagement through the formal curriculum, and by 2) furthering our understanding of the influence of individual beliefs, educational goals, and a supportive context (e.g., the multidisciplinary group) on faculty members’ course-related behaviors and attitudes. Findings from this study may also contribute to campus-based educational practice efforts by suggesting best practices for fostering student civic capacity and civic engagement through the curriculum.

**Youth Civic Disengagement**

Though rooted in historical conceptions of the relationship between democracy and education (Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont, & Stephens, 2003; Dewey, 1916, 1927; Jefferson, 1820; McCullough, 2001), renewed interest in civic engagement can be attributed, in part, to concerns about decreasing levels of civic knowledge and participation among American “youth” ages 18 to
25 or 29 (Flanagan, 2003; Gibson, 2001; Levine, 2007; Sherrod, 2005). Despite high levels of episodic volunteerism among high school and college students (Hollander, 2007; National Conference on Citizenship, 2006), such community involvement does not appear to consistently translate into deeper engagement (e.g., voting) in the civic or political arenas (Baer, 1993; Dote, Cramer, Dietz, & Grimm, 2006; Gray, Ondaatje, & Geschwind et al., 1999; Zaff, Moore, Papillo, & Williams, 2003). Skepticism aimed at politicians and politics more generally (Creighton & Harwood, 1993; Galston, 2001) may explain this phenomenon as young adults instead direct their energies toward non-profit and civic organizational means of enacting change in their communities (Harvard University Institute of Politics, 2001; Higher Education Research Institute HERI, 2004). Many American youth “characterize their volunteering as an alternative to official politics, which they see as corrupt, ineffective, and unrelated to their deeper ideals” (Galston, 2001, p. 220). Studies also indicate that levels of social trust and knowledge of political processes are also declining (Bennett & Rademacher, 1997; Putnam, 1995; Rahn & Transue, 1998; Uslaner, 2005).

Concerns about civic disengagement arise, in part, from concerns about “generational replacement” (Delli Carpini, 1989, 2005; Flanagan & Syvertsen, 2005; Zukin, Keeter, Andolina, Jenkins, & Delli Carpini, 2006). This sociological theory refers to the “gradual dying off of older age cohorts and their substitution in the population with younger ones” (Delli Carpini, 2005, p. 282). Generational replacement theorists believe that one’s youth civic participation level predicts one’s subsequent adult participation level. Recent concerns are fueled by studies suggesting that current U.S. generational cohorts are differentiated according to their civic and political attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors (Delli Carpini, 2005). Later-born cohorts are noted for not following political news as closely and for being less likely to vote than their predecessors – both currently and as compared to these earlier-born generations in their youth (Delli Carpini, 2005; Keeter et al.,
The later-born cohorts also express less interest in politics and report lower levels of political-efficacy (Keeter et al., 2002). Conversely, the later-born cohorts are more tolerant of diversity and more accepting of government’s activist role – two attitudes, which according to Delli Carpini (2005) and others (e.g., Keeter et al., 2002), are important indicators of civic health.

Generational theorists argue that as the later-born, less-engaged generations replace the earlier-born, more involved generations, our nation’s social capital – the community connective tissue that supports positive, collective identities and important norms of reciprocity on which democracies depend – will dramatically decline (Putnam, 1995, 2000). These “connections among individuals – social networks and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arises from them” are referred to as social capital (Putnam, 2000, p. 19). Putnam, believing that trust is essential to social capital and good citizenship, suggests that,

Other things being equal, people who trust their fellow citizens volunteer more often, contribute more readily to charities, participate more often in politics and community organizations, serve more readily on juries, give blood more frequently, comply more fully with their tax obligations, are more tolerant of minority views, and display many other forms of civic virtue...In short, people who trust others are all-round good citizens, and those more engaged in community life are both more trusting and more trustworthy. (pp. 136-137)

As such, social capital is a public, rather than a private good (Coleman, 1988).

From this perspective, higher education for democratic engagement can be construed as an investment in social capital and, thus, an investment in the public good and democratic society. Print and Coleman (2003) argue that social capital has four primary components as it relates to citizenship education, “it resides within groups; it involves civic virtues such as trust, tolerance, cooperation and civility; it requires engaged active participants; and, fourth, it has a mutual benefit

---

6 Negligible differences exist between the cohorts in terms of volunteering or boycotting.

7 Social change – such as shifts in civic engagement patterns over time – is not only affected by the replacement of generations or birth cohorts (historical time), but also by aging and period effects (biographical time) (Alwin & McCammon, 2003). The increases in many indicators of civic engagement immediately following the terrorist attacks on the U.S. on September 11, 2001 are an example of a period effect.

8 Although Putnam’s methods and subsequent conclusions have been criticized (see for example Print & Coleman, 2003), social capital remains a concept closely tied to civic education.
for individuals and the group” (p. 126). According to Putnam’s theory, by investing in social capital via civic education, students will become more civically engaged.

**Higher Education’s Response to Calls for Engagement**

In light of such concerns, many stakeholders – including policy makers, educational and political researchers, and non-profit organizations – have appealed to college and university faculty and administrators to reprioritize the civic missions and public purposes of their institutions (e.g., Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2002; Boyte, 2000; Campus Compact, 1999, 2000; Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1991; Checkoway, 2001; Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont, & Stephens, 2003; Ehrlich, 2000; Levine, 1994; National Education Goals Panel, 1992; Schneider 2001). Eighty-seven percent of respondents from a survey of U.S. citizens who were randomly selected believe that it is “important” or “essential” that students learn “responsibilities of citizenship, such as voting and volunteering” in college (Immerwahr & Johnson, 2007, p. 11). In reports such as the *Wingspread Declaration on Renewing the Civic Mission of the American Research University* (Boyte & Hollander, 1999), *From Inspiration to Participation: A Review of Perspectives on Youth Civic Engagement* (Gibson, 2001), and *Calling the Question: Is Higher Education Ready to Commit to Community Engagement* (Brukardt, Holland, Percy, & Zimpher, 2004), stakeholders have called on institutions of higher education not only to instill in students democratic values and a sense of civic responsibility, but also to help students translate these ideas and beliefs into concrete behaviors by becoming meaningfully engaged in their communities (see also, London, 2003).

National associations of higher education, collectives of college and university presidents, and individual institutions have responded affirmatively to these charges. A report sponsored by the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (now the Association for Public and Land-Grant Universities), for example, suggests that it is critical that postsecondary
institutions create “learning environments that meet the civic ends of public higher education by preparing students to lead and participate in a democratic society” (Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities, 2000, p. 10). Many organizations now sponsor initiatives to encourage researchers to study the issues highlighted in these reports; they also fund campus initiatives promoting innovative solutions to the problems. These programs include The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching’s “Project on Higher Education and the Development of Moral and Civic Responsibility,” Campus Compact’s Youth Vote and Center for Liberal Education and Civic Engagement Initiatives, and the Association of American Colleges and Universities “Liberal Education and Global Citizenship: The Arts of Democracy.” Involving more than 200 institutions, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), along with The New York Times, sponsors the American Democracy Project, a campus-based endeavor designed to “produce graduates who understand and are committed to engaging in meaningful actions as citizens in a democracy” (AASCU, n.d.). In 2000, 527 college and university presidents – of institutions ranging from Harvard University to Miami-Dade Community College – signed a declaration dedicating their institutions to citizenship education, calling on their counterparts to “effectively educate our students to be good citizens” (Campus Compact, 2000, p. 2).

Responses to such calls to action, however, have been piecemeal and lacking in theoretical grounding. Moreover, commitment to a mission of civic engagement does not always translate directly into educational practice (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching & CIRCLE, 2006; Kezar, 2006; Kezar, Chambers, & Burkhardt, 2005). United States higher education has recently begun to revisit this mission in earnest, acknowledging its roots and seeking meaningful actions to promote civic engagement. An historical review of the civic purposes of higher education helps explain the current revitalization in research on civic engagement (see for example CIRCLE’s efforts), the mounting interest of various disciplinary
associations in civic engagement, and concerns regarding faculty training and rewards structures which may preclude civic engagement-focused content and pedagogy.\(^9\)

**Historical Perspective**

Throughout the history of American higher education, civic engagement has been interpreted and incorporated in its mission according to three prominent means: 1) direct education of students for democratic citizenship, 2) dissemination of knowledge to the general public, and 3) institutional engagement on the part of faculty and students geared toward public problem solving. These three strands parallel the tripartite mission—teaching, research, and service—of postsecondary education. Just as teaching, research, and service have been variously emphasized depending on time and institutional type, so too are the three strands of civic engagement variously emphasized. And, just as teaching is now enjoying a resurgence in attention from various government entities and accrediting bodies (see, for example, the Spellings Report, 2006), enhancing college student civic capacity and engagement is being similarly emphasized.

Education and democracy have long enjoyed a complicated, reciprocal relationship; each allows the other, in turn, to flourish. In the 1600s and 1700s, the American colonial college served to prepare a relatively elite cadre of young White men for lives as civic leaders (Geiger, 2005; Rudolph, 1962). A classical, liberal education, namely a prescribed curriculum consisting of the *trivium* (logic, grammar, and rhetoric) and *quadrivium* (arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music) in addition to religion and ethics was presumed to serve society by providing students with a liberal education (Rudolph, 1977).

---

\(^9\) See, for example, the American Political Science Association's 2004 report, *Democracy at Risk: Renewing the Political Science of Citizenship*, The American Historical Association's consideration of civic engagement and citizenship in its published report on the preparation of future historians *The Education of Historians for the Twenty-first Century* (Bender, Katz, & Palmer, 2004), and similar efforts by the American Psychological Association and the American Sociological Association.
America’s founding fathers, particularly John Adams and Thomas Jefferson, believed one of the crucial roles of schools – including institutions of higher education – was to foster the civic education of a democratic citizenry (Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont, & Stephens, 2003). Jefferson (1820) famously wrote,

I know of no safe depository of the ultimate powers of society but the people themselves, and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them, but to inform their discretion by education.

Believing, as Jefferson did, that a strong democracy depends on the thoughtful participation of its citizens (Reeher & Cammarano, 1997), John Adams, the author of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, specifically addressed citizenship education (Colby et al., 2003). Asserting that “wisdom and knowledge, as well as virtue” among the citizenry are “necessary for the preservation of their rights and liberties,” Adams charged “the university at Cambridge” (Harvard) with fostering “the principles of humanity and general benevolence, public and private charity…social affections, and generous sentiments among the people” (McCullough, 2001, p. 223 as cited in Colby et al., 2003, p. vii). Jefferson, Adams, and others believed that citizens in a democracy require an education that teaches them their rights and responsibilities (Kahne & Westheimer, 2003). Citizens need to learn why their participation is essential and how they might substantively contribute to their communities. Perhaps more essentially, they must develop a sense of self-efficacy, the sense that their knowledge and participation matters for the success of the nation.

The mutually constitutive relationship between education and democracy emerged as an emblematic characteristic of American higher education. The Yale Report of 1828 reemphasized the important role of a comprehensive and compulsory classical curriculum (see above) in endowing a student with important foundational knowledge as well as the capacities of critical thinking, written and oral communication, and analysis necessary for democratic citizenship. A
liberal education “can hardly fail to imbue his mind with the principle of liberty, to inspire the liveliest patriotism, and to excite to noble and generous action, and [is] therefore peculiarly adapted to the American youth” (p. 31).

Following his prolonged visit to the United States between 1831 and 1832, French political theorist Alexis de Tocqueville (1835) commented on the prominent role of education in the fledgling democracy;

It cannot be doubted that in the United States the instruction of the people powerfully contributes to support the democratic republic. That will always be so, I think, where the instruction which teaches the mind is not separated from the education which is responsible for the mores.

But I would not exaggerate this advantage and am very far from thinking that to teach men to read and write is enough to make them good citizens immediately. (p. 304, format original)

de Tocqueville's sentiments echo the intentions of Jefferson and Adams. Although these three men called attention to the importance of education to democracy, none of them elaborated on the roles of scholars or the creation of new knowledge (research) in strengthening the democratic process.

The Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890 forged yet another conceptual link between democracy and education. In the resulting land-grant colleges – “democracy’s colleges” – service to community via practical and applied education and research (specifically focusing on the agricultural and mechanical arts) began to play a prominent role in higher education (Geiger, 1986; Nevins, 1962). The act provided each state with parcels of land on which to construct, or from the profits of which to establish, institutions of higher education in order to “promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes on the several pursuits and professions in life” (Section 4). These so called land-grant institutions were charged, among other obligations, to educate citizens (and not merely those of its highest social echelons) and to do outreach – to disseminate new knowledge to the public in order for it to be more broadly applied. Hence, the
role of higher education in a democracy expanded from teaching the skills and attitudes required for civic life and a democratically-run government to doing work that is meaningful to the populace, including creating new knowledge and applying that knowledge to solve public problems.

Along with the Smith-Lever Act of 1914, which introduced “cooperative extension” efforts – regional offices and agents charged with sharing research-based knowledge with the general public – to the Morrill land-grant institutions, the “Wisconsin Idea” of the early 20th century asserted that a primary mission of American public institutions of higher education is to serve the public good via research, teaching, service, and the dissemination of knowledge beyond the boundaries of the “ivory tower” (Stark, 1995). Although it was not a land-grant institution, but rather a mirror of the German university with its strong emphasis on research, Johns Hopkins University epitomized the connection between higher education and democratic society that de Tocqueville (1835) observed. In his inaugural address as the first President of Johns Hopkins University, Daniel Coit Gilman (1876), declared that Hopkins’ founding,

means a wish for less misery among the poor, less ignorance in the schools, less bigotry in the Temple, less suffering in the hospital, less fraud in business, less folly in politics; and among other things it means... more security in property, more health in cities, more virtue in the country, more wisdom in legislation, more intelligence, more happiness, more religion. (¶ 20)

Gilman believed that American universities – in addition to advancing research and learning – existed to serve larger public purposes. Some 30 years later, Harvard president Charles Eliot (1908) expressed a similar sentiment, asserting that “most of the American institutions of higher education are filled with the democratic spirit. Teachers and students alike are profoundly moved by the desire to serve the democratic community” (pp. 227-228).

Throughout the first half of the 20th century, educational philosopher John Dewey articulated a series of arguments (see for example, Democracy and Education, 1916, and The Public and
Its Problems, 1927; see also Benson, Harkavy, & Puckett, 2007) regarding the American educational system’s responsibility to democracy and civic purposes. Dewey (1916) believed the ultimate purpose of education to be the cultivation of educated democratic citizens – citizens equipped to apply their skills in service to society – through an experiential, hands-on pedagogy. He asserted that education must “equip [students] with the attitudes and habits of action that will make their understanding and insight practically effective” (Dewey, 1939, p. 695).

Dewey’s ideas about the important link between education and democracy influenced the authors of the Harvard’s 1945 report General Education in a Free Society (The Committee on the Objectives of a General Education in Free Society, 1945). Better known as the Harvard Redbook, the authors of this report promulgated a vision of general education as “that part of a student’s whole education which looks first of all to his life as a responsible human being and citizen” (p. 51). They also supported student specialization – in a “major” or field of focused study – as the vocation-oriented counterpart to general education which, together, formed a cohesive educational whole intended to prepare graduates to contribute to “modern democratic society” (p. 52).

In 1947, the President’s Commission on Higher Education, charged with “defining the responsibilities of colleges and universities in American democracy” (Zook, 1947, p. 758), published the report Higher Education for American Democracy (alternatively called the Zook Report for the Commission’s chair George F. Zook, then president of the American Council on Education). The report tackled the problem of expanding access to higher education to increasing numbers and groups of students (e.g., Jewish and Black students) – a means of advancing the promise of America’s democratic experiment through extending opportunities for education (and thus for informed participation) to formerly excluded groups of citizens. The authors also addressed the need for more general education, commenting that “Too often [a student] is
"educated" in that he has acquired competence in some particular occupation, yet falls short of that human wholeness and civic conscience which the cooperative activities of citizenship require” (p. 771). This sentiment is reflective of the reality of the civic engagement “crisis” and its present-day relationship to higher education; only recently has education for democratic capacity building – education for the public good – reemerged as a priority in higher education.

Also in the wake of World War II, research universities began to emphasize their role as public knowledge producers (Geiger, 2004). Faculty members served roles on government committees and projects as public intellectuals. Research universities became closely tied to the federal government – both in terms of its growing reliance on federal monies to fund their research projects, centers, and laboratories, but also in terms of providing research that could be applied to society’s needs and problems (Geiger, 2004). Faculty members’ were encouraged to shape their research around societal needs and to contribute their expertise to public problems. The GI Bill, passed following World War II, encouraged veterans to attend college and also shaped the role of higher education in American democracy. Rather than educating solely the elite for leadership roles in society, as was the norm prior to the war, faculty members found that they were educating men and women from a diverse range of economic and social stations and expectations for employment, again furthering access to higher education as the Zook report intended. Both of these changes – a research emphasis that focuses on solving public problems and a diverse student body – are aspects of higher education’s historic civic role.

In the 1960s emphasis shifted dramatically. Disenchanted and disenfranchised students, concerned about issues such as the civil rights movement and campus research sponsored by the military as well as energized by opposition to the war in Vietnam, sought to enact policy change (on campuses and nationally) by expressing their political voice. Student activists decried higher education curricula for being too abstract and detached from the political and social concerns of
the public realm (Bastedo, 2005). The proliferation of service-learning courses and pedagogy in U.S. institutions of higher education resulted, in part, from these 1960s demands for relevance and a curriculum of social change (Annette, 2005; Jacoby, 1996). The issues raised by the student activists of the 1960s have been rearticulated today in some of the calls for colleges and universities to reconsider, reconceptualize, and reemphasize education for civic capacity and engagement.

**Contemporary Responses**

Today, there is renewed interest in higher education’s role in educating students to participate as informed and active citizens in society. This interest is apparent, for example, by the establishment of organizations like Campus Compact and the publication of reports and books, such as those described below. Beginning with the foundation of Campus Compact in 1985 and culminating, thus far, in a long laundry-list of reports and curricular responses, institutions have begun to pay closer attention to the ways in which they enact their mission statements and their responsibility to prepare students for lives of responsible citizenship. The following paragraphs provide a chronological review of some important examples of the renewed focus on civic engagement in higher education.

Established in 1985 by the Presidents of Stanford (Don Kennedy), Brown (Howard Swearer), and Georgetown (Timothy Healy) Universities, Campus Compact is “a coalition of nearly 1,100 college and university presidents – representing some 6 million students” (Campus Compact, n.d. a, ¶ 1). Campus Compact was founded in response to concerns about the increased self-absorption of “me” generation college students whose idea of curricular relevance had more to do with job placement than with the civic and political issues of concern to students in the 1960s (Campus Compact, n.d. b). Efforts by Campus Compact and others in the 1980s emphasized the role of student affairs offices and co-curricular activities in fostering college
student civic engagement through community service (Hollander, 2007). Over the course of the last two decades, Campus Compact has served as a catalyst for the development of a “service ethos” in higher education (Cohen, 2008, p. 149).

The Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities, in collaboration with the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC), issued a series of six “Returning to Our Roots” reports between 1995 and 2000 intended to examine the role of public higher education in the U.S. The reports emphasized, in part, the role of public institutions as responsible for educating informed and engaged citizens and in public-problem solving. They culminated in “a call for a renewal of the covenant, the partnership, between the public and the public’s universities” (NASULGC, 2001, p. 7).

Also interested in advancing efforts to educate students for citizenships, The Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) published a 2004 report Taking Responsibility for the Quality of the Baccalaureate Degree in which civic knowledge and engagement, as well as personal and social responsibility, intercultural knowledge, and ethical reasoning and action are highlighted as essential learning outcomes for college students. As recently as 2006, however, Harvard University President Emeritus Derek Bok, citing empirical evidence from numerous studies and a persistent gap between word and deed, lamented higher education’s failure to adequately prepare its students for thoughtful, engaged citizenship (Bok, 2006).

As a result of these initiatives, reports, and commentaries, many institutions of higher education are now focusing considerable rhetoric and resources on creating and sustaining curricular (and co-curricular) initiatives designed to foster college student civic knowledge and capacities. In the curricular realm, two general approaches to integrating civic learning outcomes into the curriculum have surfaced, both of which require a sustained commitment to civic educational purposes and increased pedagogical repertoire on the part of faculty. The first ad hoc
approach entails the addition of civic learning outcomes to existing program goals and course syllabi in various disciplines. These efforts vary, with civic outcomes addressed by individual faculty in isolated courses. The second, more intentional, approach involves the creation of a variety of new academic endeavors that conceptually integrate civic education into the college curriculum. These efforts include new courses (either required or elective), undergraduate minors (e.g., Penn State’s CIVCOM minor, Portland State’s Civic Leadership minor), certificates (e.g., Wagner College’s Civic Engagement Certificate), or general education programs (see Harvard’s 2007 Report of the Task Force on General Education). Some stakeholders express concern that such elective courses or other degree options might serve only to “preach to the choir,” rather than systematically expose college students to civic engagement.

Both the ad hoc and intentional approaches incorporate a variety of pedagogies that typically emphasize student engagement in the public milieu. For example, service-learning – a pedagogy that “combines community service with classroom instruction, focusing on critical, reflective thinking as well as personal and civic responsibility” (Garcia & Robinson, 2005, p. 1) – has been shown to heighten student civic engagement (Astin & Sax, 1998; Astin, Vogelgesang, Misa, Anderson, Denson, Jayakumar, et al., 2006; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). With mounting evidence suggesting that service-learning promotes many positive cognitive (e.g., critical thinking skills, disciplinary knowledge) and affective (e.g., self-efficacy) learning outcomes (Astin & Sax, 1998; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Flannery & Ward, 1999; Giles & Eyler, 1994), growing numbers of faculty are integrating service-learning into their teaching repertoire (Campus Compact, 2007; Garcia & Robinson, 2005). Some faculty members, however, express concern that there is insufficient time for such approaches given increasing accountability for student disciplinary learning outcomes and other research and professional service-related roles and responsibilities (Astin & Sax, 1998; Balazadeh, 1996). Research also suggests that there have been
few advances in the arena of pedagogical practices aimed at promoting engaged citizenship (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching & CIRCLE, 2006).

If it is indeed a responsibility and goal of postsecondary education to enhance college students’ civic capacities, further study is needed to identify how civic learning outcomes are addressed in the college curriculum. Specifically, we must examine how faculty members in different academic fields incorporate civic learning outcomes in meaningful ways in their courses – as well as what contributes to successful efforts to activate higher education’s civic mission within the curriculum.

**Role and Preparation of Faculty**

Faculty members have a critical role to play in ensuring the future civic engagement of college students (AASCU, 2005; Ferraiolo, 2004; Giroux & Giroux, 2004; Hollander, 2007; Stanton, 1990). Ferraiolo (2004) suggests that “by bringing contemporary issues and problems into the curriculum and into students’ college experience, faculty members can both transmit content knowledge and inspire a sense of civic responsibility and ownership for community problems” (p. 8). Giroux (2006) insists, further, that:

If higher education is to be a crucial sphere for creating citizens equipped to understand others, exercise their freedoms, and ask questions regarding the basic assumptions that govern democratic political life, academics will have to assume their responsibility as citizen-scholars, take critical positions, relate their work to larger social issues, offer students knowledge, debate, and dialogue about pressing social problems, and provide the conditions for students to have hope and believe that civic life not only matters but that they can make a difference in shaping it. (p. 74)

Faculty members, however, frequently complete graduate school insufficiently prepared for their roles as teachers in their given disciplines (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1977; Golde, Walker, & Associates, 2006; Wulff, Austin, & Associates, 2004). The vast majority, thus, have limited knowledge of the kinds of pedagogical and curricular approaches Ferraiolo and others (e.g., Ehrlich, 1998) recommend. Instead, they are prepared to conduct
research and inquiry in their given fields and to engage in careers of lifelong learning. Those few faculty members who teach civic content and develop teaching strategies that foster civic engagement have usually learned to do so on their own or through on-the-job professional development.

**Faculty Commitments**

In the 2004 report *New Directions for Civic Engagement: University Avenue meets Main Street*, Ferraiolo suggests that “the two strands of undergraduate education, disciplinary or ‘academic’ and civic, are much more powerful when they are creatively combined” (p. 55). She concludes that incorporating civic learning outcomes into courses does not compromise more narrow disciplinary goals, but, rather, enhances overall retention of course material. This conclusion is in keeping with other research suggesting that deeper learning occurs when course materials are presented in an active manner and tied to real-world problems (Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, 2000; Dewey, 1916; Entwistle, 2008).

A challenge to the incorporation of civic outcomes arises because faculty beliefs about the purposes and goals of higher education vary considerably. A 2004 survey of approximately 38,000 fulltime faculty members with undergraduate teaching responsibilities at more than 400 institutions indicates that, as a whole, postsecondary faculty believe that developing students’ “ability to think critically” and mastery of “knowledge in a discipline” are very important or essential teaching goals (99 percent and 94 percent, respectively) (Vogelgesang, 2005). Just over 60 percent of respondents, however, rated the goal of “prepar[ing] students for responsible citizenship” as very important or essential. Faculty may be taking their lead from their institutions; less than half viewed their home college or university as committed to goals essential to civic engagement. Only about 40 percent reported that their institutions prioritize “creat[ing] and sustain[ing] partnerships with surrounding communities.” Approximately 30 percent indicated
that their college or university sought “to help students learn how to bring about change in American society” or “to provide resources for faculty to engage in community-based teaching/research.”

In the absence of clear institutional missions, faculty members committed to civic goals must take up the cause of civic education themselves. Hollander (2007) suggests that:

The involvement of faculty in preparing students for their role as active citizens is one of the most significant and challenging aspects of the college civic engagement movement. It is significant because faculty are at the heart of higher education, and their involvement is essential to embedding civic learning in the academy and to increasing student understanding of the systemic causes of problems and theories of change in democratic (and nondemocratic) societies. Faculty members are key in helping students understand the social contributions to be made by every discipline. In addition, engaged pedagogy is a powerful form of teaching and learning for many students. (p. 16)

Data from the 2005 Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE) suggest that “how faculty members organize class time is generally consistent with what they say they value” (NSSE, 2005, p. 32). For example, overall, women faculty members report higher levels of commitment to active and collaborative learning practices, corresponding to their increased likelihood to utilize group activities and to lecture less (FSSE, 2005). Yet questions remain regarding why faculty members prioritize some educational goals over others and how they translate their commitments to goals like civic engagement into teaching practice.

Almost 21 percent of the approximately 40,000 postsecondary respondents to the 2004-2005 American College Teacher faculty survey reported current involvement in teaching service-learning courses (Lindholm, Szélényi, Hurtado, & Kom, 2005). Additionally, 42 percent reported collaborating with their local community in research and/or teaching, and 42 percent advise student organizations engaged in service/volunteer work (Lindholm et al., 2005b). Faculty respondents from public universities reported slightly higher rates of teaching service-learning courses and research/teaching efforts in the local community (22 percent and 45 percent,
respectively). Despite these relatively low levels of civic-engagement-oriented teaching practices, research indicates that additional faculty members may be “waiting in the wings” – ready to engage themselves and their students once it “counts” – for their colleges and universities to institutionalize support for such civic engagement efforts (Ferraiolo, 2004). Only 31 percent of faculty respondents to the American College Teacher survey believe that providing resources for faculty engagement in community-based teaching or research is an important institutional priority at their college or university (Lindholm et al., 2005). This statistic underscores the importance of providing faculty members with critical support (e.g., incorporating teaching for civic engagement and community-based research into faculty promotion and rewards structures) and resources (e.g., seminars on content and/or pedagogy, forums for discussion, and involvement in national programs and conferences) to aid them in integrating civic learning outcomes into the curriculum.

**The Public Scholarship Movement**

A grassroots effort at Penn State has attempted to address these very needs. On Penn State’s campus, the land-grant tradition is being reconceived as a pledge to do the work of the academy (teaching, research, and service) with the public in mind. Comprised primarily of Penn State University faculty members, the Public Scholarship Associates which was established in 1999, wrestles with how to integrate the various strands of faculty work (teaching, research, and service) with the three strands of education for democracy outlined above (civic education, dissemination of knowledge, and community problem-solving). In the words of one of the group’s founders, the Public Scholarship Associates is “an emerging Penn State faculty and student cohort…struggling with questions about university mission and the academy’s place in a society” (Cohen, 2006, p. 1).

Public scholarship is “the conduct of scholarly and creative work, including teaching, research, artistic performance, and service, in ways that contribute to informed engagement
in the democratic process” (Cohen, 2006, p. 506). As such, it is a philosophical response to the rising concern regarding civic apathy which advocates the intellectual engagement of the academy with civic issues and the public realm. Public scholarship conceives of a reciprocal relationship between higher education and intellectuals on the one hand, and democratic society on the other.

As an emergent educational paradigm, public scholarship embeds students in community contexts – physically or conceptually – with the intention of fostering student learning and the co-creation of new knowledge alongside faculty members. In this way, it promotes students’ engagement as critical citizens in the public sphere. Public scholarship advocates suggest institutions of higher education and their faculty members have “a duty to develop civic engagement among students with an eye on why, as well as on how” (Cohen & Yapa, 2003, p. 5).

In this sense, public scholarship is an educational philosophy akin to John Dewey’s which relies on a pedagogical approach (via tools such as undergraduate research, community-based research, and service-learning) as a means of re-imagining the relationship between higher education and community as a reciprocal one. Societal issues provide excellent “real-world” fodder for teaching and learning and draw attention to the need to educate students to envision their role as citizens to include the sustained application of their intellect and talents to social problems – not simply as annual excursions to the polls or periodic volunteer work.

The Public Scholarship Associates at Penn State meet regularly to discuss their work, advance public scholarship as a legitimate approach to faculty work (and to higher education meeting public needs), and to learn from each other through the mutual exchange of ideas. All of the participants selected for this study had participated in the Public Scholarship Associates in some way(s), and through this research explore the role of the group in influencing faculty members’ approaches to civically engaging undergraduate students in their courses.
The Case of Penn State University

The Public Scholarship Associates is only one manifestation of how teaching for civic capacity and engagement are being taken seriously at The Pennsylvania State University. Graham Spanier, President of Penn State since 1995, has been an active and outspoken champion of the civic and public purposes of higher education on campus and at a national level. In 2002 Spanier chaired the Board of Directors of the National Association of State University and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC), now the Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities (APLU). From 1998 to 2000, he led the Kellogg Commission-funded Initiative on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities which produced a series of seven “Returning to our Roots” reports concerning the public purposes of land-grant institutions, including the 1999 iteration The Engaged Institution. Under his leadership, Penn State faculty produced UniSCOPE 2000: A Multidimensional Model of Scholarship for the 21st Century (Hyman et al., 2000), a proposed model for conceptualizing and rewarding faculty teaching, research, and service in congruence with Boyer’s (1990) Scholarship Reconsidered.10 The UniSCOPE report promotes public scholarship (alternately referred to as outreach or engaged scholarship) in the form of faculty members’ research and teaching.

In 2008, Penn State was classified as a community-engaged institution by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (Aneckstein, 2009). It qualified for this voluntary classification under both categories – curricular engagement and outreach and partnerships. Penn State’s application for this recognition – and its subsequent receipt of this honor – is yet one more

10 Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate (also referred to as The Boyer Report) was released in 1990 and written by Ernest Boyer, the president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. In the report, Boyer advocated a new paradigm for faculty scholarship – expanding the dual understanding of scholarship as teaching and research to a four-part conception of the functions of scholarship: discovery, integration, application, and teaching. His work spurred conversations and debate among scholars and on U.S. campuses of higher education, leading many to adopt new promotion and tenure guidelines congruent with this new articulation of scholarly endeavors.
indication of the institution’s commitment to teaching for civic capacity and engagement and to enabling staff, faculty, and students to contribute to society in meaningful ways.

**Purpose of the Study**

In this study, I examine how faculty members at a public land-grant and research university align their undergraduate teaching practices with their implicit and/or explicit commitment to foster students’ civic capacity and engagement. Using a model of curriculum planning, as well as the lenses of sociocultural theories of learning, I explore why and how study participants incorporate civic learning outcomes into their teaching. Specifically, I focus on how faculty members design and implement undergraduate courses consistent with their personal civic commitments. This study thus addresses two research questions of theoretical and practical importance:

- How, if at all, does faculty participation in the Public Scholarship Associates – a multidisciplinary, civic-engagement-oriented faculty group – influence their teaching-related learning and/or practice?

- How, if at all, do faculty members align their undergraduate teaching practices with their implicit and/or explicit ideas about civic engagement as an educational purpose?

By asking, “How do faculty members at a research university align their undergraduate teaching practices with their implicit and/or explicit ideas about civic engagement as an educational purpose,” I seek to extend our understanding of how faculty members design courses consistent with their beliefs about educational purpose. Little research at the postsecondary level exists related to this fundamental question and the study thus contributes to the sparse empirical literature on curriculum planning and implementation in colleges and universities. The findings have theoretical implications, suggesting refinements to the contextual filters model of faculty course planning (Toombs, 1978; Stark, Lowther, Bentley, Ryan, Martens, Wren, & Shaw, 1990).
To answer the question, “How does faculty participation in the Public Scholarship Associates – a multidisciplinary, civic-engagement-oriented faculty group – influence teaching-related learning and/or practice,” I examine the influence of a specific faculty development mechanism on participants’ (a) commitment to civic engagement as an educational purpose, and (b) their learning and decision-making about undergraduate course design. These findings will contribute theoretical and practical knowledge about the role of faculty interactions on beliefs about educational goals and practices.

**Significance**

A growing consensus identifies education for civic capacity, responsibility, and engagement as an integral component of college curricula (AAC&U, 2002, 2004, 2005; Spellings, 2006). According to a national study conducted by a cadre of national higher education associations and accrediting bodies, these goals are among "a few key outcomes that all students, regardless of major or academic background, should achieve during undergraduate study" (AAC&U, 2005, p. 2). The 2006 Spellings Report on the future of U.S. higher education similarly asserts that higher education must empower students as citizens. This apparent consensus, which reflects higher education's historic mission, should be an impetus for institutions and researchers to seriously consider how faculty members are teaching for civic engagement, as well as how colleges and universities can better equip them to do so.

There is a limited body of research that explores how postsecondary faculty members plan their courses and, in particular, align their teaching practices with specific educational purposes. Stark et al.’s (1990) contextual filters model provides a framework through which to consider how college and university faculty translate their commitments to educational purposes such as civic engagement into course plans appropriate for their discipline or field and how local institutional contexts influence their course planning. By overlaying a sociocultural lens onto the
model, I emphasize the importance of examining faculty course planning as a learning process. Gherardi et al. (1998) argue that the previously dominant model of learning "which implicitly conceptualized learners as individual actors processing information or modifying their mental structures" has been replaced by "an image of learners as social beings who construct their understanding and learn from social interaction within specific socio-cultural settings" (p. 275). Examining the learning (and course planning) processes of faculty Public Scholarship Associates, including how they make sense of the tools and artifacts of the group (e.g., publications including *A Blueprint for Public Scholarship at Penn State*, 2003), is expected to have important implications for future professional development efforts aimed at assisting faculty in incorporating specific educational purposes like civic engagement into their courses.

Further exploration of the processes by which faculty members identify, examine, reflect on, and develop their course content and/or pedagogy to reflect commitments to civic engagement contribute to our understanding of faculty teaching behaviors broadly. It will also illuminate how postsecondary faculty members teach for civic purposes. In particular, the study seeks to reveal ways in which faculty members align commitments to broad educational goals that are not discipline-driven (e.g., diversity and social justice) with their disciplinary commitments and courses.

Understanding how faculty members adopt a particular educational purpose or purposes, how they translate these, implicitly or explicitly, into educational outcomes, as well as how they plan educational activities (e.g., reading, writing, problem solving) that reflect these purposes and outcomes has practical implications for both doctoral education and faculty professional development activities. Findings from this study may assist administrators and graduate educators in developing programs and activities to prepare future faculty for their teaching responsibilities. The exploration of the impact of faculty participation in a voluntary group (the Public Scholarship
Associates) may suggest low-cost, but effective ways of connecting faculty members with similar research and teaching interests in forums that provide opportunities for discussions of teaching and learning that target their interests. As more stakeholders, including regional and discipline-based accrediting bodies hold institutions and their faculty accountable for a growing array of learning outcomes, it is imperative that colleges and universities allocate scarce resources in ways that effectively prepare future faculty, and help current faculty, to teach in ways that are consistent with the historical mission of higher education and the needs of contemporary society.

**Organization of this Thesis**

In this chapter I framed the problem of teaching for civic capacity and engagement in our colleges and universities and outlined the focus of this study. Chapter 2 explores the research literature on faculty teaching, introducing the contextual filters model of faculty course planning, and sociocultural perspectives on learning, fusing the two to form the guiding conceptual framework of this study. In the third chapter, I present the research methods which guided data collection and analysis in this qualitative study. Participants are introduced in Chapter 4 and Chapters 5 and 6 contain study findings pertaining to the first and second research questions, respectively. Finally, in Chapter 7 I offer recommendations for theory development, future research, and institutional policy and practice with regard to teaching for civic capacity and engagement.
CHAPTER 2:
LITERATURE REVIEW AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Civic education typically takes place within the context of an academic field; a political science professor requires students to research community members’ voting behaviors; a social work instructor asks students to work at local non-profit organizations to understand responses to poverty in an inner city. To understand how faculty members align their teaching practices with their commitment to civic education, researchers must understand not only the roles of faculty background characteristics (e.g., scholarly training, prior experiences, values and beliefs), their views of their academic field, and the purposes of education they espouse, but also how these characteristics, prior experiences, and personal views and commitments interact with contextual factors such as departmental expectations and institutional mission, resulting in specific teaching and course-design practices.

In this chapter, I synthesize the current literature related to faculty course planning, introducing the conceptual framework that underpins the research design of my study (outlined in Chapter 3). The contextual filters model of faculty course planning posits that faculty background characteristics (content) interact with contextual filters such as institutional mission (context), to influence course plans (form) (Stark, Lowther, Bentley, Ryan, Martens, Wren, & Shaw, 1990). As I outline the research literature that underlies Stark et al.’s (1990) contextual filters model as well as more recent related literature, I explain how my study extends the model by applying it to a new context (the research university), highlighting the elements of the model most relevant to my research questions. I also introduce sociocultural learning theory – alternately referred to as situated learning or situated cognition – (Greeno, 1997; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wertsch, del Rio,
& Alvarez, 1995) as a theoretical lens for examining how faculty members align their course
design and teaching practices with their commitment to civic engagement.

**Conceptual Framework**

A conceptual framework “explains, either graphically or in narrative form, the main things
to be studied — the key factors, constructs or variables — and the presumed relationships among
them” (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 18). Stark et al.’s (1990) contextual filters model (see Figure
1), a composite explanation based on the reports of almost 2,500 faculty members, identifies
those factors that contribute to the planning of college courses. Toombs’ (1978) depiction of
content, context, and form as the building blocks of curriculum design provided the initial
impetus for the work of Stark, Lowther, Ryan, Bomotti, Genthon, Martens, and Haven (1988)
and Stark et al. (1990). In the *Reflections on Course Planning (Reflections)* study the researchers used a
series of qualitative interviews with faculty members to identify components of postsecondary
course planning and design (Stark, et al., 1988). The emergent model was refined subsequently
following the quantitative *Planning Introductory College Courses (PICC)* study, which was the first large-
scale, nationally-representative study of course planning in U.S. higher education (Stark et al.,
1990). The NCRIPTEL research team surveyed 2,311 faculty members representing 12 academic
fields at 97 institutions during 1987-88. Notably, the sample excluded faculty working at research
universities.

---

11 These two studies were conducted under the auspices of the National Center for Research to Improve
Postsecondary Teaching and Learning (NCRIPTEL) at the University of Michigan
12 The 12 fields included: composition, literature, history, sociology, psychology, biology, mathematics, fine
arts, romance language, educational psychology, nursing, and business administration.
This study seeks to extend the work of Stark et al., exploring its applicability to research institutions. The components of the contextual filters model serve as an organizing framework for the review of the literature in this chapter. After reviewing the relevant literature, I propose a modified conceptual framework, based on the contextual filters model, that emphasizes the role of learning and that situates course planning in a larger social, historical, and cultural context.

The Contextual Filters Model: An Overview

Stark et al. (1990) defined course planning as “the decision-making process in which instructors select content to be taught, consider various factors affecting the teaching and learning process, and choose from alternative strategies for engaging students with the content” (p. 2). The course planning process, according to Stark et al. is nonlinear and not entirely systematic or
rational; instead faculty members typically undertake a series of continual minor adjustments, often throughout the semester rather than prior to the start of a course (Stark et al., 1990).

Building on work by Toombs (1978), who initially identified content, context, and form as components of curricular design, Stark et al. (1990) found that faculty respondents identified a series of individual, disciplinary, and experiential influences on their course planning. **Content influences** – including faculty members’ backgrounds and characteristics, views of their academic disciplines or fields, and beliefs about educational purpose – play a primary role in determining how faculty members select course content, arrange this content, and teach. **Context influences** – such as student characteristics and goals, available resources, and campus contexts – mediate, rather than influence directly, faculty members’ decisions about course design and teaching (form). For example, when choosing to incorporate civic engagement into a course, a faculty member’s personal commitment to community involvement might be a particularly salient content influence, leading him or her to seek assistance from the campus community service office (a contextual influence). The resulting form of the course might subsequently incorporate service-learning pedagogy in addition to the teaching methods the faculty member typically employs.

Generally speaking, faculty members in the **PICC** and **Reflections** studies identified aspects of their personal backgrounds (e.g., scholarly training and related non-academic work experience) and beliefs about their disciplines and educational purpose as important “content” influences on their course planning. Faculty members also identified a number of “context” influences responsible for shaping their course designs. These contextual factors tend to be external, that is outside the individual faculty member’s control. Examples include student characteristics and instructional resources. The end-products of faculty decisions and influences the selection of instructional activities and materials, decisions about sequencing course material, and depictions of
a course reflected in a syllabus. Decisions about course design are not final, but iterative; faculty members seek and receive formal and informal feedback about their courses during delivery that cause them to evaluate and readjust aspects of their course content, structure, and pedagogy. Similarly, contextual factors can alter a course plan. For instance the addition of new learning outcomes mandated by an accrediting body can affect the selection of course topics. More rarely, new experiences may cause faculty to modify their own ideas about their field or beliefs about educational purpose. A recent study of how faculty members select undergraduate teaching methods identified influences similar to those suggested by the contextual filters model. Einarson (2001) found personal and disciplinary influences (content) and organizational factors (context) influenced the choice of undergraduate teaching methods.

In the following sections I explicate the major elements of the contextual filters model – content, context, and form – in greater detail. In doing so, I discuss the corresponding subcomponents of each element, integrate recent research which elaborates our understanding of various facets of postsecondary course planning, and specifically address how the specific context of teaching for civic engagement may be understood in light of this model.

**Content Influences**

In the *PICC* study, faculty respondents indicated that content influences play a prominent role in their course planning (see highlighted components of model in Figure 2). Faculty respondents identified elements of their backgrounds, including their educational and teaching experiences and beliefs about educational purpose, as important content influences. Again recent research supports this assertion, but suggests that additional individual characteristics – such as race, gender, and rank – may also influence faculty decisions about course design and teaching practices.
Faculty members’ background characteristics – particularly their scholarly and pedagogical training and experience – are thought to be relatively stable, pre-existing influences on faculty members’ course planning and teaching (Stark et al., 1990; Lattuca & Stark, 2009). These characteristics not only affect additional content factors (e.g., faculty views of their discipline and beliefs about the purposes of education), but may also directly affect both how faculty perceive and manage various contextual filters (e.g., program goals or student characteristics) and their decisions about form (e.g., course content).

Research suggests that disciplinary influences on course goals, planning, and teaching are the most salient of the content influences (Angelo & Cross, 1993; Lattuca & Stark, 2009; Quinlan, 1999; Smart, Feldman, & Ethington, 2000; Stark et al., 1990). Faculty members from low-
consensus fields\textsuperscript{13} place more emphasis on general education than their peers in high-consensus fields (Gaff & Wilson, 1971) and are more likely to consider student character development – something civic education proponents also emphasize – as a worthwhile educational goal (Smart & McLaughlin, 1978; Smart & Ethington, 1995; Stark et al., 1990).

Faculty disciplinary training may also include discipline- or field-related non-academic work experiences. For example, an engineering faculty member may have worked as a civil engineer for a state department of transportation. Though few faculty members in the Stark et al. (1990) study reported such experiences, this might be a salient background characteristic for faculty from applied fields such as business and engineering. Faculty members from these fields are more likely to have work experience outside of academia (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). Stark et al.’s (1990) profile of the course planning patterns of faculty members in business – who reported higher levels of work experience outside of higher education – also supports this contention.

In addition to their discipline-specific scholarly training, faculty members report that both formal pedagogical training undertaken during graduate study, on-the-job professional development, and the more informal training acquired in the course of teaching, impact the ways in which faculty design undergraduate courses, though to a lesser degree than their disciplinary training (Stark et al., 1990). This may be, in part, because formal pedagogical training is infrequently encountered in graduate school (Golde, Walker, & Associates, 2006; Wulff, Austin, & Associates, 2004); approximately 30 percent of faculty respondents in the \textit{PICC} study reported taking courses regarding pedagogy or educational theory (Stark et al., 1990). Further examination

\textsuperscript{13} One framework for understanding academic disciplines categorizes them according to how they vary in the levels on consensus that exist among their members about various topics including appropriate research questions and methods. Generally, the physical sciences (e.g., biology) are considered to be high consensus and the social sciences (e.g., political science) low consensus, with the humanities (e.g., English Literature) even lower (Braxton & Hargens, 1996).
of the role of pedagogical training on faculty course planning and teaching practices may aid in the crafting of learning experiences for graduate students considering academic careers. And, since we know that certain pedagogies (e.g., service-learning and community-based research) are effective means of teaching for civic capacity and engagement (Battistoni, 1996; Myers-Lipton, 1998; Rhoads, 1998; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Strand, Marullo, Cutforth, Stoecker, & Donohue, 2003), it is important to examine the extent to which faculty are familiar with these teaching methods, and how they gained any such familiarity.

Stark et al. (1990) found that in up to 10 percent of cases, faculty respondents’ identified their religious and political beliefs as playing a role in their decision-making about course planning. More recently, Voigt (2007) found that some faculty members at Master’s level institutions reported that their religious beliefs played a role in their teaching. As is our knowledge of the role of religious background, our understanding of the role of political orientation in faculty course planning is incomplete. We do know, for example, that college and university faculty members disproportionately identify as liberals and Democrats (HERI, 2002; Rothman, Lichter, & Nevitte, 2005; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006; Tobin & Weinberg, 2006). The nonpartisan Higher Education Research Institute’s (2002) survey of 55,000 faculty members and administrators at 416 institutions estimated that 48 percent of faculty members identified themselves as liberal or left of center, while only 18 percent identified as conservative or right of center, politically. Research also describes how the political orientations of faculty members vary according to institutional type and academic field (Cardiff & Klein, 2005; Klein & Stern, 2005a, 2005b; Klein & Western, 2005; Ladd & Lipset, 1975). Specifically, faculty members at elite research universities and liberal arts colleges tend to be the most liberal (compared to their community college counterparts who were the most conservative) (Gross & Simmons, 2007), and faculty members in business and
economics tend to be more conservative than those in the humanities and social sciences, with those in the biological and physical sciences falling somewhere in the middle (Gross & Simmons, 2007; Klein & Stern, 2005a; Rothman, Licter, & Nevitte, 2005; Tobin & Weinberg, 2006). Beyond such descriptions, there is little empirical study of how faculty political beliefs and affiliations potentially manifest themselves in educational settings like classrooms, despite the recent claims of David Horowitz and the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education (FIRE) and others regarding the prevalence of liberal political bias and indoctrination in postsecondary classrooms (e.g., Horowitz, 2007; Neal, French, & Siegel, 2005; Salerno, 2003).

It seems likely that the political beliefs, affiliations, and experiences of faculty members will be salient in the context of this study because of the close linkage of political beliefs and behaviors to broader civic beliefs and behaviors. This salience, however, likely has to do with faculty motivation and beliefs about democratic purposes of higher education; Colby, Beaumont, Ehrlich, and Corngold (2007) indicated that faculty members teaching for political engagement do not seek to, nor actually alter, students’ political affiliations. Mariani and Hewett (2008) also concluded that faculty political orientation does not influence students’ political orientation. In fact, Zipp and Fenwick (2006) found that liberal faculty members, in comparison to their conservative colleagues, were less likely to believe that “shaping students’ values” is an important undergraduate educational goal.

**Demographic Influences**

Stark et al. (1990) chose not to include faculty demographic characteristics such as age and gender in their contextual filters model, arguing that faculty members reported such characteristics were not influential in the process of course planning. Despite faculty members’ assertions, evidence in the research literature suggests that personal demographic characteristics (Maher,
such as gender (Chamberlin & Hickey, 2001; Constantinople, Cornelius, & Gray, 1988; Feldman, 1993; Grossman & Grossman, 1994; Herron, Beedle, & King, 2006; McDowell, 1993), race (Antonio, 2002; Maruyama & Moreno, 2000), and tenure status (DeAngelo, Hurtado, Pryor, Kelly, Santos, & Korn, 2009) may indeed influence pedagogical choices and beliefs about educational purpose. Moreover, the influence of academic discipline can be difficult to separate from those of other faculty background characteristics and educational beliefs that appear to be highly correlated (Stark et al., 1990).

Empirical evidence demonstrates that women and faculty of color are more apt to practice active learning techniques, to investigate research questions related to social justice, and to engage students in service-learning and in classroom discourse regarding diverse ideas and perspectives (Abes, Jackson, & Jones, 2002; Antonio, Astin, & Cress, 2000; Hammond, 1994; Maruyama & Moreno, 2000). Additionally, faculty members of color are “more apt to view the work of their profession as being applied to change in society” in comparison to their White colleagues (Antonio, 2002, p. 598). Faculty of color are also more likely than White faculty members to be committed to involving students in community engagement and to engage in their own outreach activities (Antonio, Astin, & Cress, 2000; O’Meara, 2002). Moreover, “Students often find that traditional faculty [members] are unable to make the deeper connections because they live too exclusively within the disengaged and isolated culture of academia” (Long, 2002, p. 9).

Career age, if not actual age, is another demographic characteristic that is empirically related to course and teaching behaviors. Data from the Higher Education Research Institute’s (HERI) 2007-2008 faculty survey of more than 22,000 faculty members at approximately 370 diverse four-year colleges and universities indicates that there are extensive differences among
faculty at various career stages with regard to their pedagogical practices (DeAngelo, Hurtado, Pryor, Kelly, Santos, & Korn, 2009). Early career-faculty members, for example, report using student-centered or inquiry-based teaching methods more often than their mid- or advanced-career colleagues. This was the case for all seven pedagogical survey items, including cooperative or small group learning, the use of real-life problems, group projects, reflective writing, electronic in-class quizzes with immediate feedback, students evaluating each other’s work, and requiring multiple drafts of written work. Assistant professors were also more likely to not rely on extensive lecturing than their peers who were associate or full professors (DeAngelo et al., 2009).

Research on civic engagement, in particular, suggests that faculty members’ individual characteristics – including gender, race, rank, discipline, experience, and epistemology – not only influence how faculty design and teach their courses but may also motivate them to teach with the goal of advancing student civic engagement (Abes, Jackson, & Jones, 2002; Colbeck & Wharton-Michael, 2006). Colbeck and Weaver (2006) similarly found that faculty motivations to engage in the work of public scholarship – whether in the form of research, teaching, or service – suggests that family background and experiences as well as engagement in community organizations may be important influences. Finally, background characteristics appear to influence both how faculty members’ view their disciplines and what purposes of education they espouse (Stark et al., 1990).

**Views of Their Academic Fields**

Faculty members’ views of their academic discipline or field\(^{14}\) also surfaced as important content influences on course planning (Stark et al., 1990). Faculty respondents indicated that they attempt to convey their particular view of their field to students in introductory courses, suggesting that faculty conceptions of their discipline correlate with the ways in which they say

\(^{14}\) Stark et al. (1990) used the term “academic field” as an inclusive catchall for the terms academic discipline, academic field, and professional field; I do the same throughout this study.
they teach their classes. For example, faculty members who reported that they portray their discipline as a mode of inquiry tend to view their discipline in this manner as well.

Over 60 percent of PICC faculty surveyed identified several characteristics\(^\text{15}\) as describing their discipline or field “well.” Respondents characterized their discipline or field as a set of “interrelated concepts and operations” (74 percent), an “organized body of knowledge” (71 percent), a “mode of inquiry” (68.9 percent), a set of “skills to be applied” (68.8 percent), “an interrelated set of interests and values” (64.4 percent), and as a set of “skills to be mastered” (63.8 percent). Factor analysis of the eight characteristics faculty were asked to evaluate identified three general ways in which faculty respondents tended to view their academic discipline or field: 1) an organized body of knowledge, 2) a group of scholars, or 3) a set of skills. Each of these key views represents a composite snapshot of how faculty members understand their discipline.

While establishing common ground for individuals in an academic specialty, such views may be obstacles to incorporating civic capacity and engagement-oriented learning outcomes into college courses. Hollander (2007) reports that:

There is widespread agreement among leaders in the civic renewal movement that the biggest barrier to embedding civic engagement in the academy is the resistance of faculty and the disciplinary associations to which [faculty] owe their first loyalty. This is one reason why there have been major efforts over the years to deepen the role of research universities in the movement. It is believed that if the top ranked research universities endorse engaged teaching and research, it will be easier to make the case throughout higher education. (pp. 16-17)

Hollander adds that engaged teaching and research must also be legitimized within faculty tenure and promotion systems (which also may require disciplinary support).

\(^\text{15}\) Faculty respondents to the PICC survey were asked to identify according to a Likert-type scale how well each of the following eight characteristics described their discipline: 1) “a mode of inquiry,” 2) “an interrelated set of interests and values,” 3) skills to be mastered,” 4) “skills to be applied,” 5) “phenomena to explain,” 6) “individuals who share common interests,” 7) “organized body of knowledge,” and 8) “interrelated concepts and operations” (Stark et al., 1990, p. 28).
A number of disciplinary associations (e.g., Political Science, Sociology, and Psychology) have civic engagement-related initiatives, subgroups, committees, etc. Some have even dedicated extensive study to this topic as it relates to the teaching and practice of their discipline and summarized their findings in reports (see discussion in Chapter 1). Changes in faculty views of their discipline or field may have implications for teaching, research, and service. The case of “public sociology” provides a useful illustration.

Gumport (2002) depicts the development of sociology as a disciplinary field in the United States as, in part, motivated by the larger political environment; some faculty “viewed their academic work as a form of service to the community or had political interests outside the immediate campus or profession” (p. 11). Knowledge, particularly academic knowledge, is a social construction with important consequences. It is “simultaneously deeply personal in its sense-making value, potentially professional in its currency for academic careers, and ultimately political” in that it may be used to advocate either social change or social reproduction (Gumport, 2002, p. 3). Sociology’s penchant for intellectual activism stands in contrast with longstanding notions of the university as an ivory tower dedicated to “pure” science.

The American Sociological Association’s (ASA) Committee on Public Sociology (n.d.) defines public sociologists as “those who take sociology out of the classroom and laboratory to directly impact social change and decision making in the public sphere.” As the theme of the 2005 ASA conference, and a pet project of then ASA President Michael Burawoy, public sociology became a focal point of ongoing debate about the relationship between sociology and the public realm (Burawoy, 2005). Burawoy suggests the need for public sociologies, emphasizing the multiple layers and definitions of such an endeavor, and suggests, just as advocates of public scholarship do, that teaching is a central component of public sociology (Public sociologies, 2004). A task
force of the American Sociological Association estimates that between 20 and 30 percent of sociologists practice public sociology (Jaschik, 2007). The particular case of public sociologists illustrates how the way in which faculty members' view their field has important consequences for their teaching. It also points out that an academic discipline or field is not a monolithic entity; faculty members understand and practice their disciplines in a variety of different ways. The way in which a faculty member views his or her field is likely to influence the educational purposes to which they ascribe (as indicated by the right-pointing arrow between “field” and “purpose” in Figure 2).

**Civic Educational Purposes**

Educational research reveals strong, albeit complex, relationships between faculty members’ classroom practices and their thinking, beliefs, and knowledge (Goodyear & Hativa, 2002; Hativa & Goodyear, 2002; Quinlan, 1999). Faculty members’ beliefs about educational purposes are closely related to their views regarding their disciplines or fields – faculty from a given discipline tended to choose beliefs about education akin to those chosen by their disciplinary peers (Stark et al., 1990). For example, a journalism faculty member who views civic journalism\(^\text{16}\) as an important movement in the field is likely to view education for democracy as an important educational purpose.

Stark et al. distinguish educational purposes from course goals. Educational purposes are the broader of the two, providing generalized statements about the rationale for education (for example, the purpose of education is to make the world a better place for everyone; higher education should prepare students to live and work in democratic communities). Educational goals are more narrowly construed within the context of a particular course or academic program.

\(^{16}\) Civic journalism holds that journalists have a public responsibility to foster democracy beyond simply reporting the news (for additional information, see Perry, 2003; Rosen, 1999).
(e.g., students should understand how to design and conduct an experiment). Faculty beliefs about the educational purposes of their discipline have received little empirical attention compared to faculty goals. Studies of beliefs about educational purposes are more common at the elementary and secondary levels (e.g., Calderhead, 1996; Quinlan, 1999; Shulman & Quinlan, 1996). With the exception of Stark et al., researchers have focused on the types of educational (program and course) goals common in different disciplines and fields (Cross, 2005; Smart & McLaughlin, 1978; Smart, Feldman, & Ethington, 2000). These studies provide strong support for the existence of disciplinary differences in faculty members’ commitments to educational goals.

In-depth research on faculty members’ beliefs about educational purpose is needed because disciplinary differences are central to the “scholarship of teaching” (Boyer, 1990) and efforts to examine or improve faculty teaching must be situated in the scholarly communities of faculty members’ academic disciplines or fields (Jenkins, 1996; Shulman, 1993). In their meta-analysis of 93 empirical studies on teaching in the K-12 setting, Wideen, Mayer-Smith, and Moon (1998) conclude that the research reveals that prior beliefs about teaching – thought to accrue via a combination of personal experiences, schooling, and formal knowledge – are well-established by the time of enrollment in college and are considered to act as a fairly robust set of filters for subsequent teacher education or professional development interventions. It is likely that the beliefs of postsecondary faculty members are similarly established and resistant to change.

In their examination of faculty beliefs about educational purpose, Stark et al. (1990) found that more than 90 percent of faculty respondents teaching introductory college courses identified “teaching students to think effectively” as an important educational purpose. Effective or critical thinking is considered an essential skill to develop as part of education for civic capacity and engagement (Ehrlich, 2000). Additionally, between 50 and 60 percent of PICC respondents
(across 12 fields) selected “helping students to clarify values and make commitments,” “helping students learn to make the world a better place to live,” and “teaching students the great ideas of humankind” as (Stark, 2002). Faculty members ascribing to such educational purposes are probably more likely than their peers to elect to incorporate civic learning outcomes into their courses. By comparison, less than 35 percent of faculty respondents believed that it was important to “help students gain personal enrichment” or “prepare students directly for jobs” (Stark, 2002).

Research indicates that faculty members ascribe to a number of civic engagement-related educational purposes. Yet, Vogelgesang (2005) concludes that while more than 80 percent of respondents believe that civic engagement is a worthwhile goal for higher education – indeed even a responsibility – “they do not see it as their personal job to be engaged in terms of scholarship. In some cases, they may not [even] see a connection between what they do and the concept of engagement; they may perceive it rather as the job of outreach or extension” (p. 16).

Contextual factors – including institutional mission and program goals – may be partially responsible for why faculty members believe in a given educational purpose but believe that it is someone else’s responsibility or purview to implement.

Context

Contextual influences (see shaded boxes in Figure 3) – including student characteristics and goals, institutional, college, or program goals, campus resources, as well as teaching and learning literature – mediate faculty members’ decisions regarding course planning and teaching. Faculty members’ personal characteristics, views, and beliefs may filter through these context-specific factors before faculty make course decisions.
More than two-thirds of faculty respondents in the *PICC* study identified the general characteristics of the students enrolling in a course – for example, their ability, preparation, and future goals – as the most salient contextual influence on their course planning (Stark et al., 1990). Program goals (e.g., goals of a particular department or major) were especially influential for faculty teaching courses required by the program (as opposed to elective courses) or enrolling mostly program students (e.g., courses that are not general education requirements). College goals were generally not seen as being as influential as program goals, but Stark et al. (1990) found that college context mediates the other contextual influences (for example, the characteristics of students and available resources may influence program goals).

Institutional goals are notably absent from the set of context factors identified by Stark et al. (1990) because only a handful of faculty respondents identified institutional goals as an
important contextual influence. (They are thus considered “other influences” in the model.)

Institutional context, in the form of the espoused and enacted values (mission), however, seems to play a role in the development of students' civic attitudes (Berger, 2000; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Sax, 2000). It may follow that a similar influence exists on faculty members’ civic attitudes and the value they place on teaching for civic engagement. Whether and how institutional mission statements translate into concrete commitments and actions on the part of colleges and universities remains a matter of question. However, a recent study highlights differences in commitments to civic engagement according to institutional type. In an analysis of over 300 mission statements of U.S. institutions of higher education selected using random-stratified sampling, Morphew and Hartley (2006) found that “civic duty/service” ranked as the most common (tied with “serves local area”) element at public Doctoral/Research Intensive universities (followed by “research”). This mission element did not rank in the top three for Masters institutions (public or private), public or private liberal arts institutions, public Baccalaureate institutions (general or liberal arts). It did, however, rank second for private Baccalaureate institutions as well as for private Doctoral/Research Extensive institutions.

Additional research suggests that the quality of campus resources such as libraries, research facilities, and students may mediate the effect of institutional type and mission on faculty course design and teaching (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995; Dunkin, 1986; Peterson, Cameron, Mets, Jones & Ettington, 1989). A variety of other contextual factors may play a role in faculty course planning. These include pragmatic factors such as class size and the availability of textbooks for a course, external influences such as accreditation requirements, and available resources including available advice (e.g., from a campus Teaching and Learning Center).
published teaching and learning literature, and opportunities such as conferences on teaching and learning.

**Form**

The content factors and contextual filters described above influence “form” – that is, course decisions regarding content and learning outcomes, course assignments, the sequence of these materials, and instructional methods (Stark et al., 1990) (see shaded box in Figure 4). Peer, student, and self-evaluations of course effectiveness may, in turn, affect future course planning by influencing how faculty members subsequently reengage with contextual filters (e.g., by visiting the campus teaching center) and, to a lesser extent, may also influence content inputs.
For some postsecondary faculty members, teaching for civic capacity and engagement takes the form of service-learning (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). We also know some faculty elect to engage their students in community-based research (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005), teaching them the content and modes of inquiry of their discipline or field through participation in a specific research project designed to solve a community need (e.g., identifying transportation use and needs in a city borough). What we know very little about, however, is why faculty members choose these methods of teaching over others or what civic-related course content they cover. My study attempts to fill these gaps in the literature.

The contextual filters model provides a starting point for an investigation of how faculty members at a research university make decisions about their courses in light of a commitment to civic engagement as an educational purpose. In examining how faculty members’ personal beliefs and experiences, and the ways in which they make sense of and are influenced by various campus-
based factors effects their course planning, it will also be important to consider how participation in an intentional faculty development experience – the Public Scholarship Associates – may influence faculty decisions about course content and pedagogy. In the next section, I introduce sociocultural learning theory as a theoretical lens through which to examine how participation in such a group may influence course planning.

**Sociocultural Theory**

Sociocultural theories of learning focus attention on the role of collective practices and contexts on individual thinking and action. Rooted in the work of Russian psychologists Lev Vygotsky, Aleksandr Luria, and Aleksi Leont'ev, sociocultural learning theories (e.g., situated learning theory, cultural historical activity theory) hold that learning is powerfully influenced by the social, cultural, and historical contexts in which it occurs. For example, academic disciplines and fields are situated in a sociohistorical context in which culture and time continually shift, producing nuanced differences in how various concepts (e.g., civic engagement) are understood, prioritized, and practiced. The contextual filters model that guides this study acknowledges the role of faculty members’ immediate contexts, positing, for example, the influence of resources, student characteristics, and other factors that facilitate or restrict decisions about courses. It also acknowledges the role of the academic discipline, as the primary source of influence on faculty members’ thinking about what and how to teach (Stark & Lattuca, 1997).

In the second edition of *Shaping the College Curriculum*, Lattuca and Stark (2009) note the importance of considering large sociohistorical contexts on curricula in their revised model. Sociocultural learning theories direct our attention to a larger set of contexts (e.g., the social, cultural, and temporal contexts in which individuals and social institutions are embedded), and to
the social interactions (shaped by these various contexts) that also influence faculty thought and action.

Sociocultural learning theories assert that our understanding of the world (our learning) is indirect or mediated by cultural artifacts and tools (such as written and spoken languages, academic disciplines, technology, etc.) that shape the way we interact with and know our world (Wertsch, del Rio, & Alvarez, 1995). In this study, the Public Scholarship Associates group, as well as the artifacts and tools its members have created (e.g., publications such as *A Blueprint for Public Scholarship at Penn State*), are viewed as “meditational means” (Wertsch, 1998, p. 25) that influence what and how faculty learn about public scholarship and how they learn to use public scholarship to teach for civic engagement.

To illustrate the roles of tools and interaction, imagine an assistant professor who is interested in civic engagement. She will learn something about civic engagement by reading a chapter that discusses how to use community-based research to introduce students to educational issues in low-income communities. Although she reads this chapter at home in her study, this interaction with a text is a social interaction because it involves the use of a social artifact – the chapter – and because it constitutes a kind of conversation between author and reader. That same assistant professor may clarify her thinking about civic engagement through a conversation with a colleague in her department, or if she is a member of the PSA, through collegial exchanges about public scholarship with a group of peers. This is, in fact, a goal of the PSA: participants are expected to advance their thinking about public scholarship and to learn new information and practices (e.g., teaching techniques), which they can incorporate into their teaching, research, and service activities (Cohen & Yapa, 2003).
Learning, from a sociocultural perspective is inherently social. The social nature of learning is most obvious when we study a group like the Public Scholarship Associates, which intends to structure interactions among individuals of varying levels of experience with the idea and tools of public scholarship and civic engagement. Lave and Wenger (1991) crafted the term "legitimate peripheral participation" to describe the learning processes through which new members of a group learn to "think, argue, act, and interact, in increasingly knowledgeable ways, with people who do something well by doing it with" more experienced members (p. 19). Rogoff (1990) frames the interactions among more and less knowledgeable and skilled individuals a “cognitive apprenticeship.”

By assisting faculty members in appropriating new cultural tools (e.g., public scholarship as a pedagogy), participation in the PSA group may encourage faculty members to consider their disciplines and their courses in new ways, and may also provoke larger campus conversations about teaching and public purposes. Stark et al. (1988, 1990) posited a role for the kinds of professional development activities that the PSA represent, but did not explore these in depth. Such activities would be captured in "other influences" in the contextual filters model (see Figure 5). In this study, the PSA group is viewed as a potential influence on learning and course planning because participation in the PSA may mediate faculty learning and thus influence their course planning. In the language of the contextual filters model, the PSA is a "contextual influence” that shapes faculty thinking about how to plan their courses.

By framing faculty participation in the Public Scholarship Associates as an example of sociocultural learning, and studying in detail the role of various contextual influences, I underscore the importance of conceiving of faculty course planning not as an isolated, individual act, but as one embedded in a particular cultural context and influenced by collective understandings and
practices related to faculty work. My choice is consistent with the assumptions of the contextual filters model in that I identify an array of content and context influences that affect course-planning. For example, I explore faculty members’ disciplinary training and beliefs as a content influence, and examine the role of their departments, colleges (administrative units), and disciplinary professional communities as context influences.

Stark et al.’s (1990) contextual filters model serves as a general heuristic for understanding the role of faculty characteristics and institutional contexts in the development of undergraduate courses. It presents a composite model of influences on faculty course planning, suggesting that there is a "typical" case of what influences individual faculty members course design processes. The overlay of a sociocultural framework enables me to focus on a particular case and thus consider the potential influence of communities of interest like the Public Scholarship Associates on faculty members and their course planning.

From a sociocultural perspective, higher education institutions are comprised of interconnected activity systems in which various priorities and values are placed on organizational realities such as teaching, research, service, and civic engagement. Even within the same unit, for example, a college of education, programs and departments promote particular hierarchies of values and develop their own norms of behavior. Understanding how faculty participants perceive the priorities and values of the Public Scholarship Associates as supporting and/or conflicting with those of their home disciplines and departments allows me to explore previously unexamined contexts consisted with the intent of the contextual filters model.

**Conceptual Framework for This Study**

Figure 5 depicts the conceptual framework for this study. Note that Stark et al.’s (1990) model in its entirety has been embedded in a larger sociohistorical context and that the Public
Scholarship Associates group has been included as a separate contextual filter. Sociocultural learning theories argue that social actors (e.g., faculty members) learn from interactions with others in specific contexts. All individual actors and interactions among actors are similarly influenced – enabled and/or constrained – by aspects of larger time-dependent social, cultural, and historical contexts (e.g., current political climate) and trends.

Figure 5. Conceptual Framework: Contextual Filters Model in Sociohistorical Context.

In this *a priori* conceptual framework the dotted line suggests that participation in the PSA may act not only as a contextual filter on course design, but also as an influence on faculty content factors including how they view their discipline and what educational purposes they endorse. Although not explicitly depicted in the conceptual framework, faculty demographic characteristics – e.g., race, gender, tenure status – will be considered relevant “background and characteristics”
that potentially influence course planning because recent research reveals the relationships among these characteristics and teaching strategies and course plans.

**Conclusion**

This review of the literature corresponds to my research questions and my initial conceptual framework and informed my choice of research design and interview questions. My study seeks to advance understanding of how faculty design and teach their courses, by expanding on the work of Stark et al. (1990) and incorporating a sociocultural analytic lens. By examining how faculty members plan courses that foster student civic capacity and engagement, the study will also contribute to the civic education literature. In Chapter 3, I describe the data collection and analysis methods employed to answer the research questions posed in Chapter 1.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY AND METHODS

In Chapters 1 and 2, I established the purpose and significance of my study and synthesized the relevant research literature concerning how postsecondary faculty plan courses. I also introduced the conceptual framework of my study, which combined the assumptions of the contextual filters model (Stark et al., 1990) with sociocultural perspectives on learning. This framework represents the starting point for my investigation of how faculty members align their teaching practices with their beliefs about civic engagement as educational purpose. In this chapter I describe the study design and methods, including sampling, data collection, and data analysis strategies. Finally, I outline the limitations of my study, discuss my role as a researcher, and describe the ways in which I worked to enhance the trustworthiness of the findings reported in Chapters 4 through 6.

Qualitative Research Methodology

As a qualitative research project, this dissertation study was conducted within a constructivist or interpretivist paradigm, conceiving of a “world in which reality is socially constructed, complex, and ever changing” (Glesne, 1999, p. 5). Qualitative research, according to Creswell (1998),

is an inquiry process of understanding based on distinct methodological traditions of inquiry that explore a social or human problem. The researcher builds a complex, holistic picture, analyzes words, reports detailed views of informants, and conducts the study in a natural setting. (p. 15)

Patton (2002) framed constructivist inquiry in terms of fundamental questions such as "What are [participants'] reported perceptions, 'truths,' explanations, beliefs, and worldview? What are the consequences of their constructions for their behaviors" (p. 96). According to this approach, "it is impossible to separate the inquirer from the inquired into. It is precisely their interaction that creates the data that will emerge from the inquiry" (Guba & Lincoln, 1989, p. 88).
The constructivist orientation of this study suggested a focus on questions about the relationship between participants’ understandings of educational purposes (their beliefs about education) and the decisions they make about how to structure and teach their courses. The choice of sociocultural learning perspectives – which hold that learning is a social process powerfully shaped by sociohistorical contexts – offered an analytical lens that reflects this constructivist stance. As will become evident, constructivism also influenced my selection of phenomenology as a methodological approach and my subsequent choice of data collection methods and analytical strategies.

By examining faculty course planning in a particular context – in this case, the Public Scholarship Associates, a multidisciplinary group interested in civic engagement – I explored whether and how participation in such a group shapes or supports faculty attempts to align their teaching practices with civic education as an educational purpose. The sociocultural framework I employed required that I understand how participation in this larger collective of faculty members engaged in intellectual conversations regarding civic engagement mediated the thinking, learning, and, ultimately, the course planning decisions of individual faculty members. My research was not a case study of an organizational unit, but an examination of the interactions of individual participants within a group of peers with similar interests. I asked “How does participation in this group, which intends to further faculty commitment to civic engagement, influence faculty decisions about their teaching?” Thus, while my unit of analysis is individual faculty members, my analysis takes into account the ways in which their interactions with the Public Scholarship Associates (PSA) group may shape and/or support their courses and teaching.

My study is rooted in the qualitative tradition of phenomenology, but also relies on broader qualitative traditions. Using a phenomenological approach focused my attention on how faculty members made meaning of the ideas of civic engagement and public scholarship and how
their participation in the Public Scholarship Associates group influenced that meaning-making. Yet because there is some existing research regarding these phenomena and because there are models and theories regarding faculty learning and course design, I also incorporated a conceptual framework – the contextual filters model – into my study which also guided my choices of methods. I sought to extend and test the contextual filters model by applying it to a new context (a research university) and explored the potentially reciprocal relationship between faculty beliefs about their academic field and the PSA as a contextual filter.

**Phenomenology**

I incorporated phenomenological methods to understand how interactions among faculty members with shared interests in civic engagement mediate the course planning activities and processes of individuals. In general, phenomenological studies seek to describe “the meaning of the lived experiences for several individuals about a concept or the phenomenon” (Creswell, 1998, p. 51). Some forms of phenomenological inquiry direct the researcher to find the “essence” of a phenomenon – that is, the de-contextualized meaning that a phenomenon has for all individuals, regardless of individual characteristics, experiences, or settings (see, for example, Barritt, Beekman, Bleeker, & Mulderij, 1985). The adoption of a sociocultural perspective precluded the assumption that faculty beliefs and course planning decisions can be understood without reference to the contexts in which they occur. As a result, I was not searching for the “essence” of civic engagement or public scholarship but, rather, I sought to understand how faculty members make meaning of their participation in the Public Scholarship Associates group and how they translate (or do not translate) those meanings into decisions about their courses and teaching. In this way, the investigation presents an *emic*, that is an insider’s or participant’s perspective, rather than the *etic* or researcher’s perspective (Creswell, 1998; LeCompte & Schensul, 1999).
Phenomenology points to use of specific methods to ensure that researchers identify participants’ *emic* perspectives. In particular, it is essential for researchers to set aside or “bracket” their own experiences and preconceptions (Husserl, 1931, used the term *epoché*, Greek for “a cessation,” to describe this suspension of personal beliefs). Instead the researcher relies on the voices of participants to understand their lived experiences (Creswell, 1998; Field & Morse, 1985). According to Ashworth (1999), the “process of bracketing [refers] not to a turning away from the world and a concentration on detached consciousness but to the resolve to set aside theories, research presuppositions, ready-made interpretations etc., in order to reveal engaged, lived experience” (p. 708). Thus the purpose of bracketing is to “[allow] the life-world of the participant in the research to emerge in clarity” (p. 708). Bracketing helps the researcher to avoid imposing previous understandings or themselves upon participants, instead allowing for a more iterative and inductive research process in which understanding and theory emerge from the data themselves (Merriam & Associates, 2002).

This phenomenological approach required that I bracket my own assumptions about civic engagement (for example, that teaching for civic engagement “looks” like service-learning) and about the role of the Public Scholarship Associates group in influencing faculty beliefs and behaviors, in order to understand how faculty participants in this group came to their understandings of educational purpose, how those understandings did or did not change due to participation in the group, and the impact of the group on their courses and teaching practices. Incorporating a conceptual framework into the study may seem to contradict phenomenological approaches to qualitative research like bracketing; however the framework helped to focus my interview questions, while bracketing remained important given my close affiliations with the PSA group’s members and programs.
Theory can play an important role in a qualitative study by helping to focus a researcher’s attention on important elements thought to be related to the research questions. No researcher begins a study without some preconceptions about the phenomenon of interest. Clearly depicting these preconceptions in a conceptual or theoretical framework (Miles & Huberman, 1994) and describing the “conceptual context” (Maxwell, 1996, p. 25) of the study, then, can help render these assumptions explicit. Qualitative research can help to “elaborate and extend” (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 12) an existing theory – like Stark et al.’s (1990) Contextual Filters Model.

I relied, initially, on a tested theory (the contextual filters model), and, in addition, on sociocultural learning theories which further specified the research design (for example, by identifying “interaction” as an object of interest). I sought to elaborate or extend the contextual filters model by investigating its usefulness in a new setting (a research university), examining an educational purpose not specifically included in the original framework (civic engagement), and focusing on a specific contextual filter (a multidisciplinary faculty group). I also sought to understand whether and under what conditions participation in such a group could alter faculty members’ beliefs about educational purposes. Although this approach is not an example of “pure” grounded theory, it is consistent with Strauss and Corbin’s (1998) suggestion that this method can be used to study new questions and new contexts.

One advantage of using grounded theory to guide my research methods is that “grounded theories, because they are drawn [directly] from the data, are likely to offer insight, enhance understanding, and provide a meaningful guide to action” (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 12). By shedding light on faculty thought processes and their impact on teaching practices, this study provides institutional leaders with practical suggestions for faculty professional development as well as for the graduate education of future faculty.
Study Design & Data Collection

The design and methods of this study were selected in light of the phenomenological and broader qualitative research methods described above. My use of a guiding conceptual framework and incorporation of sociocultural learning theories also guided my research design. In the pages that follow I outline the overall design of this study including site selection and sampling strategies. I also describe my choice of data collection methods – including interviews, observations, and document analysis – and how I incorporated each element into the study.

Site Selection & Access

In electing to study faculty in a land-grant and public research university, I focused on a particular institutional type and context. Morphew & Hartley (2006) and Thornton & Jaegar, (2006) suggest that institutional type is related to organizational emphasis on citizenship. Land-grant institutions, in particular, have an historic mission of fostering civic capacity (e.g., Cooper, 1999). Indeed, as illustrated in Chapter 1, research universities are often the site of efforts to advance educational priorities and practices related to civic engagement and have been the focus of many reports regarding civic engagement priorities (Boyte & Hollander, 1999; Checkoway, 2001; Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching & CIRCLE, 2006; Walshok, 2000). By limiting my investigation to the activities of faculty members in a single public research and land-grant university, I hoped to understand how this institutional context mediated faculty beliefs about educational purposes (including civic engagement) and their decisions about courses and teaching approaches. In addition the selection of a research university allowed me to examine how the contextual filters model, which was derived from research primarily involving faculty at liberal
arts and comprehensive institutions (and included no participants from research institutions\textsuperscript{17}), might fit a new institutional setting.

The general parameters of my study were endorsed by Dr. Jeremy Cohen, the Vice President and Senior Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education at Penn State. Dr. Cohen was a “gatekeeper” to the members of the Public Scholarship Associates group. His endorsement of this project assisted me in garnering the participation of faculty members of the PSA group.

\textit{Sample & Participant Recruitment Strategies}

The primary goal of my study was to understand how faculty members at a public land-grant and research university frame their educational commitment to civic engagement and how membership in a group focused on civic-minded teaching and research influenced their decisions about how to align their personal commitments to civic engagement with their undergraduate teaching practices. Consistent with a phenomenological approach to the study, I purposefully sampled faculty members who were 1) participants in the Public Scholarship Associates group and were thus, at least nominally, committed to civic education/engagement as an educational purpose, and 2) had taught at least one undergraduate course in the last two academic years in which civic engagement or public scholarship was incorporated. Based upon these criterion, I identified 43 potential participants (from the group’s membership of more than 75), including 13 humanities faculty members, 10 social scientists, 6 scientists, and 14 faculty members in professional fields. In this pool were 21 women and 24 men as well as 16 tenure-track and 29 tenured faculty members. Ultimately, I sought to select a diverse array of faculty members who varied by sex, tenure status, academic field, and race – characteristics identified in the research

\textsuperscript{17} Stark et al. (1990) did not include research universities in their Planning Introductory College Courses (\textit{PICC}) Study because they were interested in studying faculty course planning and were concerned that “many introductory courses [at research universities] are taught by graduate assistants not fully responsible for planning them” (Stark, 2000, p. 415).
literature as influencing faculty teaching and course design (Abes, Jackson, & Jones, 2002; Angelo & Cross, 1993; Antonio, 2002; Colbeck & Weaver, 2006; Lattuca & Stark, 2009; Lindholm, et al., 2005a; Maruyama & Moreno, 2000; Quinlan, 1999; Smart, Feldman, & Ethington, 2000; Stark & Lattuca, 1997; Stark et al., 1990).

From the list of just over 40 faculty candidates for participation, I sent recruitment letters to 18 potential participants (Appendices A and B contain the participant recruitment letters for both of these groups of faculty). I selected these 18 based upon attempting to balance the representation of academic fields, gender, tenure status, and level of involvement in the PSA. I measured involvement based upon 7 criteria: 1) receipt of a course development grant, 2) participation in the faculty seminar, 3&4) contribution of essays to two different PSA-sponsored publications, 5) PSA leadership council membership, 6) CIVCOM board membership, and 7) participation in Constitution-day activities. I sent recruitment letters via campus mail to 6 faculty members who had received Public Scholarship Course Development/Enhancement Grants and 8 participants in the 2007-08 public scholarship faculty seminar, “A Capacity to Sustain Democracy.” I also sent letters to two individuals who had both received a grant and who were participating in the seminar. I sent six additional recruitment letters to faculty members identified by key individuals (the Director of the Laboratory for Public Scholarship and Democracy and the Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Education) as being good candidates for my study based on my criteria. Six of these 18 participants declined to participate – including one who did not have undergraduate teaching responsibilities and two others who were currently on sabbatical. I then sent subsequent recruitment letters to four additional individuals, three of whom accepted. Ultimately 15 faculty members agreed to participate in the study and were subsequently interviewed; these participants are described in Chapter 4.
Data Collection Procedures

Personal interviews were the primary data collection method for the study; observations of PSA events and document collection supplemented the interview data. Each data collection method is described below.

**Participant Data Form**

I collected a brief, demographic data form from each participant prior to the first interview via email or at the beginning of the first interview (see Appendix E for the form). The form requested basic information, including the participant’s academic discipline or field, tenure status, college and departmental affiliations, and courses taught. The completed forms assisted me in developing an initial understanding of each participant’s background characteristics and the campus context in which they were situated, and in crafting questions for the first interview. It also allowed me to verify that the participants met the study criteria.

**Documents**

I collected and analyzed documents including participants’ curriculum vitae, undergraduate course syllabi, and publications related to teaching, public scholarship, or civic engagement. I examined course documents posted on the participants’ course websites, when available. Some of the study participants contributed essays to *A Blueprint for Public Scholarship* (Cohen & Yapa, 2003) and/or authored chapters in *A Laboratory for Public Scholarship and Democracy* (Eberly & Cohen, 2006). These yielded rich data reflective of participants’ views regarding public scholarship at earlier points in time. To the extent possible, I collected and reviewed documents prior to the first interview with a given participant so that I might use the information gathering as a starting point for our conversation or to explore participants’ thinking about teaching for civic engagement. Being able to converse about a concrete artifact served to remind a participant about
particular nuances of a course, a prior experience, or the ways in which their beliefs about public scholarship have shifted.

Additional documents, including lists of faculty Public Scholarship Associates members, recipients of public scholarship course development and enhancement grants, and participants in related faculty development seminars and conferences, as well as virtual documents such as website content provided background information and sometimes served to stimulate conversations with participants.

**Semi-structured Interviews**

Participant interviews were the primary data collection method for this study. I conducted three semi-structured interviews with each faculty participant between fall 2007 and summer 2008. (See Appendices F through H for interview guides.) Semi-structured interviews (Kvale, 1996; Rubin & Rubin, 1995) allow an interviewer to introduce the overall topic (e.g., teaching civic engagement) and then guide discussion with specific questions (e.g., How would you describe your involvement in the Public Scholarship Associates group?), prompts (e.g., Tell me more about how you got involved in the PSA group?), and probes (e.g., How do you try to incorporate civic engagement in your courses?). The focus of each interview corresponded to the three key components of the conceptual framework (content, context, form) although some overlap was inevitable due to the interconnection of these components and the loosely structured nature of the interview. The 45 interviews (three for each respondent) averaged 66 minutes apiece, ranging anywhere from 36 minutes to almost two hours in length. All interviews were digitally recorded and transcribed verbatim for subsequent analysis.

The first interview (see Appendix F) focused largely on content influences. Before the interview began, I asked participants to provide me with a signed informed consent form (Appendix C) which I sent with their recruitment letter. I then reviewed the purpose of my study
and asked for any necessary clarifications of information contained on the participant data form, curriculum vita, and any course syllabi, instructional materials, or publications provided me prior to the interview. I began the substantive part of the interview by asking participants to describe the way they incorporated civic engagement/public scholarship into a specific course. As there are a variety of terms used to describe civic engagement (e.g., community engagement, democratic engagement, education for democracy, public scholarship, service-learning), I also frequently asked participants to share with me and define the terms they commonly used in conversations with their students and colleagues, as well as those they used in grant proposals and publications.

The remainder of the questions focused on faculty members’ views of their discipline, their beliefs about educational purpose, and how their identities and/or background influence their teaching and the way they design their courses.

The second interview (see Appendix G) focused on contextual influences on teaching and course design. I asked participants to identify factors that they believe affect the way they plan their courses. Rather than initially asking participants directly whether their teaching has been influenced by their participation in the Public Scholarship group, I waited for them to discuss if and how their involvement in this group influenced their courses and teaching. If participants did not spontaneously raise the role of the PSA group, I eventually asked the participant about their involvement in the group and whether it has had any influence. I also prompted interviewees to consider and discuss other contextual influences identified in the contextual filters model including institutional mission, college, and departmental factors.

In interview three (see Appendix H), I focused on form, which in the contextual filters model, refers to decisions faculty make about how to teach a course. At this point, I queried participants regarding how their course planning, course content, and teaching methods had changed over the course of their careers and the impact, if any, of their participation in the PSA.
group. At this time, participants were also provided a printed copy of the conceptual framework underpinning the study, and given the opportunity to write on, or otherwise comment regarding, how well it reflected what they believed influenced how they design their courses.

Observations

In addition to interviews, I used observations to gather data about faculty members’ thinking about civic engagement and its potential influence on their course planning. I observed meetings and events sponsored by the Public Scholarship Associates group, but not all faculty participants were observed. For example, many of the PSA members participated in a related “A Capacity for Sustaining Democracy” faculty development seminar sponsored by the Laboratory for Public Scholarship and Democracy. At the time of the study, I was a graduate student member of the Public Scholarship Associates and the Ostar Fellow working with the Offices of Undergraduate Education and the Laboratory for Public Scholarship and Democracy. My role at such events was as a participant observer (Jorgensen, 1989) as I not only observed the meetings, but also was a participant in the seminars. As suggested by Spradley (1980), I inquired about the meaning participants ascribed to various experiences and behaviors in subsequent interviews.

Because I was not exploring whether and how faculty members enact their course plans, I did not formally observe faculty in their classrooms. Instead, I sought to understand the factors that faculty members identify as influencing their course design and teaching practices in the context of civic engagement/public scholarship. The sequence of interviews thus served as the primary data collection tool. Course materials, publications, and observations of PSA meetings and events supplemented the information collected through interviews by permitting me access to public expressions and discussions of civic engagement and public scholarship by participants.
Fieldnotes

In addition to recording participants’ interviews, I took fieldnotes during interviews and observations. During interviews, my fieldnotes consisted primarily of single words and phrases intended to remind me of items of interest to be explored and analyzed further. I took more in-depth notes during observations, focusing primarily on participants’ involvement in group discussions, interactions with other members, and comments about teaching for civic engagement.

These fieldnotes were translated into interview or observation summaries which were written as soon as possible following each interview or observation. These summaries served three purposes. First, as expansions of my notes, they served as additional data. Second, by jotting down my initial interpretations and hunches, they provided a forum for initial data analysis. By providing copies of my summaries to the appropriate participant(s), the fieldnotes also served as a method of ensuring trustworthiness (discussed in greater detail later in this chapter).

Data Analysis

Data analysis occurred iteratively throughout the data collection process and continued after data collection was complete. I utilized several methods to analyze collected data both inductively and deductively (LeCompte & Schensul, 1999), including analytical memos, case summaries, and a priori and open coding. My conceptual framework served as an initial scaffold for data analysis (e.g., various influences serving as a priori codes), yet I remained willing to modify or entirely discard the framework if the data indicated that it was not an accurate or useful way of understanding, for example, how faculty members made meaning of their participation in the Public Scholarship Associates group or its influence on their course planning.
Initial data analysis occurred following each interview and observation as I synthesized what I heard and observed in the form of brief contact summaries (Miles & Huberman, 1994), which were also shared with participants as a means ensuring trustworthiness. I drafted a number of analytical memos that served as “think pieces” (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003, p. 114) in which I tested out initial ideas, discuss emergent themes, and brainstormed additional interview questions. My initial analysis was also furthered by my participation in two timely professional development opportunities. I was selected as an Emerging Engagement Scholar to participate in a three-day workshop as part of the October 2008 National Outreach Scholarship Conference held in University Park, PA. Here I was given individual feedback by an experienced faculty mentor. Later that month I presented my initial findings in an Emerging Scholars session “Teaching for Engagement: A Study of Professors’ Strategies for Teaching Civic Knowledge and Skills” at the October 2008 International Research Conference on Service-learning and Community Engagement (IARSLCE) Conference in New Orleans, LA. I received written and verbal feedback on my paper entitled “Teaching for Engagement: A Study of Professors’ Strategies for Teaching Civic Knowledge and Skills” from a senior scholar as well as from audience members.

**Coding**

All interviews were transcribed and subsequently coded (along with fieldnotes) with the aid of NVivo 7, a qualitative data coding and analysis software package. I engaged in a continuous process of open and a priori coding throughout and after the data collection process. Coding was used to identify emergent themes and commonalities among participants. I analyzed fieldnotes both to understand how participation in the PSA group influences faculty participants’ thinking and to generate additional interview questions.
The contextual filters model suggested a set of *a priori* codes (Schwandt, 2007) based on the concepts of content, context, and form. These *a priori* codes helped determine if and how my data fit the conceptual schema. In addition, I employed open coding, forming additional “initial categories of information about the phenomenon being studied by segmenting information” into meaningful themes (Creswell, 1998, p. 57). Through coding I sought to “expand, transform, and reconceptualize [my] data, opening up more diverse analytical possibilities” (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996, p. 29). Finally, I used document analysis techniques involving similar codes to understand the type and extent of information the research participants were receiving and using. Thematic analysis or coding was focused on the components of the contextual filters model and elements of sociocultural learning theory (including the role of the institutional context, the PSA group context, and the nature and impact of interactions among faculty members).

**Trustworthiness**

As a qualitative researcher, I was the primary research data collection instrument of my study (LeCompte & Schensul, 1999) as well as the primary analyst. Thus, the validity of my research was dependent on collection of sufficient data, effective analysis and presentation of data that captures participants’ views, and the use of several means to assure the trustworthiness (or validity) of this study.

Subjectivity can be defined as “the quality of an investigator that affects the results of observational investigation” (Peshkin, 1991, p. 285). It is considered by many to be the opposite of objectivity, which is a canon of positivist research. In keeping with Eisner (1992), I believe that pure objectivity is an unattainable and undesired goal for qualitative research. Eisner (1992) asserts that,

Recognizing and accepting the inevitable transaction between self and world seems to me more realistic and more useful. This recognition would underscore the constructed, tentative, and framework-dependent character of perception and
knowledge. It would contribute to a more pluralistic and tentative conception of knowledge, one more dynamic and less dogmatic, one with a human face. It would recognize that *doxa* [belief], not *episteme* [knowledge], is all we can have. (p.15)

It was imperative that I became, and remained, aware of my potential biases as a researcher and strove to make them work for rather than against my research purposes. Peshkin (1988) asserted that “one’s subjectivity is like a garment that cannot be removed” (p. 17). Nor, I assert, should such action be attempted. Passion and interest in one’s subject can help a researcher maintain focus during prolonged study: writing notes, coding data, sifting through information, or observing long meetings. It was important, however, that I be aware of the ways in which my personal beliefs and values might hinder my research or act as blind spots in my study.

*Reflective Memos*

To surface my personal beliefs, perspectives, biases, and inclinations as I begin my research project I engaged in writing a series of reflective memos (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Uncovering my “Subjective I’s” (see Peshkin, 1991) is a reflective process; one that I began prior to starting my project, but also continued throughout my study through journaling, personal reflection, and conversation with colleagues (that did not impinge on the confidentiality of participants). Throughout the study, I thus wrote reflective memos that chronicled my responses to the data and the nature and impact of these responses on my analysis. To the extent possible, I “bracketed” (Ashworth, 1999) my personal and theoretical understandings of civic engagement, public scholarship, and course planning as acquired by a phenomenological approach.

*Triangulation*

The use of multiple data collection methods (including interviews, observations, and document analysis) “reduces the risk of chance associations and of systematic biases due to a specific method, and allows a better assessment of the generality of the explanations” developed (Maxwell, 1996, pp. 93-94). Denzin (1978) used the term triangulation, which emerged from the
navigational means of determining the location of an unknown point by drawing a triangle between two known points and an unknown point (Polkinghorne, 1983), to describe the use of multiple methods to enhance validity in qualitative studies. Denzin (1989) also advocates theoretical triangulation as a means of ensuring research validity. By incorporating the contextual filters model and sociocultural learning perspectives into a single conceptual framework, I attempted to expand the range of explanations that I considered in this study and reduce the possibility that a single theory would constrain my interpretations of the data.

**Peer Debriefing**

By employing a peer debriefer (Creswell, 1998), who reviewed my coding and analysis, I integrated a means of externally checking my data analysis and validating my conclusions. A peer debriefer acts as a “devil’s advocate” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) that asks challenging questions about interpretations and serves as a sounding board for the researcher. In this way, peer review helps to ensure the trustworthiness of a researcher’s methods and claims. The peer reviewer for this study was a fellow doctoral candidate and graduate student member of the Public Scholarship Associates. As such, she was familiar with the context of this study; she was not, however, aware of the identities of the study’s participants.

**Member Checks**

I shared drafts of Chapters 4 – 6 with participants in the study, asking them not only to verify the information I presented, but to comment on my interpretations of the data. I did not necessarily alter my interpretations if participants did not agree with them, but instead carefully considered participants’ responses as I finalized my analysis. By sharing my findings chapters with participants, I was also able to ensure that I was adequately protecting participants’ identities (see discussion of ethical considerations below).

**Ethical Considerations**
The institutional affiliation of all participants in this study is public. To protect the identity of individual participants, however, I incorporated a number of strategies. As part of my discussion of informed consent with each participant, I noted that while I would make every attempt to conceal their identity, it might be inadvertently compromised within the Penn State and local communities. I asked participants to indicate on the informed consent form if they authorized the use of their disciplinary affiliation in my dissertation and any interim and subsequent papers and reports. I also asked them if I might incorporate quotes from their published writing on relevant topics. If a participant elected not to allow me to publish information on his or her disciplinary affiliation, I refer to him or her only as a faculty member (tenured, tenure-track but untenured, or contingent) and in a humanities, social science, science, or professional discipline or field. For the duration of the study I maintained a master list of participants’ names and corresponding assigned number, as well as all data files, memos, and reports in a password-protected file on my password-protected computer.

Limitations

Though I believe that my study contributes to the literatures on course planning, faculty beliefs about teaching, civic engagement, and public scholarship, like any study, this research effort has its limitations. In electing to carry out my study at a single institution I concentrated on the influence of institutional context on faculty course planning, but I potentially limited the applicability of the study findings to other universities and colleges. In addition, because membership in the Public Scholarship Associates group is elective, all faculty participants were motivated in some way to join the group. This may limit the application of the findings to other faculty or to other professional development activities. I am not, for example, able to comment on how faculty members who are not similarly motivated might incorporate civic engagement into their courses (in keeping with institutional or program missions), nor on how similarly
motivated faculty members who do not have access to a group of like-minded colleagues are supported as they plan courses for civic engagement. In presenting the findings of the study, I provide sufficient detail so that readers can determine whether the findings could reasonably be extrapolated to different settings.

The nature of the group I examined as a potential mediating context for faculty course design may also be construed as a potential limitation. As the PSA group focuses on the intersection of public scholarship on the whole of faculty work (e.g., research, service, and teaching) and my study focuses primarily on teaching, it may appear too encompassing. From a sociocultural perspective, this may be viewed as an advantage because the choice of the group permits the study of faculty work in its complexity, as well as the potential integration of faculty roles in research, teaching, and service. Finally, due to my small, non-random sample, I sought not to make generalizations, but to set the stage for further study by surfacing themes and additional questions in need of further examination.

**Summary of Methods**

This study was designed to explore the relationships among faculty beliefs about educational purposes, specifically civic engagement, and their course planning decisions. There are few studies in higher education that focus specifically on the role of educational beliefs in course design and even fewer that explore this relationship in detail through intensive qualitative methods. Understanding why, if, and how faculty align their beliefs about the purposes of higher education with their course designs and teaching will thus contribute to the curriculum literature. In particular, the study is designed to explore whether the contextual filters model may be extended or elaborated and how intentional faculty development activities (such as the Public Scholarship Associates) affect faculty member’s educational beliefs and behaviors. The
propositions generated as a result of the study can thus guide future research and the consideration of faculty development approaches.
CHAPTER 4:
PROFILE OF PARTICIPANTS

This chapter introduces the 14 tenured and tenure-track Penn State faculty members who participated in this study, in terms of various demographic, personal, and professional characteristics. These and other attributes are, according to the contextual filters model of faculty course planning (Stark et al., 1990) which guided this study, content influences on faculty members’ curricular and instructional choices. In order to protect the identities of the participants, I describe them collectively, summarizing their relevant characteristics, beliefs, and experiences.

This chapter is organized in accordance with the “content” portion of the contextual filters model that guided this study (see Figure 6). First, I describe participants’ professional and personal backgrounds and characteristics, including their: tenure status, academic field, and academic appointment, gender, family status, race, and religious and political identities. I also review how these characteristics and experiences motivated participants to teach for civic capacity and engagement. I then describe their views of their academic fields with regard to public scholarship and civic engagement and their beliefs about the civic purposes of education. Throughout, I comment as appropriate about how these characteristics, beliefs, and experiences act as “content influences” (as understood in the contextual filters model that guided this study) on participants’ decisions regarding what and how to teach for civic capacity and engagement.

18 I interviewed 15 faculty members for this study. In the course of conducting a second interview with one participant, however, I learned that although he held the title Assistant Professor, his was a multi-year, fixed-term position rather than a tenure-line appointment as specified in my sample selection criteria. Since this study was intentionally limited to tenured and tenure-track faculty, who work under different job expectations than fixed-term faculty, I have excluded this participant’s experiences from my discussion. It should be noted, however, that fixed-term and adjunct faculty and instructors at the university that served as the site for this research have been heavily involved in the Public Scholarship Associates and teach a number of service-learning and other civic engagement-oriented undergraduate courses.
Findings relating to the two research questions driving this study – 1) How, if at all, does faculty involvement in the Public Scholarship Associates (PSA) influence their teaching-related learning and/or practice? and 2) How, if at all, do faculty members align their undergraduate teaching with their implicit and/or explicit ideas about civic engagement as an educational purpose? – are presented in Chapters 5 and 6, respectively. In those chapters, I examine the influences of individuals’ characteristics, beliefs, and experiences – as presented in this chapter – on participants' navigation of contextual contexts (such as the PSA) and on their teaching for civic capacity and engagement.

**Participants’ Background and Characteristics**

The personal and scholarly characteristics and prior experiences of faculty members are considered relatively stable, pre-existing influences on course planning and teaching (Stark et al., 1990; Lattuca & Stark, 2009). Within the guiding conceptual framework of this study, these
attributes are captured in the “faculty members’ background and characteristics” box (see Figure 6) and include educational training, religious and spiritual beliefs, political beliefs, and professional experiences outside of the academy. Based on previous research, I posited that demographic characteristics such as a faculty member's career age or tenure status (DeAngelo, Hurtado, Pryor, Kelly, Santos, & Korn, 2009), gender (Chamberlin & Hickey, 2001; Constantinople, Cornelius, & Gray, 1988; Feldman, 1993; Grossman & Grossman, 1994; Herron, Beedle, & King, 2006; McDowell, 1993), and race (Abes, Jackson, & Jones, 2002; Antonio, Astin, & Cress, 2000; Hammond, 1994; Maruyama & Moreno, 2000) might also be salient content influences with regard to teaching for civic capacity and engagement. In general, participants' responses support the findings of previous research, at least with regard to gender and tenure status. I could not analyze the influence of race, due to the racial homogeneity of the study sample. Participants’ reports suggest that additional “experiences” (in the parlance noted in the contextual filters model) may be salient content influences on curriculum decision making. For example, participants talked about the influence of community engagement experiences during childhood, parental status, personal identities (e.g., “change agent”), and personal motivations related to civic engagement. My analysis suggests that these background characteristics and experiences are mutually influential; for example, content influences such as a faculty member’s view of her academic field shapes her beliefs about the civic purposes of education. The contextual filters model did not specify the interaction of content influences; rather, discussions of the model have described content factors as influencing how faculty members react to and navigate the contexts in which they work and make course decisions (as discussed in subsequent chapters).

Each faculty member in the study participated in a series of three hour-long interviews, the first of which focused primarily on their personal characteristics and prior experiences and how these influenced their teaching practices. (A list of the questions that guided the first set of
interviews can be found in Appendix F.) I began initial interviews with study participants by asking them to share with me how they came to value and practice education for civic capacity and engagement. In relating to me their journeys, participants identified different combinations of family, educational, religious, and professional influences that led them to teach for civic purposes. While many of these content influences stemmed from childhood experiences, not all participants traced their interest in teaching for civic capacity and engagement to such early influences. Identifying and examining these various content influences reveals the roots of faculty members’ convictions about teaching for civic capacity and engagement.

While a number of personal and professional characteristics appeared to influence participants’ teaching for civic engagement, it was their experiences, more than their demographic traits or formal positions that appeared most influential. This finding is reflected throughout the chapter; the findings regarding the effects of spiritual and political influences, for example, are much more extensive than those related to demographic characteristics such as gender. Additionally, it is important to remember that though the content influences presented in this chapter are parsed into categories and subcategories, the reality is that participants’ characteristics, beliefs, and experiences are not so easily separated; while faculty identities are multiple and integrated, in a given situation, one or more of their characteristics (e.g., gender), beliefs (e.g., about the purposes of education), or experiences (e.g., administrative experience) may be a more salient influence.

Professional Characteristics & Experiences

In this section of this chapter, I discuss the influence of participants’ professional characteristics – specifically tenure status, academic fields, and academic appointment – and experiences related to these professional characteristics on their decisions to teach for civic purposes.
Tenure Status

More than two-thirds of the participants were tenured; of these, four were associate professors and six were full professors (one of which held the title of Distinguished Professor). At the time of our interviews, four respondents were assistant professors on the tenure track (see Table 1). Following the completion of data collection for this study, the two female participants attained tenured status as associate professors.

Table 1: Participant Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure Status</th>
<th>Assistant Professor (n = 4)</th>
<th>Associate Professor (n = 4)</th>
<th>Full Professor (n = 6)</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male (n = 8)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Faculty of Color (n = 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female (n = 6)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>White (n = 11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More tenured faculty than tenure-eligible assistant professors participated in the study. In fact, only four (out of 14) participants were untenured during the course of our interviews. Three of those four pre-tenure faculty participants had employed service-learning as a pedagogical tool with which to teach civic engagement, while only 3 of the 10 tenured participants had done so. This finding is in keeping with the extant research, which suggests that younger (i.e., tenure-track assistant professors) faculty members are more likely to incorporate active and experiential instructional methods into their teaching (see for example, DeAngelo, Hurtado, Pryor, Kelly, Santos, & Korn, 2009).

Tenured participants, even those who had engaged in public scholarship and teaching for civic capacity and engagement prior to earning tenure, reported that they would discourage their pre-tenure colleagues from doing so. On the whole, they felt that early-career faculty would be
insufficiently rewarded or even penalized for focusing too much on their teaching rather than their research. Similarly, three of the four pre-tenure participants indicated that they would likely increase their public scholarship and teaching for civic capacity and engagement once they were tenured. The role of tenure and promotion policies and expectations are discussed further in Chapter 5 as a contextual influence on faculty course planning and teaching for civic capacity and engagement. I note the influence of institutional reward practices here because some participants indicated they taught for civic capacity engagement despite a lack of institutional credit or reward – and attributed these decisions to personal “content” characteristics, like beliefs about the purpose of higher education or personal values.

**Academic Field**

Faculty are members of academic fields. They also have views of their fields that affect the curricular planning decisions they make. In my discussion, I treat disciplinary affiliation as a background characteristic, and reserve a discussion of the influence of participants’ understandings of their discipline for the section entitled “Participants’ Views of their Academic Fields.”

Respondents represented 16 specific academic disciplines and/or fields and 10\(^{19}\) of the University’s 13 colleges. To protect their identities, I do not identify participants’ by their specialization but rather by the larger classification for their field. For example, a sociologist is grouped with other faculty in social sciences; a physicist with those in the sciences. Participants included four faculty members from humanities fields, four social scientists, four from professional fields, and two from natural sciences (see Table 2).

---

\(^{19}\) The colleges of business, health and human development, and information sciences were not represented in this study. The Public Scholarship Associates at the University has active faculty members in the latter two colleges, but these individuals did not participate in the study.
Table 2: Academic Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Classification</th>
<th># of Participants</th>
<th>Participants’ Disciplines and Fields(^\text{20})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>African &amp; African American Studies, English, History, Philosophy, Rhetoric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Economics, Education, Geography, Women’s Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Geosciences, Physics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Fields</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Architecture, Communications, Education, Engineering, Landscape Architecture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research suggests that disciplinary influences on teaching are the most salient of content influences (Angelo & Cross, 1993; Lattuca & Stark, 2009; Quinlan, 1999; Smart, Feldman, & Ethington, 2000; Stark & Lattuca, 1997; Stark et al., 1990). This makes a great deal of sense considering that most college courses focus on disciplinary content goals. Participants in this study, however, indicated repeatedly that personal history, experiences, motivations, and beliefs were the stronger influences on their decisions to incorporate civic engagement and/or public scholarship into their courses and teaching practices. Participants also acknowledged that their academic disciplines influenced the intellectual content of their courses, but were more apt to attribute their decisions to use civically engaging instructional methods and content to their own personal experiences, beliefs, and motivations. Yet even those respondents who perceived a civic engagement or public thrust within their academic field (including communications and economics, for example) tended to view their efforts as atypical or marginalized within their field.

\(^{20}\) The number of disciplines and fields is greater than the number of participants because some faculty members held formal dual appointments or were affiliated with a second department. Some fields, like African & African American Studies and Women’s Studies, are by nature interdisciplinary and could be categorized as, for example, humanities or social science fields. In order to not repeat fields represented by multiple participants, however, I elected to categorize such fields by virtue of participants’ primary affiliations. Women’s Studies, therefore, is listed under Social Sciences and African and African American Studies as a Humanities field because participants with dual appointments (rather than only affiliations) came from disciplines in these categories, respectively.
This finding suggests the primacy of personal traits and experiences over disciplinary affiliation (which may or may not be receptive to civically-engaged faculty work) with regard to faculty members’ teaching for civic capacity and engagement.

**Participants’ Academic Appointments**

Six participants held dual appointments (one of which held appointments in two different colleges). Two participants held or had held faculty appointments with University Extension responsibilities. Extension was described by one of these participants as a “branch of the university that provides research-based information for its citizens.” Four participants held administrative positions in addition to their faculty responsibilities; at least three others occupied such positions in the past. Participants’ administrative experiences, the departments and colleges in which they worked, and other aspects of their faculty positions influenced their teaching for civic capacity and engagement in many ways.

Half of the participants currently or formerly held administrative appointments in an academic program, department, college, a center, or at the university at-large. Positions ranged from coordinators of undergraduate or graduate studies to department heads, a dean of a college, center directors, and a vice-presidency – and a few participants held more than one of these appointments. Having administrative experience appeared to influence participants’ understanding of various aspects of the institutional context, and seemed to render certain aspects of this context more salient. For example, four of these seven participants indicated that their administrative experience raised their awareness of institutional barriers to and enablers of teaching for civic capacity and engagement, allowed them to more adeptly navigate institutional policies and structures to further their teaching goals, and helped them make strides toward enhancing the emphasis on civic capacity and engagement in the undergraduate curriculum.
The seven participants who held dual appointments or positions with extension education responsibilities, or faculty appointments which deviated from the presumed norm (the tripartite responsibilities of research, teaching, and service) similarly indicated that these positions influenced their curricular and instructional decisions related to teaching for civic capacity and engagement. These respondents perceived that the cultures and resources of their different departments or colleges at times enhanced and at other times made it more difficult to teach for civic purposes. Similarly, extension education responsibilities brought faculty members into regular contact with various communities and constituencies, allowing them to draw on these experiences in their classroom discussions or other teaching interactions with undergraduates. A faculty member with no classroom teaching responsibilities was able to channel his or her teaching energies toward undergraduates interested in engaging in public scholarship research and directed study regarding civic and community engagement.

**Professional Experience**

Though only a relatively few faculty members in Stark et al.’s (1990) *PICC* study indicated having experience as practitioners in their fields, more than half of the study respondents reported having worked outside of the academy in positions related to their discipline or field. Those faculty members with such experiences, however, identified them as among the strongest content influences on their course planning; faculty in professional fields rated these influences most strongly (Stark et al., 1990). I posited, based on newer research like that of Schuster & Finkelstein (2006), that faculty members in applied/professional fields (e.g., education, engineering) might be more likely than their colleagues to have had such experiences. While all three of this study’s faculty participants in professional fields had substantive work experience outside of the academy that was directly related to their field of expertise, two of the four faculty members in the humanities and three of the five social sciences participants also reported such work experiences.
Participants' professional experiences prior to their current faculty positions included work in the corporate world and in not-for-profit organizations, as well as teaching experiences outside of higher education. Three participants, two in social sciences and one in a humanities discipline, indicated that they had substantial teaching experience in the k-12 arena. Other faculty members had prior work experience in advertising, for non-profit organizations, community-based agencies, in the political arena, and as consultants in their fields.

These faculty members viewed their experiences as pivotal influences on their undergraduate teaching and, particularly, on their teaching for civic capacity and engagement. For example, a tenured humanities faculty member responded:

What enables me? Well, two things come immediately to mind. One is having read newspapers as a kid and the other is having been a reporter and a journalist and an editor. And the wider context for those would be the connection between language arts skills and citizenship skills.

Her response demonstrates the important role that work experiences outside the walls of the academy can play in teaching, as well as how viewing a discipline as public-serving – as being innately connected to issues of engagement, democracy, and citizenship – can lead a faculty member to advocate certain purposes of education and to adopt specific course goals and instructional tactics. Many respondents relied on practical examples from their prior work experiences to drive home important points regarding the application of course content to public problems. For example, one tenured participant whose work experiences including creating women-centered advertising campaigns used these to focus students' attention on real-world examples of the differential (i.e., sexist) treatment of women by the media. She also spoke of those experiences in the corporate world as a motivating force behind her return to graduate school and her subsequent work in public scholarship. She explained that there are ways to lead lives of coherence in which one lives her values, but
also that one can “fight the good fight,” from inside the corporate structure, as she once did. She indicated that her experiences gave her “street cred[ibility]” in the eyes of her students. Another participant also indicated that she believed that her past work experiences combined with her continued community-engaged scholarship help to keep her “credible” and “grounded.” At least four others also relied on stories from their professional experiences to suggest, for instance, complexities, applications, and obstacles that practitioners in their various fields face in the “real world.”

Five of the seven respondents also indicated that their professional experiences influenced their teaching – the “form” of their courses in the contextual filters model – by leading them to reflect on their discipline/field how it could be used to espouse particular educational purposes. One participant indicated, that part of the reason he works to incorporate community-based projects into his courses is because his professional experiences led him to believe that “people should have access to design as a way of improving their lives” and that “if students can learn from having that experience of providing it [good design], then we should” give them those experiences.

Additionally, these “real life” experiences tended to focus participants’ attention on particular contextual elements – such as external influences like public policy, k-12 education, and the role of the media, in ways that indirectly influenced the courses participants taught. One social scientist, for example, indicated that her k-12 teaching experiences and her cooperative extension work underscored the importance of teaching students about issues of social justice and to consider their own privilege as they embark on service-learning or other community-based experiences in underprivileged communities.
**Educational Background**

Participants' educational backgrounds, in particular their experiences (or lack thereof) with pedagogical training and prior teaching experiences, were relevant to their propensity to teach for civic capacity and engagement. Participants reported their proclivity for teaching approaches that resembled those used by teachers they held in high regard, and for avoiding approaches they had personally found to be frustrating, problematic, or ineffective as students. Some said they found it difficult to change their teaching habits to address the needs of students who they perceived to be different than they themselves were as undergraduates. A tenured historian spoke of the influence of graduate school and disciplinary training on faculty teaching:

There’s no question that we come into a teaching position like this as the product of graduate training through our disciplinary departments; we see those models practiced upon us and we then become practitioners of those models. Often it is just by example, rather than by much explicit training in teaching per se.

Another participant, an assistant professor in a professional field, remarked that rather than recreating the wheel, or designing a course from the ground up, the “old joke” in his field was that faculty members tend to recreate the last studio course they experienced as students. There’s a grain of truth to this joke, according to the participant, “because to a certain degree your experience of what studio is supposed to be comes out of what you experienced” as a student. He expressed “dissatisfaction” with this shortcut; instead has “read books about teaching and what constructivist teaching might [look like].”

Participants in this study, in keeping with the research literature, reported that formal pedagogical training undertaken during graduate study, on-the-job professional development, and learning from teaching, affected the ways in which they designed undergraduate courses. These influences, consistent with the findings of Stark et al. (1990), appear less influential, however, than participants’ disciplinary training. In addition, most respondents reported little (if any) formal
pedagogical training throughout the course of their graduate studies, a finding consistent with the literature on graduate education (e.g., Golde, Walker, & Associates, 2006; Wulff, Austin, & Associates, 2004). Whereas approximately 30 percent of faculty respondents in the PICC study (Stark et al., 1990) reported taking courses on pedagogy or educational theory (Stark et al., 1990), roughly the same percentage of the faculty participants in this study had similar experiences. The percentage increases if participants in the PSA seminar are included. Only one participant, a tenured humanities professor, was required to take a course on college-level instruction during her graduate studies, though two participants had taken coursework in instructional methods and/or educational theory as part of their teacher training for elementary and/or secondary education.

Pedagogies such as service-learning and community-based research can be effective means of teaching for civic capacity and engagement (Battistoni, 1996; Myers-Lipton, 1998; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Rhoads, 1998; Strand, Marullo, Cutforth, Stoecker, & Donohue, 2003), but none of the study participants reported encountering such pedagogies in their graduate training. Only one respondent reported receiving some formal training on service-learning – in the form of an elective, professional-development seminar – at a previous institution.

Five participants reported teaching experiences outside the academy. One taught high school French and history while attending college, another taught English as a Second Language and American Studies courses while living abroad, a third taught at a Governor's School while in graduate school, another taught middle-school social studies, and the fifth taught elementary school for two years in addition to an array of other k-12 teaching experiences. All taught prior to earning their terminal degrees. Only two of the four reported any form of formal teacher training – or training in curriculum planning or instructional methods prior to their teaching experiences. The one who taught at the Governor's School later received some training in instructional methods in the form of faculty development while a newly minted tenure-track faculty member at
a prior university. The remaining participant taught high school abroad and reported no formal teacher training. These participants suggested that these prior teaching experiences had indeed influenced their current course planning and teaching, but not necessarily the way they taught for civic capacity and engagement (with the exception of the one with training in service-learning pedagogy).

While most faculty respondents asserted that they had never had any formal training as part of their graduate programs in teaching, one lamented that “teaching was not valued” in her graduate program – a few noted formative experiences, in the shape of a required graduate course or an optional faculty development seminar. Only one participant, now a tenured humanities professor, reported receiving formal training – in the form of a pre-tenure, elective faculty development seminar – regarding known civic engagement pedagogies like service-learning.

**Personal Characteristics & Experiences**

In addition to their professional roles and responsibilities discussed above, I explored how, if at all, participants’ personal characteristics and experiences (i.e., gender, childhood experiences, parental status, race and cultural background, religious and political beliefs and identities) influenced their teaching. As noted earlier, my analysis suggests that the various content influences are mutually influential; this becomes evident in the discussion that follows. Participants’ personal characteristics and experiences influenced their views of their academic fields and their beliefs about the purposes of education (the two additional content influences). In addition, these personal traits and experiences affected participants’ perceptions of various contextual influences (discussed in Chapter 5) and thus affected their decisions about incorporating teaching for civic capacity and engagement in their undergraduate courses.
Gender

Six participants identified as women and eight as men (see Table 1). In keeping with Stark et al.’s (1990) findings, participants in this study did not identify their gender as directly influencing their decisions to teach for civic capacity and engagement. However, respondents did identify certain life experiences – like parenting – as influencing their decisions regarding teaching for civic capacity and engagement in gendered ways. Upon being asked directly about the influence of gender on their teaching for civic capacity and engagement, all three of the six women participants who were mothers indicated that they perceived their status as mothers as affecting their teaching for civic capacity and engagement. By comparison, only two of the seven participants who were fathers indicated that their parental status was similarly influential; one of these participants also stated that he believed that women faculty – and women faculty who were mothers, in particular – faced more challenges professionally in terms of time and expectations due to society’s continued gendered norms. Most interestingly, while both of these fathers as well as one of the mothers perceived their status as a parent as motivating their teaching for civic purposes, the other two mothers – one tenured and one tenure-track – perceived their parental status as an obstacle preventing them from teaching for civic capacity and engagement to their fullest potential.

Half of the women – including all of the mothers – indicated that they experienced tensions between traditional gender roles (i.e., woman as primary caregiver) and their professional goals and responsibilities. Specifically, as teaching for civic capacity and engagement was perceived by many participants as important but not rewarded by promotion and tenure policies, two of the three women admitted to feeling tugged in multiple directions and to experiencing guilt – to feeling that they were “not doing enough” to advance undergraduate civic capacity and engagement. While both men and women participants (parents and non-parents alike) indicated
that they perceived teaching for civic capacity and engagement as more time intensive (in terms of planning and teaching) than teaching classes without incorporating such course goals, participants who were mothers were more likely than the participants who were fathers to indicate that they felt that their efforts to teach for civic capacity and engagement sometimes suffered because of their (gendered) parental status.

A female, tenured humanities professor, exemplifying one influence of gender on teaching for civic purposes, expressed feelings of guilt about not incorporating certain civic-engagement-oriented instructional techniques in her undergraduate classes currently, despite having had previous previously found them to enhance student learning and engagement in her courses. She explained that a multitude of roles and responsibilities – including being a mom currently expecting her second child – led her to feel unable to incorporate time-intensive pedagogies like service-learning or on-line dialogue in her undergraduate courses at present. Similarly, a woman tenure-track faculty member in a professional field spoke at some length about juggling various roles and obligations – as a faculty member, wife, and mother. Returning from a women’s retreat, where another Penn State faculty member spoke about making career decisions as a woman, mother, and care-taker of an elderly parent, she reported that she burst into tears. She commented that she later recognized that “what I was responding to was her [the speaker's] sense of complete exhaustion of being in that scenario of not feeling like she's meeting anyone's needs well and feeling like she's just letting everyone down.” The time and energy demands traditionally placed on women, and particularly, women with children, appeared to have a negative influence on their ability to incorporate relatively time-intensive service-learning activities into their teaching practices. The women, particularly mothers, felt they simply did not possess the time and energy to devote themselves to such civically-engaged teaching strategies, though they
believed they were important and effective, particularly in light of their perception that such
efforts would not be institutionally recognized or rewarded.

That female participants struggled to balance the demands of their professional and
personal lives is in keeping with recent national survey data by the Higher Education Research
Institute (DeAngelo et al., 2009). While two women participants indicated that their gender led
them, in part, to not do as much as they would like to teach for civic purposes, a third female
participant indicated that her gendered experiences were part of her motivation to teach for civic
capacity and engagement. This participant, a tenured scientist and mother of two school-aged
children, lamented, “it’s one of the hardest things you have to do as a female... [to] put your kid in
daycare and go back to work. And it doesn’t get easier with the next one. It’s really tough.” She
identified this as a gendered experience; that is, mothers, in particular, experience tension about
leaving their children in daycare. This tension, however, also appeared to drive, or at least justify,
her decision to engage in civically-minded teaching and scholarship activities. She taught the
science behind pressing policy concerns such as climate change to educate undergraduates who
would be called upon to vote on related issues that would, in turn, affect her children’s futures.

**Family Status**

My queries about gender, as well as what motivated participants to teach for civic capacity
and engagement, unearthed influences of parenting and family characteristics on curricular and
instructional decisions. Two factors – current parental status and childhood experiences –
emerged as salient influences.

**Parental status.** Five of the 10 participants with children – women and men – explicitly
stated that their parental status influenced their teaching for civic capacity and engagement.
Participants with their own families – partners, or partners and children, for example – often
spoke of looking at their world and their work through new lenses.
For example, the woman scientist quoted at the end of the previous section wanted to make her work “worthwhile” by making meaningful contributions through her research and teaching in ways that might make the world a better place. These commitments, she noted, were inexorably linked with her decision to put her children in day care in order to go back to work. Specifically, she wanted to make her work:

something that they’re going to be proud of and that helps them have a better future. And so there was a motivation for me – maybe it’s a rationalization, I don’t know – that if I’m going to spend my time away from them I’m going to spend it doing something that I think is worthwhile and that they can be proud of.

A tenured male scientist also identified his children as a catalyst for incorporating public scholarship into an undergraduate science course. He perceived the k-12 science education that his children received in a local public school system as “almost an afterthought.” His children, he argued, “did not get a very good education in science and they were turned-off by science quite a lot.” Recognizing that he, as a scientist who believes that “it is in society’s interest that the public learn about science and develop a more positive attitude [toward it],” he began a partnership – to improve the local primary school science curriculum – with a colleague in the College of Education and a local elementary school.

Another participant, the father to a two-year-old child, who was anticipating a second child with his partner (also a tenure-track faculty member at the University) discussed the impact of fatherhood: “obviously thinking about the world I want them to live in and how I want them to see the world, the role model aspect comes into play.” Like other participants with children, this participant identified his child as a motivational force – in this case creating a desire to shape the world in which his child would grow up.

Childhood experiences. Participants with and without their own children indicated that experiences during their youth influenced their worldviews and personal commitments to
teaching for civic capacity and engagement. For example, participants who observed parents and grandparents engaged in improving the well-being of their communities tended to do the same—and to incorporate such efforts into their teaching commitments. Notably, these childhood influences were not necessarily limited to one source—participants recalled a diverse array of early experiences ranging from examples set by family members, to religious instruction or accompanying parents to political rallies or public protests, to international travel and discussing community news or debating political issues at the dinner table, which they believed influenced the personal value they place on community engagement.

Participants sometimes referred only nebulously to experiences and teachings dating to their childhood; others, however, were able to relate specific stories or recall specific memories that launched their interest in civic engagement. For example, one participant shared a compelling story which combined the influences of his parents and their religious and political beliefs as they answered their son's simple query about a neighborhood child who came by their house begging for food. His mother, a Buddhist, explained that it was the child's “fate” to “liv[e] a life of need because [he and his family] were not generous in their past lives.” She intended this as a lesson about generosity for her own son. When he asked his dad about the child, his father told his son that those “people are not educated and [those] people are not trying, they have no desire to achieve things in society.” He told his son “if you care about these things then you should educate yourself and you should become a minister of state and then as an educated person in political power [you will] be able to change these things and help these people if you want to.” It was the second lesson that the participant took to heart, the adage to combine education and “non-sovereign power” to create social change. His dedication to addressing issues of poverty in this country is embodied in his research and his teaching, which take the form of public scholarship and teaching for civic capacity and engagement.
Four participants did not identify early roots to their commitment to teach for civic purposes. For example, a tenured humanities faculty member, indicated, “I don’t have a big background in terms of civic engagement, in terms of things I did as a kid with my family or anything like that.” Instead, she attributed her interest in “thinking about public scholarship, of working in public scholarship” to a service-learning seminar she attended as a new faculty member. Engaging students in local communities came first as a way to effectively teach her students to ground their understanding of course principles in real life. Two other participants similarly identified later educational or professional experiences as fostering their commitment to teaching for civic capacity and engagement. Four respondents were able to identify early influences that made them more open to the idea of teaching for civic purposes, but believed that later experiences were more influential.

**Race and Cultural Background**

In addition to gender and family influences, four participants noted how their race/ethnicity or cultural backgrounds influenced their curricular and instructional decisions. The majority of participants in this study were White, but six participants had lived outside the U.S. for extended periods of time. One of the White participants held dual citizenship. The sample also included three faculty members of color, two of whom were born and raised outside of the United States (one in a South American nation, the other in Southeast Asia), and the third identified as Black, with Afro-Caribbean roots (see Table 1).

One faculty member of color reported that growing up in the African American community, and specifically in a Black church, was one impetus to teach for civic capacity and engagement and for social justice. All four participants who grew up outside the United States attributed some of their motivation to teach for civic capacity and engagement or pedagogical choices to their cultural backgrounds and international experiences. Three other participants with
extensive international experiences, e.g., those who lived outside the U.S. for extended periods, similarly commented that these experiences contributed to their teaching for civic capacity and engagement. These participants drew on their experiences of the value of civic engagement and the role of public scholarship in other cultures and countries in class discussions, thereby enhancing conversations regarding social justice, the role of knowledge in community decision making, and other facets of civic capacity.

Advocates of teaching for civic capacity and engagement often specify the goal of helping students understand differences among people of various races, ethnicities, political inclinations, religions, and sexual orientations – in the hope of fostering students’ abilities to work productively across difference in the work place and in civil society. In addition, these advocates also argue that recruiting and retaining a diverse faculty is central to this goal (Cole & Barber, 2003; Hurtado, 2001; Smith, 1989; Umbach, 2006).

One tenure-track faculty member of color expressed having been hesitant to join the faculty ranks of a university perceived as lacking in racial diversity and located in a racially homogenous area. This participant’s decision to accept the faculty position created a professional obstacle; because his/her research focuses on urban populations of color, the University’s rural location was challenging. The participant's research projects have been focused in an urban area approximately a three-to-four hour drive from campus. The time and travel requirements have made it more difficult to involve undergraduates in research projects, which are central to her teaching for civic engagement and social justice. In this instance, the participant's race appears to have influenced his/her research interests, and this situation, combined with contextual influences including the University’s rural location and racial homogeneity, make finding sites for conducting public scholarship, and therefore teaching students by involving them in personal research projects, extremely challenging.
In some instances, participants discussed their cultural background, rather than their race/ethnicity, as influences on their decisions to teach for civic engagement and engagement. The influence of cultural background emerged in the context of comments about family upbringing, extensive international travel, and religion. For example, a tenured humanities professor and person of color indicated that “my sense of political engagement with issues started in high school and that [engagement] came out of the politics of my [home country] in the 1960s.” In our interview, this participant noted that his upbringing in a fledgling democracy taught him the importance of democratic engagement, something he strives to share with his students.

Race appeared to be a salient content influence on teaching for civic purposes for participants of color in this study. All three participants of color consistently brought issues of race, and social justice issues more broadly, to the forefront in our discussions of their curricular and instructional decisions about what and how to teach for civic capacity and engagement. It should be noted, however, that most of the White participants also intentionally chose to incorporate issues of race and social justice into their teaching for civic capacity and engagement.

Religion and Spirituality

Although Stark et al. (1990) included religious and spiritual beliefs in their contextual filters model, they found that only in about 10 percent of cases did faculty respondents’ identify these beliefs as influencing their course planning. More recent research, however, suggests that strong spiritual beliefs influence how people make meaning and construct knowledge (Tisdell, 2001) as well as how they engage in the world around them (Astin, Astin, Lindholm & Bryant, 2005; DeSouza, 2003; Harris & Moran, 1998). For example, persons who identify as spiritual are likely to highly value civic responsibility and work for social justice (Lindholm & Szelenyi, 2006). A number of the faculty participants in this study indicated that their religion and/or spirituality influenced their decisions about course form and their teaching, albeit mostly in an indirect
manner. For example, participants tended to describe how principles such as justice and helping others were part of their religious or spiritual upbringing and/or beliefs, and that they strove to live out these principles in their personal and professional lives, including through their teaching for civic purposes.

The religious and spiritual leanings of the faculty participants, as well as the degree to which they described them as influencing their teaching, were diverse. Four participants – notably all women – were active members of different faith traditions, identifying as Church of Christ, Episcopalian, Lutheran, and Quaker. The majority of participants indicated that while they were raised within a specific religious or spiritual tradition (Christianity, Hinduism, and Islam were named), they no longer practiced or identified with the religion in which they were raised.

One tenured social scientist grew up in “a multi-religious and multicultural extended family structure,” which meant, he explained, that “from very early on I had to learn to live across cultures,” and to understand and respect religious differences, lessons he strives to share with his students. He also indicated that he considers himself a “free thinker” who doesn’t “get trapped by dogma.” This personal characteristic appears to influence his teaching for civic capacity and engagement in the sense that he believes his courses teach students to think critically.

A tenured humanities faculty member described himself as the “product of a non-practicing Catholic mother and a non-practicing Protestant father.” Having spent a considerable portion of his childhood in the Middle East amidst Muslims, Jews, and Christians of various denominations, he reported taking “a very secular view toward religion,” seeing it “as part of the mosaic of ideologies that have helped people define who they are.” He remarked that this formative experience and his personal beliefs about religion influenced his beliefs about his discipline and, in turn, his teaching practices:
My interest in ancient religion has deepened my doubt about the authority of any one religion to present to us a clear and authoritative vision of the truth. I see all of these as products of human experience struggling for understanding. And of course, I'm well aware of how those struggles have spawned conflict in the name of religion and so I'm not especially a champion of dogmatic religion for those reasons.

This participant's religious and international upbringing influenced not only his intellectual interests but also his contention that working across differences (of faith, culture) is essential to a peaceful and vibrant community of whatever size. While his personal religious beliefs (or non-beliefs, as the case may be) don't emerge directly in his classroom, they do however manifest themselves to the extent that I build that into my intellectual makeup and commitment to teaching, I'm committed to presenting a view of the diversities of faiths and how they have operated as one of the major strands of historical experience.

He attempts to share with his students a non-secular perspective on religion’s influence in human social history.

Other faculty members who identified with particular faith practices spoke of their religions as having influenced their beliefs about community and service which, in turn, influenced their beliefs about the purpose of education, their own teaching philosophies, and, directly and indirectly, the very form of their teaching practices. For example, one faculty participant reported that her faith community was “an integral part of [her and her family’s] life; it was the central foundation.” Specifically, she “always saw people giving back,” felt a strong sense of community, and learned “that you are not one person, you are part of a community, and [that community] wouldn’t be where [it is] are without the community and helping others. For her, faith and community were deeply intertwined. This upbringing and continued spiritual identity influenced her beliefs about educational purpose and her personal philosophy of education – which might be summed up as “it takes a village” – suggesting that teaching and learning occur regularly in formal and informal ways and that we all have something to learn from and teach each other.
Another faculty respondent spoke of a “spiritual quest” that led her, as an adult, to Quakerism. She found that “Quakers embody all the things that I’ve always believed in.” The Quaker framework, SPICE, refers to the core beliefs of Quakerism: Simplicity, Peace, Integrity, Community, and Equity. These beliefs reflect her own sense that “it’s not enough for you to believe things, but you have to enact them in your life and you have to be a person for change.” These beliefs are embraced in her teaching philosophy and practices – in the notion that issues of social justice must be embodied in educational policy and “that you have to be true to what you know to be true from a social justice perspective.” She further indicated that “[it's] been really nice to kind of find this spiritual practice in line with things; that’s been helpful.”

Another participant, a scientist who was raised Episcopalian and had recently rejoined the church, values religious teachings regarding stewardship and justice. This participant struggles with “trying to find ways to think about stewardship from religious traditions, to reconcile them with my understanding as a scientist.” Biblical understandings of creation, for example, are in direct contradiction to the participant's personal knowledge as a scientist, but she finds support for environmental justice in the values Episcopalianism. She commented,

I’ve given a lot of thought to stewardship issues and environmental justice based on my own religious or spiritual journey that I’m stumbling along on, inadequately, but none-the-less. Certainly that’s something that’s relevant for me….I came to a reconciliation with that that you invest in yourself educationally so that you can give back later.

This participant's spiritual faith fosters a personal motivation to give back to the community, particularly in environmentally conscious ways, and reports that she often incorporates these values in her courses.

While most participants who reported their religious or spiritual identities influenced their civic values, one participant indicated that her religion fostered her choice of and passion for her academic field and, in particular, its public aspects. This tenured humanities professor recalled
how her religious upbringing in the Lutheran Church spawned her passion for her academic discipline. She commented,

    I think that’s where I got my first taste of, and interest in, philosophy without [yet] knowing what that was. There were important big questions and you could read [the Bible] and you were supposed to kind of ask and press [for answers]. So I think some of those early [religious] experiences did play a role.

According to this participant, “there was a kind of angle on big questions, as I am calling them, that I can chart back to being younger.” She believed that,

    some of the religious questions I had earlier as a younger child and [her belief] that [religion] shouldn’t just be something abstract talked about in church, but should be meaningful or be rejected. That’d be fine too. But the hypocrisy sort of got on my nerves in terms of, well, if we’re really talking about this stuff, what does it mean to play out in real life?

She found herself asking similar questions of her disciplinary area of study – and so her religious training, her interest in “big questions” and their “real world” applicability manifest themselves in curricular and instructional choices that include teaching for civic capacity and engagement.

**Political Identity and Beliefs**

In addition to religious and spiritual upbringing and beliefs, participants' political identities and commitments also appeared to influence their teaching for civic and community engagement. This influence was primarily indirect; for instance as a motivator for one’s curricular and instructional choices; for example, one respondent’s beliefs about democracy and democratic decision-making influenced the manner in which she managed classroom dialogue. Nearly all of the faculty participants in this study identified politically as left of center, consistent with national trends (HERI, 2002; Rothman, Lichter, & Nevitte, 2005; Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006; Tobin & Weinberg, 2006).

Some participants indicated that they identified themselves politically, either directly or indirectly, to their students but were intentional about creating open environments in their
classrooms. A full professor in the humanities who self-identified as liberal added that “I’m probably not going to be on Horowitz’s hit list for radical liberal educators.” He explained, saying, “I don’t preach from the front of the classroom on a liberal agenda.” Rather, as a historian he demonstrates in his courses “how those who hold political power conservatively succeed as well” as their more liberal peers. As a result, he believes “that quite often [his] students probably don’t know what [his] personal politics are.” Interestingly, while this participant is careful to avoid sharing his personal politics during regular class time, during election cycles he offers an optional, extra class session in which he leads a discussion about the relationship between current political issues and one of the course’s themes – ancient democratic politics. It is only during this session that he shares his own political beliefs with his students. The response to his revelation of his own political beliefs and identity varies – he reported “both beaming faces who feel that their own beliefs are affirmed...and others who seem to be crestfallen” – and he “view[s] that as a healthy indicator that I’m at least getting people whose natural upbringing or own disposition is diverse to think in expanding ways about the world in which they live.” The fact that students attend these sessions seems to indicate their interest in connecting past historical circumstances to current political issues and desire to explicitly address such connections. That the participant believes this is best done outside of class may reflect both his personal beliefs (content influences) and the contextual influence of organizations like the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education (FIRE), which assert that college and university faculty members demonstrate an overt liberal bias in their teaching.

21 David Horowitz is the founder of the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education (FIRE) and the author of The Professors: The 101 Most Dangerous Academics in America (2006) in which he argues that college and university professors practice liberal ideological indoctrination in the classroom.
Regarding his own political leanings and the way they manifest themselves in his teaching, one tenure-track faculty member, argued that a “balanced” message is more effective. Thus, he resisted the impulse to advocate a particular perspective to students. Later he elaborated,

as a public scholar one needs to always be ready and willing to entertain ideas that don’t necessarily suit your worldview because you’re also part of that dialogic between the two and that’s, as you get older, got to be harder.

So, while his own perspective is decidedly liberal – based in part, according to him, on his experiences living and teaching internationally – he works to make his course content politically balanced by attempting to examine communications theories and practical examples from a variety of perspectives and by fostering a classroom setting that encourages students to express (and listen respectfully to) divergent ideas and beliefs.

Another liberal participant, a tenured humanities faculty member, was much less reticent about sharing her own political beliefs with her students, and is more involved in campus-based political activism – in forms such as rallies in support of rights for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered (LGBT) persons and protests in favor of affirmative action and against university support of sweat-shop labor produced clothing. This commitment developed during her pre-tenure years at another university where some of her “slightly senior faculty colleagues were very comfortable being activists and they didn't think being a faculty member and an activist were at odds with each other.” She came to embrace this position as she “moved from covering [events]...[to] being part of [the] moment” in the course of an affirmative action rally at which social and political activist Jesse Jackson spoke. This pivotal experience motivated her to incorporate public issues and public activism into her undergraduate courses. She gives students in her course time to share announcements about campus issues that might be of interest to their classmates. She also uses assignments such as writing a letter to the editor of either the campus or local paper about a campus or public issue about which they feel strongly.
Most participants chose not to share their political affiliations with their students (it is worth noting that the 2008 presidential primaries and election occurred during data collection for this study). The large numbers of Penn State Students that canvassed neighborhoods in support of candidates made keeping political affiliations private as students and faculty and students frequently bumped shoulders at campaign headquarters. At least three respondents were actively involved in the presidential campaign. Other faculty members were affiliated with various causes or groups on campus – for instance, one serves as the advisor to Amnesty International and another is extensively involved with the Penn State Democratic Students Association – organizations that tend to be aligned with liberal political ideologies.

Two participants spoke of the ways in which their previous educational experiences helped to shape their political views, especially as they relate to their disciplines. For example, one tenured scientist who attended graduate school at the University of Chicago indicated that it was “a particular place in [his discipline] with respect to society because that is where the first nuclear reaction was done; it was very political because of the question of the bomb.” During his graduate training, he recalled discussions of the intersections between scientific research and advancement and its potential implications for civil society. These experiences led him to believe in the importance of similarly addressing such political topics head-on in his own classes.

Similarly, another self-identified liberal who came of age during a time of great political turmoil in his home country, commented that his “academic work [is] directed at...a therapeutic level – it [is] designed to ease some of the social strains that had shaped the country’s politics.” He continues to write on politics in newspapers in his home country, discussing how the politics of the past and shape the present and how American interventions in his country were not always done with the best of intentions or the most success. His political beliefs and his own public
A third of the respondents spoke of growing up in households in which politics were openly and vigorously discussed and debated. Some also accompanied parents to political rallies and observed parents as they were politically active in local political campaigns and other forms of community activism. These formative experiences appear to have led them to confront political issues in the classroom when directly relevant to topic at hand. One faculty member spoke of growing up in a political household in which “mom used to work for local city council elections so she'd get us [him and his siblings] out in hats and t-shirts and whatnot” and conversations and debates about political issues were common. Although he noted that he voted for the Republican candidate in the first election in which he was eligible to vote, his experiences outside the U.S. led him to develop a more liberal political outlook. His conversations with his family seemed to translate into a nuanced understanding of how to approach politically-charged topics in his classroom. He has observed that many of his students have not had similar experiences and lack an understanding of historical and contemporary political issues. Furthermore, he argued that many had not engaged community issues through direct participation because political issues are not openly or directly addressed in high school or college curricula. He lamented, 

If I had been learning this stuff in high school about politics and the [political] institutions, about how this [political system] really works, I think I would be a better person, and so I say to my classes today, 'let's understand the dynamics of your political system and how that leads us to get into wars overseas or how that leads to the fact that you can see these news stories about the economic crisis that is looming and you say that has nothing to do with you. Let's talk about your student loans, okay? ‘Oh, my gosh, it does have something to do with me’ – you connect the dots, the information is out there. Why aren't you doing it? And then I always end with the idea, saying when they leave class, they'll say, ‘wow this is great. You know I'll be impressing my parents that I know something.’ and I say, 'good. You're 20 years ahead of me and what will that do for society if you continue this or if you bring that out.'
His conversations with students in his classes are deeply influenced by his personal and educational experiences regarding politics. A tenured social scientist spoke about the relationship between politics and public scholarship. He asserted that “as public scholars...[we] recognize [our] value orientations and...see the value, [we] recognize those value orientations and [we] see the importance of explicating those – not trying to make the case that [our] work is somehow apolitical and objective...[or] neutral.” He also emphasized the importance of working on significant public problems in a “public-regarding way” as suggested by Sullivan’s work on civic professionalism. This participant believes that this “is a really important part of public scholarship – [working] with and for people. It's acknowledging the biases and it's recognizing [that] the work is political, not apolitical.” So while he attempts not to directly influence course discussions (or community discussions) by sharing his own personal stance on issues, he does address potentially thorny political issues head-on – asking students to consider the tenets and merits of various stances before they themselves come to their own decision. And this, he believes, is what democracy is about – discussions of difference, open dialogue, and reasoned argument.

The political culture, as influenced by national, state, and local politics, and election cycles, for example, seemed to influence how readily participants addressed aspects of political engagement, which is one aspect of civic engagement, in their courses. The interrelationships between participants’ political identities and beliefs and the larger political culture of the United States and higher education is an example of how content and context influences interact.

**Motivation for Teaching Civic Capacity and Engagement**

What motivated faculty members to teach was not included in Stark et al.’s (1990) contextual filters model, as the *Planning Introductory College Courses (PICC)* and Reflections studies were...

---

22 William Sullivan (2003) argued that civic professionals make a “public pledge to deploy technical expertise and judgment not only skillfully but also for public-regarding ends and in a public-regarding way” (p. 10).
designed to examine influences on faculty planning and decision-making for introductory undergraduate courses. Yet, while teaching, generally, was an explicit job responsibility for 13 of the 14 participants in this study, none were required to teach for civic capacity and engagement; rather they were expected to instruct students about disciplinary concepts and skills. Thus, participants’ motivation to teach for civic purposes became an important component of this study. I have chosen to discuss participants’ motivations under the rubric of participants’ “background and characteristics,” as they identified complex mixes of personal and professional experiences as the impetus for their teaching for civic capacity and engagement.

Participants voiced multiple, intertwining motivations for their incorporation of civic engagement into their undergraduate courses. Their complex motivations were both personal and professional. Participants expressed a sense of personal responsibility to teach for civic capacity and engagement – stemming from many of their personal characteristics and experiences discussed above – and an accompanying sense of personal satisfaction and reward when teaching for civic purposes. They also indicated that their desire to successfully teach students disciplinary content was realized through grounding students learning in real-world circumstances. Teaching for civic capacity and engagement led participants to feel a sense of both personal and professional accomplishment; they believed that they were making a difference in world by giving back to or “paying it forward” to their communities and future generations of students. As one participant succinctly explained, “people get involved in things that somehow affect them.” I elaborate on these motivations in the following sections.

Most participants expressed a sense of personal responsibility to teach for civic purposes; they experienced a sense of personal satisfaction or reward when they were able to civicly engage their students. This dual motivation – responsibility and satisfaction – stemmed, in part, from many of the personal characteristics and experiences presented in prior sections of this
chapter. Most indicated that they began teaching for civic purposes because of personal values and that they continued to teach for civic capacity and engagement because it was personally rewarding. For example, a tenured scientist considered her motivation to include education for citizenship in her teaching “very personal.” She felt a need to give back, reflecting on her socioeconomic class and the educational “privilege” she enjoyed. She also reported gaining a sense of satisfaction from her work: “It was just very satisfying for me and exciting for me to think about what I was doing as playing a role in making our nation stronger by creating a more informed citizenry.” Another participant, a tenure-track faculty member in a professional field, explained that her personal morality dictated that she meaningfully contribute to her community.

While this participant, like many others, reported a sense of personal obligation to do more public scholarship and teaching for civic purposes, she also believed, professionally, that “that’s where the meaningful work is.” Another participant, a tenured scientist also framed his motivation as stemming from a combination of personal and professional inclinations – he spoke of experiencing a personal sense of reward stemming from having taught a course with a service-learning component, but also indicated feeling professionally rewarded after observing how “excited about science” his students became. He believed that the course was a “wonderful educational experience” for his students – a professional success – while also experiencing personal satisfaction because of the greater contributions to the local community that he and his students were able to make. In total, all but two participants emphasized more than professional and disciplinary motivations of their teaching for civic capacity and engagement; eleven respondents indicated that their efforts stemmed from an intertwining of personal and professional motivations.

Approximately two-thirds of this study’s participants also indicated that they understood that actively engaging students through service-learning or other civically engaging pedagogies was
one way to enhance student learning and retention of disciplinary content. These respondents were, thus, professionally motivated to ground their academic material – the theories, principles, ideas, and skills central to their course goals – by having students apply them to and practice them in real-world contexts. For example, a philosophy faculty member indicated that her motivation to teach for civic capacity and engagement was largely professional. She reported, “It was as a new teacher, really wanting to help… [and] an interest in teaching and a commitment, and really wanting the students to connect and see how fun and interesting and relevant philosophy could be.” Other participants offered similar responses, saying that they felt that incorporating teaching for civic engagement into their undergraduate courses lead students to practice and develop communication skills, to understand social justice issues, or developed their capacity to understand the complexity inherent in applying academic theories to real-world problems and situations. The current literatures regarding civic engagement learning outcomes and effective teaching and learning practices support participants’ perceptions, suggesting that the motivations of these faculty members are leading them in promising directions educationally (Astin & Sax; 1998; Battistoni, 2002; Boyte, 2008; Ehrlich, 1998, 2000; Kahne & Westheimer, 2003; Keeter, Zukin, Andolina, & Jenkins, 2002; Kirlin, 2003; Kuh, 2008; Strand, Marullo, Cutforth, Stoecker, & Donohue, 2003).

Summary: The Influence of Participants’ Background and Characteristics

Participants’ personal and professional characteristics including tenure, gender, race, academic discipline or field, religion/spirituality, political identity, and motivation were salient “content” influences on faculty teaching for civic capacity and engagement. Though parsed separately above, these characteristics and background experiences function, in actuality, as sets of intertwining influences. Collectively, their characteristics, background experiences, and motivations encapsulate who these faculty participants are as complex individuals; such influences
are difficult, if not impossible, to untangle. The discussion above, however, serves to remind us that faculty members are not a homogeneous group, and that they bring unique arrays of talents, experiences, and motivations to college campuses and their classrooms. Including faculty motivations to teach for civic capacity and engagement to the model was important participants were choosing to teach with such goals in mind, rather than being explicitly expected to teach for these purposes. Faculty members in the Stark et al (1990) study, on the other hand, were asked to describe how they planned introductory courses rather than how and why they taught for a specific purpose. Participants in this study indicated that their motivations to teach for civic capacity and engagement grew out of an intertwining of personal and professional characteristics, beliefs, and experiences.

Whether their motivations were personal, professional, or a combination thereof, participants indicated a desire to make a difference in the world around them through their teaching. A tenured engineering faculty member spoke of feeling “impassioned about using [his] expertise to make a difference.” Connecting this to his incorporation of civic engagement in his undergraduate teaching, he indicated that by creating service-learning opportunities in his courses, he “also [had] the chance to create some hands-on experiences for students, which [are] pretty rare.” He viewed his work, then, as embodying his own personal passion for contributing to the solving of community ills while simultaneously providing practical experience for students and, hopefully, fostering their own understanding of engineering as a potential tool for civic engagement. This participant epitomized the complexity of motivations reported by all participants. This intertwining of personal and professional motivations to teach for civic capacity and engagement reaffirms the prominent role of faculty content influences on their decisions about course form, while also surfacing potential means of encouraging more faculty members to teach with civic goals in mind and with known civically engaging pedagogies. For example, some
participants indicated that they believed that incorporating service-learning in their courses reinforced students’ learning of key disciplinary content covered in their courses; presenting service-learning as a means of advancing student learning based on research on this pedagogy and on research university faculty members’ perceptions and experiences with this instructional method may encourage additional faculty members to incorporate this practice in their own classrooms.

Overall, the findings of this study with regard to faculty background and characteristics mirrored those of Stark et al.’s (1990) PICC study. The 14 participants in this study perceived that their personal background, characteristics, and motivations were very influential in their decisions with regard to teaching for civic capacity and engagement and regarding the form that such decisions take. These characteristics, experiences, and motivations, in turn, influenced how participants viewed their academic fields and the civic purposes of undergraduate education to which they ascribed.

**Participants’ Views of their Academic Fields**

The professional and personal characteristics and experiences described above influenced the ways in which participants perceived their academic field (see middle box in Figure 6); these perceptions, in turn, influenced the civic educational purposes participants embraced. Most participants reported viewing their field as supportive of or relevant to teaching for civic capacity and engagement. A few, however, contended that public scholarship and teaching for civic capacity and engagement were marginalized within their academic fields of study or were insufficiently addressed. While some disciplines have a history of social concern and action, it may be that participants’ personal motivations color their views of their field, encouraging them for instance to focus on perhaps marginal aspects of their fields which support public scholarship.
Respondents perceived their disciplines and fields influencing the ways they sought to incorporate teaching for civic capacity and engagement in their courses. Their perceptions of their disciplines and fields, however, might not be shared by peers in their same areas of study – and, in fact, some participants were careful to indicate that they believed their “take” on their discipline was out-of-the-ordinary amongst same-discipline colleagues at their institution.

**Fields Perceived as Supportive of Public Scholarship**

Participants who perceived their academic field as supportive of or relevant to teaching for civic purposes tended to view their field as having a public component, namely a concern about the application of disciplinary knowledge to societal needs, or as being concerned with skills (e.g., communication or analysis skills) they perceived as important to citizenship. They also viewed their academic field as a source of theoretical support for their public scholarship or as a domain of knowledge concerned about the study (if not always the practice) of democratic principles.

Almost half of the participants discussed how their perceptions of their discipline or field and various disciplinary tenets or theories drove their public scholarship and their inclusion of public scholarship and/or civic engagement activities and topics in their undergraduate courses. For example, a participant with a faculty appointment in philosophy indicated that her particular research interests within her field are part of the reason that teaching for civic capacity and engagement appeals to her. This participant commented, “I think [John] Dewey's role in my research and my sort of philosophy that I do has a lot to do with why some of this [civic engagement] stuff appeals to me and [why] I was interested in working on it in my classes.” While crediting her own interest in incorporating service-learning into her undergraduate teaching, she “wonder[s] if I...were a different person and were more interested in [different] particular strains of philosophy than I am interested in, would that mean that I wouldn’t be as interested in doing
service-learning or civic engagement sorts of stuff?’ In doing so she partially credited her academic discipline – philosophy – with her commitment to teaching for civic capacity and engagement. For her, incorporating service-learning pedagogies into her teaching has ‘to connect up with the kind of basic interest [she has] in philosophy and not just be a kind of add-on.’ Another participant, a history professor viewed his field as an important ‘tool’ with which to examine contemporary civic life. His view of his field translated into his belief about the purpose of undergraduate education: ‘my basic position is that you cannot be an effective citizen unless you have an understanding of the history of the society in which you live.’

Three participants – the two scientists and a humanities professor – believed their disciplinary field had broad societal implications, but that the undergraduate courses they were assigned to teach were not all necessarily directly relevant to fostering students’ civic capacity and engagement. The physical scientist indicated that although he perceived his field as having broad public implications and viewed general scientific knowledge as critical to informed citizenship, he had difficulty explicitly connecting his introductory course content to civic capacity or engagement. He felt he needed to spend extensive periods of time teaching students to understand basic principles and theories, and to comprehend and calculate mathematical equations, leaving little time for considering societal implications of the science. The other two participants similarly indicated that they felt a need to focus on disciplinary content, on students learning facts and figures and basic concepts (as well as on other academic skills, such as writing cohesive arguments), and were not always able to take the time to get students to apply.

*From Margin to Center*

More than 40 percent of respondents in this study indicated that they considered themselves outliers in their own academic fields or in their home departments. They believed that their passion for public scholarship and civic engagement placed them at or near the margins of
their fields in terms of the topics they chose to research and teach, as well as the ways in which they performed these tasks. For example, a participant who practiced public scholarship in her research, publications, and classroom, spoke of perceiving herself as being at the margins of her department, though not necessarily her entire discipline. She indicated that when she arrived at the university as newly-minted Ph.D. she was one of only a very small handful of faculty members practicing public scholarship in her classroom and research. She embraced her uniqueness, however, and has since fused her interests to create a series of learning opportunities for students to learn about civic engagement and become civically engaged. From a theoretical perspective, she argued that we are no longer in the post-modern or post-structuralist period, but “we're at the crux of something new – the post- has just become the pre- in other words.” She believed we are on the crux of an academic paradigm shift in which public scholarship is becoming more accepted, more of a norm, than in the current paradigm. She stated that,

even though there is a bit of momentum toward public scholarship, they [scholars in her field] haven't connected the two [public scholarship and theory] at all. I think the same people are doing both – gone back to the field doing intensive field work, theoretically changed, and are now moving toward public scholarship. And I think that that's important.

While identifying incremental changes as a paradigm shift seems premature, this participant’s assertion that at least some of her colleagues have begun to connect theory and practice is promising.

**Multidisciplinarity**

Notably, six participants indicated during the course of our interviews that they believed that interdisciplinary and/or multidisciplinary study and understanding were important to teaching for civic capacity and engagement. For example, a participant in a professional field reflected about a public scholarship course he co-taught with another faculty member in a different academic discipline:
I mean this [idea] is not ground breaking at all. But obviously if I put a geographer together with a landscape architect, we are going to come up with a different take on the situation than if I have them alone, because I believe that geographers need to know about design and designers need to know about geography.

Given the complex problems facing society – e.g., poverty, climate change – these participants felt that public scholarship (and student learning and training) needs to be undertaken in ways that provide complex, multidisciplinary responses. Just over half of these six participants held dual-appointments in different academic departments; two-thirds were or had been actively engaged in public scholarship projects and partnerships that brought faculty and students from different fields, departments, and colleges together to work and learn while investigating and positing solutions for public issues.

**Summary**

Participants reported a range of views of the place of civic purposes in their academic fields. They also perceived these views as influencing their teaching for civic capacity and engagement. These findings are in keeping with Stark et al.’s (1990) conclusions that faculty members’ disciplinary socialization (e.g., their educational background) and their perceptions of and beliefs about their academic fields influence “how they plan courses as well as how they teach them” (Stark, 2000, p. 414).

**Participants’ Beliefs about Civic Educational Purposes**

In addition to faculty members’ professional and personal backgrounds and characteristics, and their perceptions of their academic fields, the conceptual framework guiding this study posits that faculty members’ beliefs about the purposes of undergraduate education influence their course planning. In this study, I was interested not in participants general conceptions of the purposes of higher education, but in their particular beliefs about the role of undergraduate education with regard to civic education and engagement. Participants’ beliefs
about civic capacity and engagement could be categorized as one (or a combination) of three types of educational purposes: 1) educating students about the history and tenets of citizenship and democracy, 2) educating students about cultures and ideas different from their own and promoting social justice, and 3) helping students apply disciplinary concepts and theories to real-world contexts.

**Citizenship and Democracy**

Citizenship education emerged as an important educational purpose for numerous participants. While some participants articulated a comprehensive vision of teaching for good citizenship, others were focused instead on only one or two subcomponents of citizenship (e.g., voting, communication, leadership), often those they viewed as most closely connected to their academic field. Not all participants articulated a comprehensive vision of teaching for good citizenship; some focused instead on only what the literature would consider individual components of good citizenship (see for example, Westheimer & Kahne, 2004). A tenured scientist suggested that “the mission of public education” is to strengthen our nation by fostering “a more informed citizenry.” She viewed herself as “playing a role in making our nation stronger by creating a more informed citizenry” thus fulfilling “the mission of public education.” She claimed to be “educating voters,” particularly about how science informs policy. Another participant, a tenured humanities faculty member, felt that it is important for students to examine democratic theory: “students [need] to confront the question of to what extent [the U.S.] has historically been a democracy and, more important, how the definition of democracy in America has evolved over time.” Believing that “university education is about becoming a better citizen…the most important aspect of [which] is that it must teach [students] to be both informed and decision-makers,” this participant asks students to read about, consider, discuss, and analytically write about their ideas regarding democracy.
While not every participant mentioned education for citizenship explicitly, the majority mentioned specific skills and abilities that are directly linked to definitions of good citizenship in the literature. For example, most participants indicated that they believed institutions of higher education should teach students “how to process knowledge and make decisions,” to be able to think critically, work in diverse groups, and communicate effectively both verbally and in writing. Participants tended to report the educational purposes they espoused in these concrete terms, rather than indicating that they felt higher education should foster good citizenship.

Most respondents focused on specific aspects of which they perceived as closely aligned with their academic field and on developing students’ sense of agency with regard to applying their learning to civic concerns. For example, one geography professor believed in the importance of “getting students to civically engage with their world as a geographer” – she’s concerned with “how do they become active citizens in a global society and what is their role in a global society.” A history professor taught for “citizenship in the world today” which he believed “demands at least a certain level of awareness of these kinds of [“political and geopolitical”] issues.” He argued that students need to tackle questions such as:

[How do people relate to each other, how is power built and articulated in the world, why do people support it, how do people resist it, what do ideology, ethnicity have to do with how these things play out? These are the [questions] that anyone in the world today, regardless of their career path – whether they’re going to be business people or [in the] public health system or athletes or educators or whatever – they’re going to have to have some awareness of.]

While he believed that considering such questions was important for any undergraduate, he felt that they were especially relevant when attempting to connect historical circumstances, decisions, and events to current issues and debates. A third respondent, a geographer, indicated that “we should educate students to be good citizens” which for him translated into examining how “capitalist society creates problems” and working to “create a very different kind of knowledge”
or way of thinking about solving societal problems. Both participants’ definitions of good citizenship entailed being capable of identifying and questioning the underlying tenets of U.S. society and the predominant thinking that shapes it.

And yet another participant, a faculty member in the English department, felt strongly that students need to gain a sense of their own agency and be “able to work with other people to common purpose.” She believed that part of the civic mission of undergraduate education is to “help students gain trust in their ability to exercise collaborative, rhetorical judgment” to get them to realize that as a society, “we’re infinitely smarter together than we are separately.” Other participants similarly expressed their belief that education needs to foster students’ sense of agency – that it must “build the capacity of people to arrive at their own answers” and be capable of making informed decisions. Respondents’ assertions that fostering students’ self-efficacy or agency regarding effective participation in the public sphere is in keeping with discussions of the importance of civic agency in the research literature. For example, Harry Boyte (2008) argues that in order “[t]o develop civic agency students need not only new skills but a much more robust definition of democracy, citizenship, and politics” (p. 14). Participants in this study similarly indicated a need to have students seriously grapple with these constructs and to consider their own roles in the civic life of their communities.

Five participants specifically described ways in which their disciplines aid in such efforts. For example, many faculty members believed that higher education should prepare students to be informed and productive citizens of society. One scientist, discussing the importance of “educating voters,” was concerned in particular, about the need to educate voters regarding the science effecting current and future policy decisions (e.g., climate change). The other scientist concurred; he believed that students must be taught to identify and understand the “public...
implications of science,” and that “it is in society's interest that the public learn about science and develop a more positive attitude [toward it].” Similarly, participants in professional fields focused at least some of their discussion of educational purposes on enhancing students’ abilities to act as ethical and effective practitioners in the public realm; the historians were most concerned with students being capable of considering the implications of historical contexts on contemporary concerns; English and communications participants wanted their students to be able to communicate their ideas effectively to varying publics and to be capable of critically analyzing messages in the media; and social scientists focused on facilitating students’ abilities to critique and apply prominent social theories to public problems.

**Social Justice and Change**

Participants also articulated civic educational purposes relating to social justice and social change. They hoped that through the content covered in their courses and through participation in various civic engagement activities, students would be exposed to people and ideas different from themselves and their own – in the words of one participant that students come to know and appreciate “the diversity of human culture and political cultures in the world today.” Participants were also concerned that students be able to identify social inequities and to consider possible ways to advocate for the alleviation of these inequities. One tenured humanities professor indicated that, to him, “education is about developing the capacity to make a change in the society.”

Another faculty member, a tenure-track assistant professor in the social sciences, spoke of the need for students to view themselves as “a part of the fabric of society” necessitating that they “assist[...] those who don’t have, for whatever reason.” According to her, given the social inequalities in society, we need students to put themselves metaphorically in the shoes of others and then ponder questions such as “How would you want someone to work with you? How
would you want someone to perceive you? How would you want someone to come into your community?”

Participants embraced the idea that universities have an obligation to help students to expand their thinking. One participant, for example, believed that higher education must “encourage people to think outside of their own environment and their own little box” of personal experience. As another participant put it, students “need to be liberated from the Shibboleths in which [they’ve] been reared.” He viewed education as “an instrument of social liberation.” As such, he, like many of his co-participants, hoped to expose students to new ideas and diverse ways of thinking and being in the world; some attempted to do so through their selection of course readings, while others engaged students in service-learning or other forms of community engagement designed to allow students to explore ideas and cultures first-hand.

**Real-world Application**

Though discussed in a wide-variety of terms, many participants indicated that they believed that part of educating for civic capacity and engagement involved teaching students how to apply their learning to complex, real-world problems and issues. These participants discussed how disciplinary knowledge and skills can serve civil society and offer potential solutions to various public issues and problems. Many adopted this purpose with dual-goals in mind: 1) to reinforce student disciplinary learning of content, concepts, and skills by having them practice and apply these skills in real-world contexts; and 2) to foster students’ civic capacity and propensity to engage in their communities.

A tenure-track participant in the College of Arts and Architecture, spoke quite eloquently about the need to teach students how to grapple with what he termed “wicked problems.” While other faculty members did not use this specific language, which can be traced to Horst Rittel and Melvin Webber’s (1973) *Policy Sciences* article “Dilemmas in a General Theory of Planning,” they
too talked of the necessity of teaching students to critically analyze and work toward the solution of complex, real-world problems that have no clear or correct answers. In the words of this participant,

the *wicked problem* differentiates itself because even though you all start at the same place, you make up the conditions for the problems as you go along, and therefore you never really know when you are done, because it could always be something else.

As he explained,

the more complicated design problems like architecture and landscape architecture are wicked because they have all sorts of factors – they have people and climate, social, economic, environmental, structural, you know, a fairly insane number of things that you have to balance… and then you have to figure out of all those factors, [which one is] first in line. What is the big, important thing to be working on and then how [do] the other ones fit into that? So you never know when you are done and that’s why it is [a] wicked [problem].

Other faculty members were similarly concerned with having their students consider complex or “wicked” problems including poverty, educational policy, and eco-friendly building options. Participants believed that grappling with such complex issues requires multidisciplinary approaches to problem-solving.

Those participants who sought to teach students to apply their disciplinary skills toward solving complex societal problems – “wicked problems” – like poverty and homelessness, various other social injustices, policy issues, etcetera – as a way of developing civic capacity and actually engaging students in communities in the hopes that they will continue to do so in the future. While most participants did not explicitly refer to their beliefs about educational purpose using the “wicked problem” terminology, many supported this purpose in spirit. Some respondents were primarily concerned about using wicked problems to enhanced student civic capacity and engagement. For example, one participant in a professional field indicated that he was more concerned that his students develop a sense of personal responsibility regarding the environment, for example, than remember specific course content. Other respondents ascribing to this purpose,
however, hoped that by engaging students in real-world settings (e.g., through a service-learning activity) students would better learn and retain disciplinary knowledge; viewing civic capacity and engagement as positive by-products of their efforts. A humanities professor, for example, had no specific civic goals for her service-learning course activity, but rather viewed civic capacity as a side-benefit. She hoped her students would be better able to understand and actively apply the complex philosophical theories covered throughout the course as a result of their service-learning experience. Most participants fell somewhere in the middle, struggling to balance expectations to teach specific disciplinary content and to instill in their students a sense of civic responsibility.

Many participants were concerned about exposing their students to the messiness of real-world issues and problems. They believed that students to apply disciplinary concepts and theories – to complex problems and circumstances. For example, one participant used service-learning pedagogy to foster her students’ understanding of various ethical frameworks and theories. She wanted her students to consider “Does this experience help you gravitate more toward one theory or another in terms of seeing it as a helpful way of understanding your world?” Other participants in education and engineering were similarly concerned that their students be afforded opportunities to practice their disciplinary skills and to understand the political, economic, and other realities that they will face in the real world.

**Summary of Beliefs about Civic Purposes**

Participants ascribed to a variety of civic educational purposes. These purposes ranged from teaching content related to civic capacity (e.g., about citizenship, government, democracy, and history) to skills and behaviors thought necessary for informed civic engagement (e.g., critical thinking and problem-solving skills). Participants perceived their beliefs about civic purposes as being influenced by their individual backgrounds and characteristics as well as their academic fields and their perceptions of those fields. Like the 14 respondents in this study, many of the
faculty members in the PICC study valued “facilitating students’ personal development (75%), encouraging students to relate their field to others (74%) and to integrate ideas (70%); they were also interested in teaching “essential skills” (71%) (p. 33).

Conclusion

In this study, I relied on Stark et al.’s (1990) Contextual Filters Model of Faculty Course Planning as a starting point for my examination of the influences on faculty members’ decisions to teach for civic capacity and engagement. This chapter collectively introduced the 14 faculty members who participated in this study by characteristics including academic discipline, gender, race, religion, and tenure status. In keeping with Stark et al.’s (1990) findings, participants’ “content influences” – their personal and professional backgrounds, characteristics, experiences, motivations, views of their academic fields, and beliefs about educational purpose – interacted to influence how and why they teach for civic capacity and engagement.

Stark et al. (1990) found that faculty reported that content influences, taken as a whole, were more influential than the institutional and other contexts in which they taught. In particular, faculty beliefs about educational purpose, their prior teaching experiences, and their experiences as practitioners in their field were the strongest influences on their course planning (with more than 80 percent of faculty identifying them as influential). Weakest among the content influences examined were faculty members’ religious and political beliefs, with less than 15 percent of respondents indicating they had any influence on their introductory course planning. The content influences which respondents in this study identified as relevant influences on their teaching for civic capacity and engagement diverged somewhat from those identified in the Stark et al.’s (1990) PICC study in a number of ways. Namely, participants in this study were more likely to indicate that their religious and/or political beliefs were relevant to their decisions to teach for civic
capacity and engagement; participants perceived the values undergirding their religious and political identities as influencing the civic educational purposes they espoused.

The findings reviewed in this chapter refine and extend our understanding of content influences on faculty undergraduate course decisions. In the next two chapters – Chapters 5 and 6 – I consider how these influences affected how participants navigated, interacted with, and responded to various contextual factors from the Public Scholarship Associates to the promotion and tenure process.
In this chapter, I present findings related to the first research question posed for this study, namely: How, if at all, does faculty participation in the Public Scholarship Associates (PSA) influence their teaching-related learning and/or practice? By including the Public Scholarship Associates, a multidisciplinary group of scholars at a public research and land-grant university interested in issues of civic capacity and engagement, as a “contextual filter” in the study’s conceptual framework (see Figure 7), I proposed, based upon my knowledge of and participation in this group, that the PSA would be a salient context influencing faculty course decisions regarding civic course goals and instructional strategies. In keeping with this assertion, I sought to examine how faculty participation in the PSA – a criterion for participation in this study – influenced faculty teaching-related learning and practice. I also suggested that examining faculty course planning for civic capacity and engagement through the lens of sociocultural perspectives on learning might elucidate how participation in such a group constitutes learning. I believed participation in the PSA and its activities might be viewed as learning the practice of public scholarship and that this learning might translate into changes in participants’ course planning and forms.
The data analysis and interpretation presented in this chapter suggest that participation in the PSA was indeed a salient contextual influence on participants’ thinking about public scholarship with regard to their undergraduate courses and about how to teach for civic capacity and engagement. Viewing participants’ interview narratives through the analytical lens of sociocultural learning theory highlighted how the collective, participatory processes of the PSA influenced faculty members’ thinking and actions related to teaching for civic capacity and engagement. Situated learning perspectives view learning as a collective, participatory process (Gherardi, Nicolini, & Odella, 1998; Lave & Wenger, 1991). These theories suggest that learning occurs through social interaction and that our interactions strongly influence what and how we learn. Even when an individual appears to be learning “alone” (e.g., reading a book), she is really engaged in a social process as she interacts with a culturally situated artifact. Sociocultural theories assert that learning occurs in
these interactions: we learn through acts of observation, imitation, and dialogue, as well as other forms of shared meaning-making.

My data analysis suggests that the PSA can be viewed as a community of practice23 (Lave & Wenger, 1991) in which members learn together about, and jointly advance, the practice of public scholarship. According to Etienne Wenger (2006), communities of practice “are groups of people who share a concern or a passion for something they do and learn how to do it better as they interact regularly” (¶ 3). James Gee (2000-2001) suggests that shared interests result in individuals developing “affinity identities” with others similarly concerned with “a set of common endeavors or practices” (p. 105). Whether called an affinity group or a community of practice, such a group forms around a “shared domain of interest” and members engage in shared activities, discussions, information exchange, and mutual assistance (Lave & Wenger, 1991). In such a community, members share a repertoire of tools, stories, and experiences which collectively embody a shared practice and knowledge is mutually constructed through interaction. Conceptualizing the PSA as a community of practice calls attention to the ways in which participation in the group shaped faculty identities and learning, and underscores how participants’ levels of engagement in the PSA influenced what and how much they learned. A trajectory of increased depth and duration of participation – of increased learning – led to participants’ appropriation of ideas and terminology used by those already engaged in the PSA and consistent with the philosophy and goals of public scholarship. This learning, in turn, contributed to participants’ development and implementation of more explicit and nuanced approaches to teaching for civic capacity and engagement.

23 Communities of practice, a term coined by Lave and Wenger (1991) are comparable to other conceptions of situated learning contexts including learning communities, discourse communities (Berkenkotter & Huckin, 1995), affinity groups (Gee, 2000-2001), and activity systems (Engestrom, 1990; Leont’ev, 1978).
Using the term community of practice in reference to the Public Scholarship Associates is not entirely new. During an advisory board retreat in the spring of 2008, this group of “irregular regulars” convened and identified the importance of having various levels and ways to, in the words of one participant, “hook into” and remain involved in the group. Similarly, in the invitation to the meeting, Dr. Cohen, the group’s founder and leader, wrote,

If it’s too soon to suggest that our Laboratory for Public Scholarship and Democracy is now a ‘mature’ community of practice, it may be useful to think of ourselves as entering that state in which so many of our students fall, young adulthood: a time of transition and increased responsibility, occasionally overwhelming, and refreshingly energetic. (Personal communication, June 3, 2008)

He asked board members to contemplate “What is our work doing to create and nurture a community of practice around shared principles of education and democracy?” and to consider “where we’ve been and where we might go” (Personal communication, June 3, 2008). At the very least, these musings demonstrate a desire to be a community of practice, and intentionality is, according to Lave and Wenger (1991) a key component of a community of practice.

In the following pages, I introduce the Public Scholarship Associates, discussing its development from a small cadre of faculty members committed to advancing the civic and democratic capacities and commitments of undergraduates to the larger, multifaceted community it had become at the time of this study. In doing so, I explain why the PSA can be conceptualized as a community of practice and describe its situated learning curriculum – a series of regular meetings, events, and activities. I then indicate how trajectories of increased participation in the group’s activities – in its learning curriculum – entail learning, language acquisition, imitation, and identity development. Participants’ learning was mediated by their interactions with each other in these situated contexts and by the various articles and tools (e.g., published volumes) of the community. Finally, I foreshadow how participants’ learning in the PSA community of practice
influenced their teaching for civic capacity and engagement, a topic addressed in detail in Chapter 6.

**Public Scholarship Associates: An Introduction**

Since its inception in 1999, the Public Scholarship Associates has advanced educational opportunities for undergraduate students to develop their civic capacity and engagement by disseminating ideas and practices related to public scholarship and teaching for civic purposes. Its efforts have spawned an undergraduate minor program of study on civic and community engagement, a course development and enhancement grant initiative, a series of speakers and faculty discussion seminars, and an umbrella organizational structure, the Laboratory for Public Scholarship & Democracy. The PSA offers a constellation of opportunities for learning through participation – and study participants were involved in the group in myriad ways. Study participants reported that the group served as a source of intellectual stimulation and learning regarding the practice of public scholarship in the form of civic-engagement-oriented research, publications, and, foremost, teaching. Often research and teaching overlapped in mutually supportive ways – participants involved their students in their public scholarship research projects, engaged in research about their teaching for civic purposes, and conducted research and teaching at the same community sites.

**Perception and Purpose**

Throughout the course of our interviews, participants shared their understandings of the purposes of the PSA group and the programmatic and other sponsored programs and initiatives of it and the Laboratory for Public Scholarship & Democracy (LPSD). At times their perceptions closely aligned with the espoused intentions and purposes of the two groups, though this was not always the case. Participants also expressed desire for more and different types of initiatives,
programs, and support. Their perceptions of how successful the PSA and the LPD were in achieving their purposes also varied.

The PSA is intended to provide “a space for extended and rigorous discussion of the perils and promises of public scholarship and the potential contribution of higher education to democracy” (www.publicscholarship.psu.edu/about/History.shtml). The group is also designed for faculty “to discuss collaborative projects and common problems” and “to develop a curriculum of consequence” (www.publicscholarship.psu.edu/about/History.shtml). In a formal proposal calling for the creation of the PSA, the founding members requested that the institution provide for the:

1) Recruitment of an active group of faculty, student affairs staff, and students to nurture public scholarship initiatives though shared reflection and scholarship and the development of interdisciplinary initiatives;
2) Creation of regular formative opportunities for individuals interested in public scholarship participation;
3) A timely follow-up on financial development opportunities;
4) Commitment to a [campus] center or institute to foster the practice of scholarship though public service and service learning in teaching, research and service; and
5) The sharing of public scholarship teaching, research and service within our own academic community in ways that recognize its scholarly basis for purposes of professional development as well as for tenure and promotion and salary recognition of performance. (Cohen & Yapa, 2003, p. 6)

Just as this original proposal called attention to the need to adjust promotion and tenure guidelines to better accommodate faculty public scholarship efforts, after the PSA’s founding, Cohen & Yapa (2003) further articulated the risks of engaging in public scholarship for untenured faculty members:

Untenured faculty place their careers at risk unless their work is viewed as scholarship within the tenure paradigm. Colleagues outside the Public Scholarship Associates remain skeptical that service learning is, in and of itself, a means to conduct scholarship central to university mission. (p. 7)
These two founding PSA members argued that, “the creation of Public Scholarship Associates bestowed a sense of institutional legitimacy to the people who are striving to broaden a grass roots constituency for promoting public scholarship, both within the university and beyond” (p. 7). This sense of legitimacy which appears to have been part of the impetus for forming the PSA, was described by participants as giving them permission to do and teach the work of public scholarship. The formation of the PSA forged a community of scholars invested in teaching and other forms of scholarship for public purposes. The PSA’s creation was recognized by participants as one step toward incrementally changing, or at least challenging, the predominant research university culture of disciplinary and disinterested research and teaching. This congregation of “like minded” people in the PSA emerged as a theme repeatedly throughout my conversations with participants; they valued the PSA for bringing them together around a common purpose: defining and advancing the practice of public scholarship.

_A Group of “Like-Minded People”_

In describing their perceptions of the purposes the PSA served – intended and otherwise – study participants were most focused on it serving as a conceptual place or “discursive space” for “like-minded people” to come together in common purpose. At least two participants used the exact phrase “like-minded people” to describe the members of the PSA; another referred to the PSA as “a cadre of individuals who are of like minds.” Other participants described the PSA in keeping with this spirit, indicating that they understood and valued the PSA as “a community,” “a support community,” and “a clan.”

Established as a place for people with shared interests to come together, the PSA continues to draw people committed to civic education and public scholarship to it, serving as a supportive environment situated within what participants perceived to be a largely
hostile, indifferent, or non-supportive institutional context. One long-term member of the
group, in fact, referred to the group as a “touchstone of sanity” and as her personal “insular
Tahiti,”24 suggesting that the PSA served as an island of support for her commitment to
teaching for civic capacity and engagement in the larger institutional landscape. Newer PSA
members expressed a desire for more people to “think this through with” – to make sense of
public scholarship and refine its practice. This desire for interaction with like-minded people
and for more forums in which to consider and discuss the implications and practicalities of
public scholarship theory for undergraduate education can be framed as a desire for more
learning, or at least more opportunities for learning.

Participants often described the PSA in terms that evoked a picture of a community
of faculty members learning together about public scholarship. An original member of the
group described its founding as having “created a community that would have this
conversation [about public scholarship].” He noted that it had importantly “brought people
together” – from different disciplines and colleges across the university – that might not
otherwise have ever met. Newer members described the PSA as “a forum, if you look at it
collectively, for discussion of issues associated with public scholarship and for like-minded
people to come together.” Another newer member commented that there’s a “robust
interest” in public scholarship and a real need for the group – “faculty members need that
kind of cohesion, they need a kind of place...a place that these ideas can come through.” A
participant, whose participation places him somewhere in the middle between newcomer and

24 In calling the Public Scholarship Associates group as her “insular Tahiti,” this tenured humanities professor
is referencing a scene in Herman Melville's (1851) *Moby Dick* in which Ishmael, the novel's main protagonist
and wandering sailor, “talks about his insular Tahiti and when the world gets too hard and too difficult he
has an insular Tahiti; Tahiti being this wonderful place.” She comments, “in a way the public scholarship
group is my insular Tahiti, like a touchstone of, I can't always say sanity, but there's nothing in the world like
a shared perception...and there's more of a shared perception of what is important – despite our differences,
which I understand are healthy – in the group.”
old-timer of the group, suggested that one of the group’s purposes is to “support faculty members in their personal vision-quest to do great things” indicating that it does so through a series of initiatives, but also by fostering “a really good sense of camaraderie” among its members.

Part of the draw of a community of like-minded people for study participants is likely tied to their perceptions of the larger institutional context in which the PSA is nested. The institution’s status as a preeminent research university lends itself to a culture that privileges research and publications over undergraduate teaching and public engagement. The personal (and professional) value that participants placed on teaching for civic capacity and engagement was, then, something they had in common that set them apart from many of their colleagues and departments. Participants indicated finding the PSA community to be one of support and mutual reinforcement. Their participation in the group reminded them of why this work is important by legitimizing and rewarding, even if in small ways (e.g., course grants, recognition in press releases), their efforts that might go unrewarded in the institution’s tenure and promotion system. The PSA community, in fostering a space to meet, network, and make sense of public scholarship and its practice in undergraduate education, encouraged participants to know that they were not “working on this alone, that there were others doing similar stuff.”

**Learning in Context**

Participants identified an ongoing learning process corresponding to their teaching for civic capacity and engagement. In interacting with their peers, students, and a variety of ideas embodied in cultural artifacts, faculty participants engaged, consciously and unconsciously, in learning. They wrestled with ways in which to bring to life disciplinary and interdisciplinary
concepts for their students by connecting them to public issues and concerns in conceptual and concrete ways.

The duration and extent of faculty members’ participation in the PSA appears to have influenced the extent of their learning and, in turn, the extent of its influence on their teaching for civic capacity and engagement. Learning occurred as participants conceptualized, discussed, defined, and otherwise explored the concepts and practices of public scholarship and civic engagement. This learning was put into practice in participants’ classrooms and in other sites of undergraduate teaching and learning. Most, though not all, participants viewed the PSA as a salient contextual influence on their teaching for civic capacity and engagement. They indicated that it provided opportunities for ongoing professional development and served as a source of networking and information exchange, allowing for the cross-pollination of ideas and practices. Even the three participants (all either relatively new members or not extensively involved in the PSA) that stated that the PSA had not influenced their teaching, provided information suggesting that indeed it had. For example, one of these participants received a course development grant from the PSA that allowed her to identify a potential model for engaging students through public scholarship.

**Participation in the PSA Community**

Like-minded people may populate a community of practice but in order for a group to become, remain, and be considered a community of practice it must be sustainable (Lave & Wenger, 1991). How a community initiates and involves new members (Lave & Wenger’s “newcomers”), then, is an important aspect of a community of practice. New members may become long-time, core members (“old-timers” in community of practice terminology) by participating regularly in the activities of the community (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Individuals learn
as they engage with each other in the course of specific activities and in conversations with one another.

Participants’ engagement in the PSA can be described as falling somewhere on a continuum of participation from novice to expert, from newcomer to old-timer. Of the 14 participants in this study, I categorized three as old-timers, one as a true novice, and eight as somewhere in the process of becoming full members of the PSA community. The remaining two participants were both experienced practitioners of public scholarship. One was almost entirely new to the PSA, but had been extensively involved in advancing the practice of public scholarship at a national level; the other had followed a path of increased involvement with a decision to decrease her involvement in the PSA in order to become more involved in related scholarly communities tied more directly to her academic field. These two participants can be perceived as the exceptions that prove the most participants follow a path of increased involvement rule. In fact, it is important to note that people “participate in communities in many different ways” (Greeno & The Middle School Mathematics Through Applications Project Group, 1998, p. 10) and that they do not all follow a single learning trajectory. Rather, while many people enter into a community of practice and proceed on a course of steadily increasing and prolonged participation, learning more about the practice(s) central to the community and coming to identify more and more as a certain “kind” of person (Packer & Goicoechea, 2000, p. 235). Interaction with “acknowledged adept practitioners” (whom I call old-timers) serves to legitimate learning (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 100). Due to such conflicts or other personal priorities, individuals – like the one described above – may leave a community of practice or remain only peripherally involved. For the sake of simplicity, all participants other than the three “old timers” are discussed under the rubric of “newcomers” – despite their varying levels of “newness.”
A more experienced member of the group, described the need for balancing practices within the PSA group that allow new members to “[try] out these ideas for the first time” even though she's “not quite there anymore.” She finds herself getting bored at times during discussions because “once I figure something out, I'm done with it,” though she acknowledges that she “never leave[s] one of those [seminars] without having learned something.” She asserted that in trying to make the PSA group “sustainable,” it's important to recognize that, despite her complaints and occasional boredom, “the idea of building something sustainable from the ground up and it's never done – it just needs to be re-performed, re-performed, and re-performed.”

Similarly, a tenured humanities professor as well as a core member of the group, acknowledged her continued learning via her participation in group seminars, etc., but expressed frustration and boredom at the inevitable covering of the same ground – the need to initiate new members of the group in the language and practice of public scholarship. While she framed this as a necessary issue of group “sustainability,” viewed through the lens of sociocultural learning theories, this perception can be viewed as acknowledging the importance of creating and maintaining practices which keep experienced or central members of a community engaged, while initiating fledgling members in the language, history, and practice of public scholarship.

Another participant, an old-timer expressed concern “that, as a group, we haven’t thought enough about putting [our public scholarship work] on a theory,” and that “you need an intellectual theory....you need to find a foundation.” He believes there is a “disconnect between the way some people think about [doing public scholarship]” and how he thinks about (and does) it, and “I don’t think that we ever addressed that issue.” He was concerned that “some people [like some fellow seminar participants] feel that they're contributing to society because they published an article or because they made some learned statement; they don't quite see the need
to be action-oriented.” He also concedes that there are “many [other] faculty who are concerned about this [state of affairs] and they will talk about it, but they don't necessarily act in any particular way.” He feels that the “democracy seminars [are] a good example of [this]” discrepancy between theory and action. This participant’s comments align with the notion that while we talk about newcomers and old-timers in communities of practice, there really is not ultimate position of expertise or central position in the learning trajectory of legitimate peripheral participation. Rather, the nature of a community of practice is that it is continually evolving over time as new ideas and persons (e.g., newcomers seeking to shape practices they view as flawed or outdated) join the dialogue, as new practices replace, supplement, or otherwise amend existing ones. His comments again suggest that old-timers are concerned with the ways in which the PSA socializes new public scholarship associates.

**Old-timers: PSA “Regulars”**

Three study participants were long-term, active participants in the PSA. These participants were identified by one another and other “newcomer” study participants as core, expert members and exemplars of public scholarship teaching practice. One of the old-timers described herself and the other two as “irregular regulars” – PSA members who were regularly involved in the group’s activities and leadership; the “irregular” a nod to the core members’ diversity in terms of their disciplines, ways of regularly practicing public scholarship, and the differences in their participation in the group. Two of these three “regulars” were part of the founding membership of the group. As conveners of the community of practice, these two participants helped establish the PSA learning curriculum; they were centrally involved in the activities of the group from at or near its inception. The third old-timer, however, while involved regularly for a longer period of time that any of the newcomer participants, engaged in a learning trajectory or participated in a set of PSA-sponsored events and activities which focused his
thinking and contributed to his learning about public scholarship in a manner more similar to that of the newer PSA members. This participant indicated having learned a great deal about the theory underpinning public scholarship work and about how to frame and talk about his blend of teaching, research, and public practice or engagement. He also embarked on a series of collaborative, grant-funded studies with other PSA members designed to begin to assess student learning in his civically-engaging courses.

When asked about influences on her teaching practices, a tenured humanities professor indicated that the influence was both theoretical and practical. She described herself as always learning something new through her participation in the public scholarship seminars and other less formal interactions and conversations with some of these same colleagues. She personally believes that teaching “requires study, requires some natural talent, and requires a whole lot of practice.” She reported that she had benefited from both opportunities for continued “study” (for example through the “A Capacity to Sustain Democracy” seminar series) and also from the opportunity to teach a course for the civic and community engagement minor program.

Additional participants reported that interactions within the context of the PSA group were central to their continued learning to teach for civic capacity and engagement. An old-timer characterized his interactions with members of the public scholarship “clan” as encouraging him to think about pedagogy, environmental-based learning, and sustainability education. He reported increased “scrutiny” of his civic capacity and engagement-focused course series as a result of interactions with more experienced, public scholarship associates, whom he characterized as “people who know more about teaching” than he did. He also learned that he “wasn’t that crazy;” that “there were people doing really cool, innovative things and who also had learned how to talk about them and find the value of and share the
value” of their public scholarship-oriented work. He also reported that he “learned about how to talk about what we were doing and that there was actually a theory behind it”, noting that he also found “a language to talk about that which I could then translate into a research-grant proposal. He talked about the PSA as “a support community.” Over time, this participant became a central member of the community by learning about and enhancing his practices of public scholarship. Many of his recollections about this learning trajectory were echoed by other novice participants.

All three old-timers spoke of their continued learning through their participation in the PSA and in closely related contexts (e.g., their teaching, partnerships). One explained that continued participation in the PSA served as “a re-grounding” of sorts – a reminder of why she values and conducts this type of work. She suggested that she was not so much learning entirely new concepts, but learning about herself; that participating in PSA conversations served to remind her of what was important to her about her work. Her participation was about “getting back to that person I was” – about remembering (relearning?) what values she hold as central and toward what purposes she teaches. Having taught and earned tenure at a different research university in which she perceived the work of public scholarship as less valued, her participation in the PSA served to remind her that the educational purposes of democratic engagement that she esteem are valued by others in the academy. She appeared to draw comfort and energy to continue to advance these goals from her interactions with other PSA members, old and new.

**Newcomers: “People trying out these ideas for the first time”**

Newcomers were described by one of the old-timers as “people trying out these ideas for the first time.” One newcomer described his PSA involvement – thus far limited to his attendance at a day-long conference and his involvement in the 2007-08 faculty seminar – as “stimulating,” “the source of some fresh incentives and some fresh ideas” for his classroom practices, and as
having “specifically reinvigorated my thinking.” Another participant, the most advanced of the newcomers, having participated extensively in group activities over the past couple of years, asserted: “In my discipline, I'm learning to teach things that I believe are public scholarship” Similarly, another relative newcomer, albeit one who had been involved in more group activities over a period of approximately two years, described the PSA as follows:

So the group serves, for me, as an intellectual stimulus by which I'm able to reflect on my frustrations, be inspired by a cadre of individuals who are of like minds if not, quite frankly, much more advanced minds than mine, because they come with a lot more experience and a lot longer work in the trenches, I would argue. And that in itself makes it very important for younger faculty.

His depiction of the older, wiser, more experienced members of the group is akin to Lave and Wenger's (1991) description of the roles of newcomers and old-timers in communities of practice. Old timers provide newcomers with “access to a range of on-going activity…information, resources, and opportunities for participation” (p. 101).

Another newcomer and tenure-track faculty member spoke of learning not only about how to teach for civic capacity and engagement, but also more broadly to conceive of teaching as “a craft” to be learned and mastered. He suggested that learning to teach becomes easier over time and the basics becomes not an “unconscious” process, but one in which you can focus on more complicated, artistic flourishes (like teaching as public scholarship). He also indicated that his participation in the PSA had given him a language with which to think and talk about teaching – about educational purpose, about pedagogy, and about different educational philosophies. His students benefited not only from his increased learning about teaching for civic capacity and engagement, but also from his increased knowledge of various educational principles and foundational concepts of teaching.
Membership in the PSA provided participants with access to a situated “situated curriculum” (Gherardi, Nicolini, & Odella, 1998) – a set of somewhat proscribed activities (e.g., luncheons, committees, speakers, seminars) which provide opportunities for “specific modes of engagement” (Gherardi, Nicolini, & Odella 1998, p. 279). In the case of the PSA these “modes” include defining, discussing, writing about and practicing public scholarship. Study participants’ levels of engagement in these activities varied, yet by sharing their thoughts – aloud and in writing – with members of the PSA, they expressed and clarified their beliefs, rendered thoughts concrete, invited and reflected on critiques of their ideas, and received support and suggestions – in short, they learned from one another. Put in the language of sociocultural learning perspectives, participants learned through their participation in the practices of the PSA, and this institutionally-based community shaped – or mediated – what they learned. These opportunities to learn the practices of the PSA constitute a curriculum for new and experienced members of the community. In the following sections, I describe key elements of this ‘course of study’.

Early in its history, the PSA sponsored monthly luncheons for associates and convened a series of annual meetings and conferences for members and non-members alike. These conferences began with the March 2003 “summit” “A Blueprint for the Public Scholarship of Service Learning” attended by three study participants. Four study participants participated in the November 2004 “A National Public Scholarship Conversation” conference and eight study participants attended the April 2007 “A Scholarship to Sustain Democracy” seminar.

The monthly luncheons brought together newcomer and old-timer associates so that they could meet and interact, share ideas, and advance the goals of the group (e.g., creating a user-friendly website). Generally, the luncheons followed a relatively informal format consisting of meet-and-greet time over a buffet, around-the-table introductions and updates, announcements,
and sometimes a short speaker or two to share with the group their current course initiatives or other public-scholarship-related work (e.g., research, outreach). Two founding members described the monthly luncheons as creating “a seminar atmosphere in which to test ideas and identify issues” (Cohen & Yapa, 2003, p. 7).

Participants varied in their responses to these events. Newer members typically found the luncheons overwhelmingly large while others viewed them as important informal venues to meet new colleagues and hear about the work of their peers. One tenure-track faculty member in a professional field reported “I went to one of those [luncheon] meetings and...it was bigger than the seminar. So ... I just kind of listened and there were people who reported out. And then I went back to my office.” A newcomer, this participant’s introduction to the PSA was attending her first luncheon where she listened rather than actively engaging in the conversation. Another tenure track participant, a social scientist, expressed some doubt about the usefulness of the luncheons: “I was involved with coming to the public scholarship [luncheons]; it was great to come and get a free meal, but what am I getting out of it? I think a lot of people were asking that question.” This participant scaled up and then scaled back her involvement in the PSA when she found other PSA-like communities of colleagues within her field that better met her needs (e.g., focused on research rather than teaching). She acknowledged, however, that attending the lunches, combined with her other involvement in the PSA, introduced her to people she wouldn’t have otherwise met and models of public scholarship as teaching that she might use after earning tenure.

Both of these participants also commented that the luncheons sometimes resembled a “dog and pony show” in which they did not have the chance to meaningfully interact with colleagues. Generally, as novice members began to attend regularly and to get involved with other PSA activities, they came to value the luncheons as one of the few spaces that member at all
stages regularly attended and for the ability to socialize with other members before and after the official agenda. This socializing often served as a catalyst for the development of new classroom and research collaborations and projects. When the luncheons were discontinued in favor of smaller, but invitation-only seminars, however, newcomers and old-timers alike lamented their end as they believed the lunches served as an important conduit of communication between members.

Another avenue for participation and learning was the LPSD-sponsored course development and enhancement grants, annual awards to support faculty efforts to integrate teaching for civic capacity and engagement into undergraduate education, also acted as an avenue for introducing faculty members to the existence, purposes, and programs of the PSA and its Laboratory. Grant recipients were automatically invited to become public scholarship associates – invited to join the community of practice – as well as included on the PSA roster and welcomed to participate in sponsored events and initiatives. Recipients were responsible for reporting back to the group about their course development experiences, requiring them to reflect on their course planning efforts and a further invitation to engage with the PSA. Many of the courses were subsequently added to the community and civic engagement minor program of study offerings.

Six participants, tenured and tenure-track faculty members, had received course development and enhancement grants allowing them to spend time thinking about aspects of their courses they may not have had time to otherwise. Some funds were used toward funding student travel to a course site or for materials for a new course. Only one of these six participants was an old-timer. For at least two of these participants, their application for and receipt of a course grant marked their first involvement with the PSA.

A tenure-track faculty member in a professional field reported that her course grant allowed her to focus an existing course’s central assignment – to “pick a policy and analyze it” –
on policy implications for and needs of local agencies. Seeking to “make the policy project more authentic and integrated into the broader policy world,” she “looked at the ways we could have students actually required to go out into the world and experience policy and have to talk about it.” The course grant allowed her to take extra time to seek out non-profit organizations in need of policy information which students could provide. She now provides her students with “a much better fact sheet” with which to negotiate their policy projects. In a broader sense, however, the process of further developing her course and policy project assignment, led her directly to “thinking about developing a new major.” She realized that she “wanted something bigger” and so decided to “forget about changing the course, let’s just create a whole new major.” This new program, set to launch in fall 2009, was “modeled on the [Public Scholarship Associates-related] civic and community engagement minor” and attempts to “combine theoretical foundations [of her field] with more applied learning.” By engaging in this process of expanded thinking and moving to create a new minor infused with public scholarship theory and practice, this participant inevitably moves closer to the center on her journey of legitimate peripheral participation.

A second participant admitted that the course grant served as “this carrot [he] could grab” and that his “Design and Democracy course occurred primarily because of [this] money.” It was a combination of personal interest and external impetus that lead him to create and teach his studio course with this theme. Other participants used the grants to revise existing courses. One participant received a grant which, according to his grant application, allowed him to create “an interactive web presence…. [to] enable students to more readily access the [course] material and information that is necessary for a productive service-learning experience” and “to facilitate project blogging and critical reflection by student participants.”

Another participant received two consecutive course development grants to support her teaching/research project in Africa. She described her ongoing interaction with the PSA group as
being heavily tied to this initiative, having coordinated a PSA-sponsored speaker when an African member of the project visited the University. While she had also attended other events sponsored by the PSA, she indicated that she anticipated “getting much more involved” now that her term as a department head was ending.

While most of the annual calls for course development and enhancement grant proposals courses that could count toward completion of the community and civic engagement minor, the 2006-2007 grants were allocated toward efforts to incorporate observation of Constitution Day into courses. As the University’s convener of the federally-mandated Constitution Day, the Laboratory for Public Scholarship and Democracy and the Public Scholarship Associates sponsored course-development grants targeting the inclusion of Constitution Day teaching activities in the undergraduate curriculum. Three study participants discussed their efforts to incorporate Constitution Day into their courses and their efforts to teach for civic capacity and engagement.

Two of these participants were organizational newcomers. One of these participants perceived the course development grants as an important incentive to incorporate Constitution Day into undergraduate courses; he admitted that he probably would not have thought to have done so if not for the encouragement and financial support from the Laboratory. As the grants were awarded in the spring (Constitution Day is observed in September), faculty members had the option to use the grant for spring 2006 or fall 2007 courses. This participant a tenure-track faculty member in a professional field chose have his class “engage Constitutional issues through design” in his spring studio course – teams of students then had a six-week section of the semester to research, design, and build their creations, which were subsequently placed on public display throughout campus the following September. The installations served as educational fodder for the broader student body by encouraging students to interact with not only their physical
placement – to sit on, write on, look through – but also with ideals and ideas undergirding democracy and our country's founding. Students were asked to consider, for example, concepts regarding freedom of speech and the constitutionality of the death penalty.

Another newcomer, a tenure-track faculty member in communications, had intended to team with the first participant in such a way that his students would have provided, for example, copies of banned books with bookmarks indicating why the books had been banned. The logistics of such a combined effort proved too difficult, however. Both participants hope to be able to coordinate a future team effort to engage undergraduates around Constitution Day and their respective areas of study.

An old-timer engaged her students in examining the issue of freedom of speech with regard to banned books. Students then read chosen passages from banned book in front of the main campus library on Constitution Day to illustrate the freedom of speech afforded citizens in the Constitution's Bill of Rights. This participant had previously engaged her students in similar activities in previous years during banned-books week (observed annually in October). She incorporated Constitution Day activities into her courses because she embraced this opportunity to engage students in conversations connecting public issues – like banned books – with her own discipline, rhetoric. She did not, however, apply for a course grant; primarily because she believed they were an important tool for encouraging new faculty to “try out” civic engagement and public scholarship in their classrooms. She was already sold on the idea.

As another part of the public scholarship learning curriculum, eight study participants attended the April 2007 “A Scholarship to Sustain Democracy” day-long conference. These participants were a mix of newcomers and old-timers, with the meeting serving as the first introduction to the PSA for two participants. Talks by four invited speakers provided the intellectual stimulus for the day’s discussions. A newcomer participant, who had previously
received a course development grant, admitted that he “didn't know what was going on” until the April 2007 PSA-sponsored conference. It was there that he “was like, 'Oh, okay. I'm really learning something here.’” He called it “a really important conference where a couple of people talked and it was like okay, people are serious about this.” He recalled being impressed with the research presented, particularly with the discussion of “students' goals versus teachers' goals.” He appreciated being “exposed to people who are doing substantive work about other people, how they teach and learn.” He realized, for the first time, that he could research how his students learn when engaged in public scholarship.

Another tenured faculty member in the sciences indicated that the conference was his “first active participation” in the PSA. He claimed the experience “was very exciting for [him] because the issue is very important. So it was a great cause.” He was “very stimulated,” remembering that the “first speaker was blasting us with statistics about the degree of civic engagement in the United States and [he] was dying to say, well how does it compare to other countries.” He said “I don't know why I didn't ask that question, but I would like to know – the United States has a low voting percentage, so [it's] a very interesting question.” This participant’s status as a fledgling member of the PSA appears to have made him reluctant to ask a question in a group of seemingly more experienced – at least with the topic/practice at hand – peers. Asking a question would have likely pointed out his status as a newcomer, which can seem risky for a full professor like this participant. It may be that participation status influences how people participate and what they take – learn – from events and activities of the community of practice.

Participants found helpful the “A Capacity to Sustain Democracy” seminar series, a five-part, year-long faculty discussion of common readings pertaining to teaching for civic capacity and engagement. A participant described the seminars as a group of “very smart people, they come and they talk about ideas, they talk about books, with the understanding that that conversation
will advance the course of democracy.” Another participant in describing his seminar experience, commented, “sitting in the seminar series this year has been amazing.” He believed that he had been exposed to important foundational educational concepts and philosophies as well as to examples of how more experienced colleagues and colleagues in other disciplines thought about, framed, and practiced teaching for civic capacity and engagement.

Participants also indicated that PSA sponsored lectures and programs contributed to their learning. One tenure-track participant, who admitted to having “high hopes” for the seminar, found herself inspired by a talk that served as an introduction to the seminar series that year. She found herself considering how she might incorporate some of the information presented in this lecture in her future courses.

Some participants mentioned books or articles that sparked their thinking about teaching for civic and community engagement. Participants who attended the PSA’s democracy seminars mentioned seminar readings, including Richard Dworkin's (2006) *Is Democracy Possible Here? Principles for a New Political Debate* and Nel Noddings’ (2006) *Philosophy of Education* (2nd ed.). For example, a tenure-track participant in a professional field, commented that he had learned a great deal upon reading and discussing *Philosophy of Education*, which he described as “the book I wish someone had handed to me a long time ago.” Another tenure-track participant in a professional field, already familiar with Noddings’ work reported that she didn’t feel like she learned as much during the seminars as she had hoped. Some of the disparity in participants’ responses to the content of the seminars seemed related to with their educational and disciplinary backgrounds. Those with formal training in teaching, like this second participant, were less apt to find the seminars as intellectually stimulating as their peers who were less familiar with educational philosophy.
One newcomer participant discussed pivotal interactions with other colleagues in the PSA, particularly during the PSA seminar, “A Capacity to Sustain Democracy.” While he had previously engaged his students in formal debates in one of his courses, he reported that the seminars encouraged him to communicate his objectives for this activity – as “a practical experience in public speaking and debating” – as well as a way of reviewing historical content more clearly to his students. He commented,

I have to say that I recognized, based on some of this interaction, especially through the public scholarship seminars, how essential it is to develop that other mode of processing learning – that students actually feel invested in and engaged in understanding and articulating issues from different historical viewpoints. So that's encouraged me to define a little more clearly some of the guidelines I set for this [course activity] and some of the scenarios that I set up for these kind of discussions and debates in my classes.

This participant learned not only about the practice of public scholarship and teaching for civic capacity and engagement, but also general instructional strategies for good teaching. Participants indicated that one of the aspects of the PSA that they appreciated was the space and time it created for the sharing of ideas among peers. Regarding his experience with the public scholarship associates seminar and other events, this newcomer (and tenured faculty member, commented,

I think it’s extraordinarily stimulating and helpful to have this kind of discussion going on among faculty and across disciplines, because it returns us basically to a community of like-minded people...looking forward to learning about the world and making a difference in the world.

He continued by saying that the PSA allowed its members to “share some experience for what has worked and what hasn't worked and what distinctive paths we’re taking and what we see as the problems facing those of us in academia.”

Some participants were given additional learning opportunities – one-time, invitation-only co-curricular experiences with other PSA members. For example, the PSA regularly hosted dinners and talks with invited or visiting scholars or practitioners of public scholarship. Such
speakers included representatives from National Public Radio and a variety of partners in participants’ public scholarship projects. Newcomer and old-timer participants were able to interact with each other and the speakers over informal dinners followed by talks and question and answer periods. Participants at all stages in their PSA journeys indicated being introduced to new ideas and practices over their participation in many of these events. Additionally, a newcomer was invited to be part of a five-person team sent to participate in the American Association of State Colleges and Universities’ (AASCU’s) annual Stewardship of Public Lands 2007 program at Yellowstone National Park. Another participant, an old-timer accompanied other PSA members to a meeting in Bologna, Italy in 2006 to present on public scholarship and the role of the university in civil society.

A team of PSA faculty member and a graduate student (this researcher) were sent by Dr. Cohen, the PSA’s administrative leader, to Yellowstone National Park during the summer of 2007 as part of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities’ (AASCU’s) annual Stewardship of Public Lands program sponsored by the society’s American Democracy Program (ADP). This was part of an intentional effort on the part of the PSA’s leader to cultivate the civic-engagement teaching practices of faculty members, including a tenure-track study participant. From a sociocultural learning perspective, his selection of the specific faculty members he sent to participate in the Yellowstone experience could be perceived as an attempt to help relative newcomers move toward more central participation in the PSA group; he was cultivating the learning of potential old-timers. The study participant who attended the Yellowstone program spoke of its role in his subsequent course planning and teaching for civic capacity and engagement. He created a new studio course with a travel component to New Orleans to tackle projects for City Park. He reflected, “you go into that [course] thinking it is all about helping [Hurricane] Katrina victims, except that no, there are bigger issues and Katrina sort of found a red herring; that is, it's a
convulsive factor that brings to life all of these other issues and I am only doing this project because I am interested in all of these complicated issues.” Tying it to our Yellowstone experience, he shared,

It's like, it's Yellowstone, right? You bring out all of those things and it's just, it just complicates it even more, it makes the problem even more wicked because what you thought it was [about] is not it at all and then you have to be able to decide is this the sort of thing that I can solve.

He then shared an example, citing a fifth-year student who decided to tackle the issue of homelessness. He commented,

The answer to homelessness as far as architecture is concerned is pretty simple. I mean we build homes, period. Social issues of drug addiction and whatever else and financial problems, they don't get solved through architecture. And even if you give people homes, when do you call in the architect? Once all the decisions have been made that we are going to give them all homes....So what does the architect deal with? Special-needs populations, but you don't deal with the bigger issues. And students are very interested in the bigger issues.

How do I make a difference in their life? Sometimes you do that by asking them to apply their skills to something, sometimes within the bounds of their discipline, what they expect. And sometimes in an unexpected way.

That is what the New Orleans’ City Park course was about – asking students to consider problems from different perspectives; this participant’s involvement in the Yellowstone seminar provided him with a curricular model to replicate in his own undergraduate courses.

**Contributing to the Public Scholarship Curriculum**

As experienced members of the PSA, old-timers contribute to the existing situated learning curriculum of the group in a variety of ways. In addition to sharing their experiences and knowledge with newer members and serving as exemplars of how to “do” public scholarship well, these participants authored essays published in one of two PSA-sponsored volumes. In an outgrowth of the first “Blueprint” conference, the PSA produced an in-house publication entitled *A Blueprint for Public Scholarship at Penn State*. The *Blueprint* was an edited collection of 16 essays by
faculty PSA associates as well as campus students and staff and a Campus Compact representative. Four study participants authored or co-authored essays included in this volume. In these essays they sought to define the emerging concept and to detail examples of its practice in undergraduate teaching. A second PSA-sponsored collection of essays, *A Laboratory for Public Scholarship and Democracy*, was published in 2006 as a volume of the Jossey-Bass *New Directions for Teaching and Learning* series. Three study participants contributed to this publication.

The publication of these two essay volumes represented a synthesis of the learning of individual PSA members. The four old-timers spoke of how writing their essays, and helping to edit the two volumes, forced them to reflect on and clarify their teaching practices and beliefs. An old-timer, who became involved with the PSA as the *Blueprint* was being conceived, was able to contribute an essay to the volume describing her personal approach to teaching for civic capacity and engagement. She was more extensively involved in the execution of the second volume, commenting regarding her heightened level of engagement that helping to edit this volume was “a place where I could be of use.” She recognized this as a place her knowledge and learning could best be put to use; it was clearly a role for a more central, full community member.

The two volumes of essays produced by more experienced members of the PSA served, in the terms of sociocultural theories, as *artifacts or tools* that mediated many newcomers’ learning about the practice of public scholarship. New-comers told me how reading one or both volumes had aided in their understanding of what public scholarship meant at their institution. For example, a participant, still struggling to define for himself what separated public scholarship from service-learning from outreach, and hoping to go further with his own teaching, research, and practice, expressed frustration with the opening chapter of the *Blueprint*. He felt that the volume, including its introductory essay, talked about and around the concept of public scholarship, but “doesn't actually define it.” That
acknowledged, he was also led to recognize that this lack of a single agreed-upon definition indicated that the group was still engaged in the process of developing and defining what public scholarship looked like and meant in the context of its institution.

**Evidence of Learning**

Participants’ situated learning – the learning that occurred as they navigated the learning curriculum of PSA activities, interactions, and opportunities described in this chapter – was evidenced in their language adoption and usage; their adoption, imitation, and replication of the ideas and practices of more central members; and in their developing identities as public scholars.

**Learning the Language of Public Scholarship**

According to Lave and Wenger (1991), “to learn to talk” (p. 109, emphasis original) like a old-time member of the community, rather than to learn from their talk, is a central aspect of the situated learning which occurs through legitimate peripheral participation. Becoming a full member of a community “involves learning how to talk (and be silent) in the manner of full participants” (p. 105). “Through” language – speaking and writing are themselves acts of participation – “we realize ourselves; effect changes in our worlds; connect with other people” (Hanks, 1996, p. 236).

Some participants (newcomers and old-timers, alike) commented that through their participation in the Public Scholarship Associates they acquired a language with which to describe their practice, a language with which to describe their larger educational purpose. One newcomer, a tenured scientist, identified her introduction to the Penn State Public Scholarship Associates community as providing her with a language with which to define and describe her educational goals for her students. Prior to her introduction to the term public scholarship during a conference presentation by PSA leader Jeremy Cohen, she had the ideas, but not the language and historical context (e.g., land-grant history) with which to frame her beliefs about educational
purpose. Having these tools – terminology and an understanding of larger context – “ennobled” her work and helped her take it to the next level.

It ennobled what I’d been trying to do – it gave me a context that said this is important... It brought my awareness to another scale. And it was just very satisfying for me and exciting for me to think about what I was doing as playing a role in making our nation stronger by creating a more informed citizenry, which is the mission of public education. And I thought, 'okay, now I know why I'm doing this.' And I was charged up by it and I thought everybody needs to know this.

This participant translated an initially more passive interaction – listening to a conference presentation and actively considering the ideas being presented while reframing her prior knowledge and experiences with the new terminology (public scholarship) and information – into a series of more observable interactions – engaging in a conversation with the presenter following the presentation, and later inviting him to talk to one of her classes.

A tenured faculty member in a professional field indicated that through his participation in the PSA he too acquired a specific language. He noted that PSA members were “doing really cool, innovative things” and that he “had learned to talk about them and find the value of and share the value of” the work they were doing. He credited fellow PSA members with modeling how to talk about public scholarship. Through his participation in the PSA, he “learned about how to talk about what we were doing and that there was actually a theory behind it. It gave me a language to talk about that which I could then translate into a research grant proposal.”

The PSA group has adopted for its own a rather specific lexicon of words to describe teaching for civic capacity and engagement: public scholarship, public scholars, civic and community engagement, democratic capacity, and so forth. This shared language has emerged over the course of time and through a continual series of conversations and negotiations about language, meaning, and practice. Many of the groups’ “old-timers” advocated for terminology to differentiate the practice and teaching of public scholarship from service-learning. While total
agreement upon terminology usage and the precise definitions of many terms remains elusive, the shared meaning-making that has occurred within the group, and the manners by which new members are introduced to the group’s language, are characteristic of a learning community and a community of practice.

Participants used the terms civic engagement, public scholarship, and service-learning frequently throughout our interviews. Most indicated that they are more likely to use the term civic engagement, and to a somewhat lesser extent when referring specifically to pedagogy the term service-learning, with students, colleagues outside of the PSA, and the broader public, than the term public scholarship. They spoke of the terms as interrelated, yet distinct concepts. For example, one participant described public scholarship as a more nebulous, philosophical term than service-learning or civic engagement – which entail actions, are “thing[s] that you do.” Another participant suggested that, “Civic engagement [as compared to public scholarship] has a lot more to do with getting the students aware of the obligations and responsibilities they have as citizens, rather than [only their] rights.” Others differentiated between civic engagement as a broader concept and service-learning as a “teaching pedagogy” of which one desired learning outcome is civic engagement.

Definitions of public scholarship were somewhat contingent upon the extent and length of participation in the PSA. For example, two very engaged, yet relatively new members of the PSA community spoke of their investment in the conversation and in teaching for civic purposes, but admitted to not having a fully-developed understanding or definition of public scholarship. One of these participants, a tenure-track faculty member in the social sciences indicated, “I am new to public scholarship, so this is an area where I am still working on the definition myself.” He perceives public scholarship as having more to do with his work as a faculty member – particularly with regard to the publishing he needs to do to earn tenure – and civic engagement
having more to do with “getting students aware of the obligations and responsibilities they have as citizens.” Public scholarship operates more on his “level in relationship to my needs and to the academic and scholarly community.”

The other relative newcomer indicated that “what I was excited by when I first got involved with the group, was the idea that public scholarship was the thing beyond service-learning, the next step.” He likes to tell the following story to distinguish between service, service-learning, and public scholarship. Students performing community service might go and pick up trash at a local park – which is “super;” volunteerism is an important aspect of civic engagement. Students engaged in service-learning might “design a little park” for a local community; “essentially we do you a service in exchange for the opportunity to learn, to both learn by designing and to learn by engaging with you and all of the complicated issues of the real world.”

He expressed frustration that the Blueprint “doesn’t actually define it [public scholarship],” but instead offers examples of the work and ideas of other public scholarship associates. Interestingly, however, in an ironic parallel to the Blueprint, he then went on to offer his own definition not in a succinct phrase, but through a story, through a series of examples of what public scholarship is not and what it might be. He indicated that public scholarship is something more than service-learning, that it is not just “better branding,” and related the “example that I always sort of imagine.” In the story, biology students measure the acidity levels of a creek, practicing their data collection and analysis skills, and reflect on the exercise as an experiential or service-learning activity. They might even share their results with an appropriate governmental agency or non-profit. It’s an example of a strong and compelling learning activity for students, which connects disciplinary skill development with a sense of civic responsibility – that their information might be shared for the common good. Public scholarship entails not just stepping it up a notch, but the creation of new knowledge. These same students might collect the same data
from a creek, but also collect data from other creeks and add their findings to that of the students that came before them, creating a detailed record of changes in the acidity of this and other regional creeks. In this capacity, regular contact with the community is created and the findings might lead to eventual change in environmental protection practices, ground-water testing, or lead to further study. Here, “students learn that their work can have a greater impact, so it’s not just about the technical piece” of learning a specific disciplinary skills set, but a matter of learning how to act as a concerned and responsible citizen in an informed (and perhaps one day, professional) manner. Interestingly, this participant was not willing to just accept everything in the Blueprint, instead engaging in thinking with it – in learning from it by considering the possibilities it offered and extending his own analysis further.

Some participants defined public scholarship as more closely aligned with their own research interests and projects, while others indicated that they viewed it as a form of pedagogy or a set of instructional approaches. For example, a tenured social scientist reflected, “I define public scholarship as a way of getting students to civically engage with their world.” Some used the term public scholarship in a more philosophical way – as an approach to scholarship, whether that be in the form of teaching or research. For example, a tenured social scientist indicated that public scholarship is about dialogue; that “public scholarship is being not just in the community but being of the community.” This might not be in the strict sense of literally being a permanent legal resident of a town, state, or even country, but about understanding issues from a community member’s point of view. This participant also indicated that public scholarship is “also about fostering, building, and modeling democratic practices in your work” in “public regarding ways.” He indicated that individuals engaging in public scholarship need to be “critically reflective and reflexive…with respect to one’s values and beliefs.”
Another indicated that it’s “very tricky” to define public scholarship. She offered the following definition of public scholarship: “a way of getting students to civically engaged with their world as a geographer.” She indicated that this is a matter of getting students to consider “how do they become active citizens in a global society and what is their role in a global society.” She also indicated, like many of her co-participants, that she frequently uses the term civic engagement rather than public scholarship in talking with students because “I don’t really think they’re aware of what [public scholarship] is.” She tells students that her course is about civic engagement and then polls students to see if they know what the term means. Since her students don’t typically have a clear understanding of what civic engagement entails, “that’s where we start.” Similarly, a tenured humanities professor asks his students to consider “how citizenship and democracy get defined.”

Participants frequently chose their terms and language based on their audience. When I asked one tenured participant in a professional field to describe to me how he conceptualizes terms and how he talks about them with his students, he responded “very differently.” He indicated that he uses the term service-learning “when I don’t have time to explain what I think is a valid and rich concept of public scholarship.” He also often uses the term service-learning in grant applications because more people are familiar with it. Public scholarship, he suggested, is a great term for the community of scholars that are trying to understand the pedagogical impacts and push to understand the value of mutual interaction and the real research that can be going on imbedded in that kind of learning.

He did not, however, believe that public scholarship needs to be “the common term.” Participants tended to use more precise language, to be able to articulate the premises of public scholarship, and to modify their terminology based on their audience as they moved toward more extensive and sustained involvement in the PSA. It is important to note, however, that these examples are also evidence of how the PSA continues to evolve and develop its shared
conception of public scholarship and its practice. Again, this study depicts the group through the eyes of 14 participants at one moment in time; the PSA community and its members continue to learn and develop.

**Adoption, Imitation, & Re-Creation**

Participants’ adoption of specific practices, imitation of more core members’ actions, and their re-creation or repurposing of existing constructs provided evidence of their situated learning in the PSA community of practice. While two participants were at times dismissive of some PSA meetings as resembling “dog and pony shows,” even these show-and-tell aspects of the group – moments in which members shared examples of their own teaching and research projects – appeared to have influenced some participants’ practice or ideas about practice by providing exemplars of how the ideas of public scholarship could be translated into classroom practice. A newcomer, for example, organized a new undergraduate program of study around the PSA’s civic and community engagement undergraduate minor. Other relative newcomers identified old-timers’ projects and partnerships as models for their own efforts or became engaged in these existing projects, and one participant helped found a college-based sub-group of the PSA.

A tenure-track participant in a professional field indicated that she had identified the PSA civic and community engagement (CIVCOM) minor as a curricular model for teaching civic capacity and engagement through public scholarship. In describing a new undergraduate major program of study she was responsible for designing and advocating, she commented, “really it’s modeled on the CIVCOM minor.” In her own words, “I took the CIVCOM minor and really just kind of extrapolated it” with regard to her specific academic field – education.

A participant in the social sciences acknowledged that her involvement in the PSA introduced her to more experienced colleagues (old-timers) and, thus, to a variety of on-going public scholarship partnerships and projects which fused research, teaching, and public service.
She indicated that she intended to build upon key aspects of a founding PSA associate’s sustained community partnership – “a potential model, post-tenure, for things that I want to do” – to realize her own research/teaching/community engagement vision. She expressed hope that by creating her own on-going public scholarship project post-tenure, that she might be able to continue her research and informal teaching for civic capacity and engagement (e.g., supervising undergraduate theses, involving undergraduates in her research projects) and potentially incorporate such civic purposes into a formal course structured around the long-term project.

The PSA has spawned a smaller, college-specific faculty group intent on incorporating public scholarship into the curriculum, exchanging ideas, supporting each other, hiring more “like-minded” faculty members, and influencing the tenure and promotion process. Interestingly, there was only one faculty member, a study participant, associated with both groups. This new sub-group had just started in the year leading up to this study; he said of himself and two colleagues: “we just suddenly gave it a roof and that's where it all began to take place.” By naming their partnership and inviting others in their college to join them, they acknowledged publically, that “everyone should have a different vision of how they're going to employ an approach to democratic practices and teaching.” Further, by creating a college-wide group, these founders acknowledged that with such “a wide range of [disciplinary] interests represented; it's going to be messy.” This participant also acknowledged the lack of a “collective vision” even among himself and the other two founders. The study participant acts as a “bridge” of sorts between the two PSA groups and his two colleagues; one who is “more traditional in his approach to scholarship as public scholarship” and the other who uses more “radical pedagogical approaches to the extent that he can with the classes he has to teach.”

He believed that creating a “college-wide” group was important given that “the appeal and the imperative of the public scholarship university-wide initiative is not experienced in my
college.” This was due, he suggested, to a lack of awareness of the university-wide group and to “the fact that people are just maybe not willing to get involved in something that takes them outside of their own [disciplinary] interests.” This participant’s description of the need for a college-specific public scholarship community brings to mind how frequently communities of practice can be nested and context specific. That is, communities of practice from midwives to the public scholars of this study often have larger and more local sets of communities.

This participant also acknowledged the group’s desire to work to incrementally change their college’s culture regarding public scholarship and teaching for civic capacity and engagement by getting “more involved in the hiring process.” While acknowledging that such cultural change is difficult (that it “may never even take root”), he indicated that he and one of his other college-PSA group colleagues were recently appointed to a committee charged with hiring a new tenure-track faculty member. He offered as an example of the growing power and purview of the group that they told the committee, “we want someone who sees the world as we do and is an activist” and that “that’s what we got.” He hoped that the hiring of this new faculty member, someone he views as “good at what she does” and as likely to help build the group’s momentum, they will slowly be able to influence the larger culture of their college. This participant’s (and his colleagues’) desire to influence the hiring processes of their college emphasize the study’s research university context. That is, the participant indicated a desire to change the culture of his college by hiring faculty members committed to public scholarship, rather than more disinterested research and teaching.

**Identity Development**

Social learning theories suggest that identity formation is part of the learning which occurs with increased membership in a community of practice; learning “involves the construction of identities” (Lave & Wenger, p. 53), the becoming of “certain kinds of people” (Gee, 2000-2001, p.
110). Gee (2000-2001) argues that individuals recognize themselves and are recognized by others as “becoming” or “being” a certain type of person – an academic, a community activist, a teacher – and that these identities are place and time specific; they “can change from moment to moment in the interaction, can change from context to context, and, of course, can be ambiguous or unstable” (Gee, 2000-2001, p. 99). In fact, learning can be understood as “the development of a new identity based on participation in the system of situated practices” of a community and “learning is not conceived as a way of coming to know the world, but as a way of becoming part of the social world” (Gherardi, Nicolini, & Odella1998, p. 276). Learning the practice of public scholarship, then, entails not only learning how to teach (and research), as one participant said, “publicly regarding ways,” but to become a public scholar. Wenger (1998) argues that identity formation is inherent in participation in a community of practice. Identity is not simply a matter of “self-image” (p. 151) – though many participants actively self-identified as public scholarship associates or as public scholars as evidenced by their email signatures, curricula vitae, tenure dossiers, websites, and biographical statements submitted for conferences and invited talks. Identity is also not just how one is perceived or described by others, although many interview participants identified old-timers as exemplars of public scholars. Rather, it is an amalgamation of both and a matter of how one acts in the world. Identity as a public scholarship associate is evident in the way one acts or interacts with members and non-members of this community, and in how an individual teaches and performs research. Public scholarship associates, for example, actively teach for civic purposes, often combining their research and teaching efforts in mutually beneficial ways, and they ethically consider the public good in their teaching and research. Identity is constructed and reconstructed in practice, in the learning trajectory inherent in becoming a practitioner, a full member of a community of practice, in this case in becoming a public scholar, as well as through negotiation of our memberships in multiple overlapping and separate
communities. Old-timer participants had more fully-developed identities as public scholars; they self-identified as public scholars and were identified by each other and newcomers as exemplars of the practices of public scholarship.

All three of the old-timer PSA members were offered up by other study participants as exemplars of public scholarship associates, of how to incorporate public scholarship (and teaching for civic capacity and engagement) in undergraduate teaching. These three participants were noted by other study participants (including newcomers and fellow old-timers) for how they consistently incorporated civic engagement, rather than only civic-capacity enhancing content, into their undergraduate courses and, in the cases of two, for having achieved an enviable blend of public scholarship as research and teaching. These two participants had established regular, long-term community partnerships around which they organized series of undergraduate courses, advised student theses. All three had published articles and essays on their conceptualizations of public scholarship, how they viewed public scholarship as an important instructional tool for teaching for civic capacity and engagement. All three had also won various teaching awards and other honors for their efforts.

**Summary**

During interviews, participants identified a variety of activities, interactions, and artifacts associated with the PSA community that contributed to their thinking about teaching and how to develop student civic capacity and engagement. Opportunities for interaction and learning were available through a series of PSA-sponsored activities and initiatives, including: Constitution Day, luncheons, and previous seminars and conferences. The PSA’s speaker and seminar series provided space for reflection and thought amid their otherwise hectic lives, focusing participants’ attention on their practice of public scholarship in their classrooms and communities. Through these activities, newcomers to the community learned the language and practices of the group.
A sociocultural analysis of PSA participants’ learning about public scholarship and civic engagement revealed the role of interactions with peers and ideas in the situated learning of study participants. These interactions were mediated by participants’ personal and professional characteristics and by various artifacts of the PSA community. Like other theories of learning, sociocultural perspectives view learning as an ongoing and lifelong process. For example, in the context of this study, a sociocultural perspective suggests that faculty members continue to learn about their disciplines after their graduate training is completed, honing their understandings of their fields as well as their educational philosophies and litany of instructional approaches, as they practice their craft. As they participate in various professional communities (national, institutional, departmental, etcetera), faculty members continue to reflect on, rethink, and refine their thinking and professional practices through interactions with others and their ideas. In the next chapter, I demonstrate how participants’ learning in the PSA community of practice consistently manifested itself in participants’ teaching practices, in their choices and statements of course goals, selection and presentation of content, and in their choice of instructional methods.
CHAPTER 6:
ALIGNING CURRICULAR FORM AND BELIEFS ABOUT CIVIC PURPOSES

In this chapter, I present findings related to the second research question of this study – How do faculty members, if at all, align their undergraduate teaching with their implicit and/or explicit ideas about civic engagement as an educational purpose? My analysis suggests that participants aimed to align their course planning and teaching with the civic-educational purposes to which they ascribed. Moreover, they did so both in light of their continued learning and reflection and, in the words of one participant, a number of “enabling settings,” and in spite of many pragmatic and other contextual factors. Participants sought to align their teaching with their personal beliefs about the role(s) higher education should play in preparing undergraduates to lead lives as informed and engaged citizens. These beliefs tended to focus on expanding students’ civic capacities – the knowledge and skills necessary to informed participation in democratic society – and on actively engaging students in communities so as to practice these skills and gain experience in applying their knowledge to real-world problems.

Participants’ specific beliefs about purpose varied in explicitness and emphasis, often corresponding to their level and period of engagement in the Public Scholarship Associates (PSA) community of practice (see Chapter 5) and their perceptions of the status of civic education in their academic fields. Similarly, participants’ decisions about course form (see shaded “form” box in Figure 7) tended to also be influenced by the learning they experienced through their involvement in the PSA as well as their views of their discipline. Striving to embody their ideas about civic educational purpose in their undergraduate teaching, participants made and modified decisions about their courses – including desired learning outcomes or course goals, course content, pedagogy and instructional methods, and course sequence. Participants also considered alternate venues and means for teaching for civic purposes (e.g., in advising undergraduate theses or engaging students in faculty-lead public-scholarship and/or research projects), decisions about
partnering with community and non-profit agencies, and incorporating sometimes extensive course travel.

Figure 8: Conceptual Framework

In this chapter I first examine the “enabling setting” of the PSA and participants’ perceptions of the larger institutional context in which they and their course decisions were situated. I then describe how participants translated their beliefs about the civic purposes of higher education into specific course goals, content, and instructional approaches. I weave into this description a discussion of how participants’ perceptions of various aspects of the local (institutional) context (shaded “context” box in Figure 8) enabled and/or constrained their efforts. Finally, I describe the forms that participants’ teaching for civic capacity and engagement took according to their interview narratives (as well as documents including course syllabi). Overall, participants indicated that they perceived three general ways of enacting their beliefs about civic educational purposes in their courses: 1) focusing, on course content related to
democratic citizenship and civic capacity; 2) focusing on engaging pedagogies (e.g., service-learning) as a means of conveying disciplinary concepts and/or actively involving students in their communities; or 3) both.

**Contextual Influences**

In keeping with the contextual filters model, participants indicated that a variety of contextual factors influenced their course decisions. Participants’ content influences, especially their beliefs about civic educational purposes and the place of those purposes in their academic fields), did indeed appear to be “filtered” or mediated by elements of the local contexts in which they teach. These contextual factors – such as students’ characteristics, program and college goals, and a variety of pragmatic factors including course size – were perceived as either enabling or constraining desires to teach for civic capacity and engagement. Faculty participants reported that some contextual influences (e.g., supportive colleagues, available resources, small class sizes) generally facilitated their efforts to teach for civic capacity and engagement. Others, such as a lack of resources, lack of credit toward tenure, and time constraints, reportedly interfered with participants’ ability to make course decisions with such civic learning goals in mind. Some participants, however, indicated that they teach for civic capacity and engagement despite such constraints.

Notably, though in varying numbers, participants identified all of the original nine contextual factors posited by the contextual filters model (student characteristics; student goals; program and college goals; pragmatic factors, external influences; literature on teaching and learning; advice available on campus; facilities opportunities and assistance; and other influences; see Figure 8) as influences on their teaching for civic capacity and engagement. They also
identified additional influences, including research expectations, promotion and tenure policies,\textsuperscript{25} and course level and type. In the following sections, I discuss the influence of the institutional context of the public land-grant and research institution in which the PSA developed and in which it and this study’s participants were situated. Discussions of the remaining contextual influences arise in the subsequent analysis of participants’ decisions about course form with regard to their beliefs about civic purposes.

\textit{Institutional Context}

Participants in this study perceived the large, public land-grant and research university at which they worked as a multi-layered, multifaceted, albeit indirect, influence on their course planning for civic capacity and engagement. While institutional characteristics like mission and goals were notably absent from this study’s guiding framework,\textsuperscript{26} participants in this study suggested that their teaching was influenced not only by program and college level goals, but also by various institution-level factors. These institution-level influences tended to manifest themselves in promotion and tenure policies and practices and in decisions about resource allocation. Participants described institution-level influences as contradictory. For example, the institution’s mission statement contains references to its status as a “public research university,” and “land-grant university” (Mission, n.d.). In describing its “public character,” the institution presents itself as working to “promote the general welfare of the citizenry” (Public Character,

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{25} Promotion and tenure expectations were included in the Course Planning Exploration survey that guided the Stark et al.’s (1990) national Planning Introductory College Courses study; however, only 9 percent of the 2,311 survey respondents identified it as a salient contextual influence on their course decisions. The study sample did not include faculty from research universities, who, it was assumed, would be more likely to note the influence of tenure and promotion policies because research is typically weighted more heavily than teaching in promotion and tenure decisions.

\textsuperscript{26} Stark et al. (1990) noted that “the frame labeled ‘other influences’ can include institutional characteristics or other potentially local considerations” (p. 134). Institutional characteristics did not merit their own category or “frame” as survey respondents had not rated them as important influences on their course planning. Stark and her colleagues also acknowledged, however, that influences such as “institutional size may affect planning in distinct ways about which the faculty member is not conscious” (p. 135).
\end{footnotesize}
Institutional mission is inexorably linked with institutional type (Morphew & Hartley, 2006); this institution’s identities as a research university and as a land-grant institution were viewed by many participants as fostering competing sets of priorities. On the one hand, the institution’s status as a research university was perceived by participants as potentially subjugating undergraduate education to research and graduate education. On the other hand, the democratic roots of the land-grant institution were perceived as elevating civic engagement and public scholarship to important, mission-centric endeavors.

**Public and Land-grant Missions**

Given that the institution in this study is a public land-grant university that at least rhetorically supports and encourages teaching for civic and community engagement (Morphew & Hartley, 2006; and as evidenced by the civic and community engagement minor), it is not surprising that many faculty participants cited institutional mission and/or central administrative support as an enabling contextual factor. Institutional mission and leadership were not explicitly included in the original CFM model; the PICC study findings from which the model was derived found that faculty members were more apt to cite the more local influences of program or college as influences on their course planning. Consistent with the findings of Stark et al. (1990), however, institutional mission and central administrative initiatives and support were frequently portrayed by participants in this study as influencing other sets of contextual influences including college and program leadership and goals, available resources, and promotion and tenure policies.

Six participants explicitly noted that the public land-grant mission enabled or legitimized their public scholarship efforts – including their teaching for civic capacity and engagement. In the words of one of these participants, “at the broadest [level], at the university-wide scale, it seems that...community engagement [has] a certain place.” Another argued:
When you talk about context...the University itself … is very interested in promoting [public scholarship], as you well know from all their press releases, the egalitarian and inclusive diversity aspects of this university. As long as that remains part of their mission statement, then that's a platform from which we can stand and bark to whoever will listen.

They believed that the institution was interested, at the very least, in the positive public relations to be gained through students’ course-based community engagement efforts, but regarded civic goals as only one small “part” of the institution’s mission. The institutional recognition and reward – in the form of teaching awards, an invitation to speak at commencement, press releases, and articles in campus publications – awarded to three of the old-time PSA participants for their public scholarship teaching efforts is evidence that, at least on some level, the institution valued such faculty work. Other participants were also recognized by the institution for the teaching honors awarded them by disciplinary and other national organizations. Most acknowledged that the institution’s public and land-grant missions are regarded as only marginally relevant in their colleges, departments, and programs, if at all. For example, a tenured humanities faculty member with department head experience responded with a succinct, “no” when asked if she had ever “had any conversations, meetings, what have you, where they've talked about the public mission of our university, or even thinking about what kind of strategic goals the college, for instance, might be trying to set?”

Most participants argued that the institution’s identity and mission should enable their civic engagement work. These participants tended to perceive the institution as committed in word but not deed to civic education and outreach goals. One of the participants who perceived a disconnect between the rhetoric and reality of institutional support for civic engagement and public scholarship, commented:

I'm not optimistic, or I'm concerned I guess that – just to put my values out there, I believe in the importance of higher education's role, public work, public role, whether it's a land-grant [institution] or not – I'm concerned that despite the work
that we've done, many people have done, and the expressed commitment that we have at [this institution]...that the legitimacy, the credibility, the commitment is not there, doesn't match with the rhetoric.

This same participant also raised a critical question during our second interview. He wanted to know, at least hypothetically, “are we really, institutionally, thinking about it strategically?” Responding to his own query, he offered,

I don't think we are; there's a question in my mind...as to why we aren't doing that. And you can think cynically and say, 'well, we've got rhetoric, but we don't have reality. Or you could think less cynically about that and say we're evolving the institutional processes and procedures and commitments, to link our rhetoric more with the reality.

This tenured social scientist’s comments reflect the perceptions held by many of the participants in this study; most remained optimistic that change could happen – that the university was beginning to or would come to embrace their public scholarship work. Some of these participants mentioned the institution’s public land-grant mission as a rationale in support of their civic engagement/public scholarship work – for example, when requesting funding for course travel. They believed that the rhetorical support inherent in mission could be used to create a new reality.

Regardless of how they perceived the institution as embodying or embracing it's civic mission, all participants indicated that they perceived the institution’s status as a research university as being more influential. In the words of one participant, “If the university’s focus is research, outreach and engagement, therefore, is not really a part of that mission in a direct way.” They viewed the research mission as “the greater among equals” when it comes to institutional mission and its embodiment in policies and procedures

**The Research University Mission**

Given that this study was conducted at a research institution, it came as no surprise that participants were unable to talk about their teaching practices without also talking about their research; these two facets of faculty work were intertwined in many ways. Almost all the study
participants spoke of a seemingly inherent tension between research and teaching. Some discussed it as a matter of teaching versus research – an institutional and individual battle for precedence in which research almost always triumphed – while others spoke about their search for ways to fuse the two – by performing research on teaching, by “double-loading” or conducting research while teaching a course at a specific site, and by incorporating their own research into their courses or teaching about their research. Faculty commentary about the influence of research expectations on teaching for civic capacity and engagement tended to be closely tied to discussion of promotion and tenure (P&T) practices and policies and to their own civic-engagement-oriented research and public scholarship. Participants, particularly those who were tenure-track, often expressed a concern that their teaching for civic capacity and engagement might be viewed by P&T committees as having distracted them from their research responsibilities. They reported searching for strategies that tied their research and teaching more closely together. This sometimes benefitted their students' learning, but was primarily driven by a need to make the best use of limited time and energy.

Participants’ course decisions reflected the perceived importance of research. For example, many participants, particularly those pre-tenure, elected not to engage their students in time-consuming service-learning or other community-engaged instruction because they felt that they were expected to spend more time on their research, writing, and publication efforts – even if privileging these came at the expense of teaching undergraduates to be civically-engaged practitioners. While many participants indicated that they would enjoy being able to teach their undergraduate students about some of the cutting edge research and public scholarship in which they were actively engaged in, many commented that they do not teach about topics they have researched as often or as much as they would like. This sometimes occurred because faculty members were assigned to teach introductory courses for which their research was too advanced.
In other cases their research was too specialized for inclusion in a course. One tenure-track participant indicated that while she sometimes mentions her research, offering students “opportunities” to become involved in her projects outside of class. She sometimes dedicates one lecture in her large introductory course to a topic at the heart of her research, and does “teach, kind of, the bigger themes of [her] research.” Still, she lamented “not seeing such connectivity” as often as she would like.

The “publish or perish” pressures of the tenure track emerged as another salient influence on faculty teaching for civic capacity and engagement. Despite institution-wide changes to the tenure and promotion guidelines that give greater recognition to the scholarship of teaching and learning as well as the scholarship of service, participants perceived teaching via public scholarship or even public scholarship research as potentially. Participants, particularly those pre-tenure, felt they were “under a lot of pressure to publish, publish, publish.” Tenured participants noted it could be detrimental to expend too much time or energy on creating community-engagement learning opportunities for their students. The inference being that the pressures to publish often meant that faculty members felt they could not afford to put more than minimal energies into the planning and execution of the courses they were responsible for teaching. For example, a tenure-track participant in a professional field reflected:

I don’t think I’ve been really intentional about teaching for [civic capacity and engagement], like I’ve been kind of on autopilot as I’ve been working on [developing] this [new] major. And I’m hoping, I’m looking forward to, hopefully, the tenure process moving forward [and] that this new major will kind of be launching when I can start putting more time into my teaching and not having that penalize me as I develop these courses. And so, I can think more creatively about what are the resources out there that I can tap into in the community, organizations, and service-learning options and those kind of things.

Her comments suggest that once she attains tenure, she’ll be able to spend more time on creating course-based community engagement learning opportunities for her students.
participants similarly indicated that they anticipated increasing their efforts to teach for civic engagement and to fuse their research and teaching efforts. For example, one admitted to being “new to public scholarship,” calling it “an area where I am still working on the definition myself and where it fits into my tenure track role...because, obviously, there is more operating on my level in relationship to my needs and to the academic and scholarly community.” He also spoke of members of the PSA group encouraging and “pushing” him to “get more involved” in the PSA community, which at times may conflict with his desire to consider “what do I need to do for my own job.” This participant, like many other tenure-track participants, felt he needed to spend his time doing more research, writing, and publishing in order to earn tenure. Tenured participants acknowledged that younger or pre-tenure faculty members to be “more open” to the idea of teaching through civic engagement:

perhaps young faculty who are bringing enthusiasm with a willingness to try new things along with perhaps more or less naïveté about what the consequences of those investments of time might be, might be more willing to do those sorts of things.

Tenured participants believed, however, that “selection or survival in academia rewards those who make their most effective investments in things that preserve and advance their career, which in this context is really advancing research.” One such tenured participant recalled “examples of junior faculty who I’ve known, and perhaps even in my own profile, having been a victim of misplaced priorities in that regard.” He summarized his thoughts on the influence of tenure and promotion policies on teaching for civic capacity and engagement by stating that, “that sort of service or some other educational enhancement activity is a good thing in and of itself...but it’s not the sort of thing that is recognized and rewarded.” All participants concurred, arguing that research productivity and publications are what the institution most recognizes and rewards.

Participants held varying perceptions of the degree to which their colleges, departments, and programs supported the institution’s public and land-grant missions. A few seemed to
embrace faculty members’ public scholarship research and teaching efforts; others did not. Some participants perceived their academic units as slowly becoming more accepting of such faculty work. To a person, however, tenured participants indicated that they would not recommend that junior colleagues spend their time teaching through civically-engaging pedagogies. One such participant, who indicated that he started teaching public scholarship when he already had tenure, informed me that “my dean didn’t support that, my [department] chair didn’t support that and I said, ‘to hell with it anyway.’” Today, he “wouldn’t expect a non-tenured professor to take that risk.” He identified a measure of institutional change over the course of the last decade: “[a]nd here, 10 years later the Dean tells me to do the commencement address on public scholarship whereas five years ago the Dean said, ‘Public scholarship? What is that?’” Despite such change, however, participants indicated that teaching awards are sometimes “called the kiss of death” and that pre-tenure colleagues would be wise to spend the bulk of their time concentrating on their research agendas.

A small number of participants, including two old-timers (both tenured) and a full professor fairly involved in the PSA group indicated that they did not believe that their teaching for civic purposes was constrained in any way. They each commented, in answer to my questions about constraints, “I don’t find myself constrained,” “I don’t perceive barriers,” and “I don’t feel like I have been constrained in any way with respect to how I teach or what I teach or what I bring to the classroom.” Yet despite not feeling limitations, they were able to identify influences which might prevent others from making similar teaching decisions. One readily identified constraints – including students’ ill-preparedness and institutional reward structures – but suggested that he was willing to teach for civic purposes despite any potential risks. All three also indicated that they understood how their colleagues, especially those who were pre-tenure, might
feel that their course decisions involving teaching for public scholarship were contextually constrained. One said,

> It’s pretty obvious to me that the institution constrains a lot of other people, first of all from even ever thinking about teaching this way, secondly from feeling that they could do it, and third from rewarding them for doing it.

This comment suggests that the commitment to teaching for civic purposes may be rare, at least among research university faculty. Moreover, this participant believed that efforts to teach for civic purposes go unrecognized in the promotion and tenure system. Another indicated that while he personally had “never had colleagues in this department, I’ve never had deans, department heads, and I’ve never had university policy constrain” his teaching, if he puts his “institutional hat on” and considers his extensive administrative experience, he recognizes that there are “signals that are constraints for faculty. There’s no question about that.” He too, like the previous participant and many others of his colleagues who participated in this study, suggested that various contextual factors including promotion and tenure criteria, can act as constraining influences on faculty seeking to teach for civic purposes.

Part of this evolution of institutional response and support was manifested in the creation of the PSA community of practice. Recognizing a “tension between what we imagine the role of the land-grant/extension/outreach university to be and [this institution’s] role as a Research I University,” participants and fellow PSA members were working to achieve a balance of mission – and believed that fostering public scholarship was a good means with which to achieve such an ambitious goal.

**Public Scholarship Associates: Learning to Practice**

Participants’ narratives suggested that they valued their participation in the PSA community of practice and the support provided by the Laboratory for Public Scholarship and
Democracy. They perceived the PSA as an enabling setting; in the words of one participant, “it provides [us] a space, a space and a legitimacy.” Participants felt that the group’s existence and its support from the University’s central administration recognized and supported faulty members’ efforts to teach for civic purposes. Participants’ teaching for civic capacity and engagement appears to have been positively influenced by involvement with the PSA; they tended to report thinking more often and in more explicit detail about civic purposes of higher education and how to translate these into practice (as indicated by the dotted arrow in Figure 8). The influence of the PSA, however, depended heavily upon participants’ levels of engagement in the PSA group and their status as a new-comer or old-timer.

Those PSA participants who had been legitimately, if peripherally, participating in the group for some time but who were not yet old-timers, reported learning the most from their participation. They also indicated most often that their PSA participation (and subsequent learning) actively influenced their decisions about course form. For example, some were actively creating courses (or even new programs of study) or retooling courses that would count toward the civic and community engagement minor. In contrast, old timers had already learned a great deal and were actively practicing teaching for civic capacity and engagement. Their participation tended to influence their teaching practice by helping them “tweak” existing courses.

PSA-inspired thinking also appears to have inspired newer members to make more subtle changes to existing courses. In particular, readings and discussion in the “A Capacity for Democracy” seminars was reported to prompt participants to consider ways of further incorporating teaching for civic capacity and engagement into existing courses. For example, one

---

27 I use the term Public Scholarship Associates (PSA) to refer to both the PSA – the group of faculty, students, and administrators dedicated to fostering student civic capacity and engagement – and its organizational umbrella, the Laboratory for Public Scholarship and Democracy. This is, in part, for simplicity’s sake, but also because the PSA and many of the LPSD’s offerings pre-date the LPSD.
less experienced PSA member described his decision to more explicitly tie course assignments to the civic course goals he intended for students to achieve in light of the seminar having "reinvigorated my thinking." Another mid-range PSA member summarized his experiences as a public scholarship associate in the following way:

a big part of it [the PSA] for me was learning to be a teacher and having a reflective view of what I was doing and sort of then emphasizing to me that the public work emphasis was really important. I didn't get into teaching students just so they could be better architects, but so they could be better public architects or designers or whatever, because I wanted to send that group of students off and say it is possible out there and go be great in that way.

He, like other participants, indicated that engagement in the PSA lead him to develop his general teaching skills, but also that it focused time and attention on course planning and specifically on the civic learning outcomes he wanted students to achieve.

The PSA sponsored a number of initiatives to encourage members' educational efforts; these efforts overlapped with many of the sets of contextual influences included in the contextual filters model. The dotted lines surrounding each of the 10 sets of contextual factors in the conceptual framework were added to emphasize the overlapping and mutually influential aspects of these contexts (see Figure 8). According to respondents the PSA provided various "opportunities" (e.g., Constitution Day) and "assistance" (e.g., course development grants), acted as programmatic home for the civic and community engagement minor course of study, and served as a source of collegial "advice" as well as a point of access to the "literature on teaching and learning" (e.g., faculty seminars).

While most study participants acknowledged that their participation and learning related to the PSA influenced their thinking about teaching for civic capacity and engagement and their decisions about course form, they all indicated that their efforts to do so were also influenced – positively and negatively – by other contexts perceived as beyond their immediate control.
analysis of the influence of these contexts – identified in the CFM – is interwoven in the following discussion of faculty decisions about course form as they planned their teaching for civic capacity and engagement.

Decisions about Course Form: What Participants’ Teaching for Civic Capacity and Engagement Looks Like

Participants indicated that their beliefs about educational purpose, their views of their disciplines and fields, and their educational philosophies affected the way they designed and delivered more than 30 civic engagement-oriented courses. Those participants who articulated more explicit beliefs about civic engagement as an educational purpose were more apt to describe specific, concrete, and explicit ways in which they included civic capacity and engagement learning goals in their courses. They were also more likely to make these course goals explicit to students and to overtly and repeatedly connect course materials to these goals. Participants’ intentions to teach for civic capacity and engagement, however, were mediated by a variety of contextual influences. Participants’ efforts to incorporate civically-engaging instructional methods, including service-learning and public scholarship, were particularly subject to contextual influences. One set of contextual influences – pragmatic factors (e.g., class size, academic calendar) – emerged as the most salient influences on participants’ course planning for civic purposes. Within this category, course level (e.g., introductory vs. advanced) and course type (e.g., first-year seminar vs. lecture course vs. laboratory or studio course) repeatedly surfaced in interviews, suggesting a new facet of pragmatic influences.28

28 Recall that in Stark et al.’s (1990) Planning Introductory College Courses study, only faculty members teaching introductory classes in 12 disciplines were surveyed. PICC respondents, however, reported that they believed they would answer questions about their course planning and decision-making differently if they were asked about advanced-level courses rather than introductory ones.
In their courses, participants tended to focus on teaching for civic capacity rather than civic engagement. The distinction is that civic capacity focuses on course elements that allow students to consider and explicate various democratic principles and responsibilities; civic engagement, in contrast, actively engages students to in the public sphere. Specifically, three participants reported never incorporating active community engagement initiatives in their courses, five consistently incorporated service-learning or public scholarship components, and the remaining six participants focused more heavily on civic capacity and either included active engagement in their courses very rarely or did so only in an isolated courses not representative of their overall course load. This is not to say that participants felt that civic engagement was an unworthy venture, but given various contextual influences they viewed as constraints (e.g., time, class size, reward structure), most focused their efforts on teaching civic knowledge and ideas, believing students could translate or channel these capacities into community engagement on their own. More than half of the six participants who sometimes included civic engagement activities in their courses expressed regret that they felt unable to create more opportunities for their students to be actively involved in communities. Those four participants who regularly included a civic engagement component in their courses were tenured, had participated in the PSA longer, and/or were in an academic field which commonly emphasized real-world applications of learning.

While participants indicated that they made decisions regarding course goals, content, instruction, and sequence when planning to teach for civic purposes in their undergraduate courses, they reported spending the most time considering content and instruction. When seeking to incorporate civic learning goals into their courses, three participants focused their planning on decisions regarding what content to cover, three others focused on instructional methods designed to foster civic engagement, and the eight remaining participants indicated that they focused their planning on both of these aspects of course form. Interestingly, participants’ civic
course goals tended to be remarkably similar regardless of whether they incorporated civic pedagogies—nearly all participants identified goals related to civic capacity and civic engagement. Decisions regarding course sequence tended to have less to do with participants’ civic goals and more with the overall disciplinary intended content and learning outcomes.

**Course Goals**

During interviews, virtually all participants were able to identify and describe specific course goals (intended student learning outcomes) related to civic capacity and engagement. Participants’ course goals could be categorized as designed either to enhance students’ civic capacity or to provide opportunities for them to practice civically engaging behaviors and skills, or both (see Table 3). These goals usually paralleled participants’ espoused civic educational purposes, but were often not primary course goals. The specificity of civic course goals and the extent to which they were explicitly communicated to students distinguished participants. In general, participants who were more experienced members of the PSA community of practice tended to have more specific goals and to more explicitly address desired civic learning outcomes in their course syllabi and conversations with students than less experienced participants.

Participants’ civic capacity-focused goals focused on specific disciplinary knowledge sets (e.g., of democratic processes, history), attitudes (e.g., fostering cultural understanding and an appreciation of human diversity), and skills (e.g., analysis, decision-making, problem-solving) they believed important to informed civic engagement. Participants also held civic engagement-specific course goals; they wanted students to practice certain skills and behaviors while applying them to real-world situations and to engage in specific behaviors like attending community meetings, volunteering with non-profits or other community or governmental agencies, and voting. Yet many of their civic engagement course goals were not incorporated into course content or
pedagogy – that is, participants hoped that students would use course content related to civic capacity to benefit society through civic engagement after the course was completed.

Table 3: Participants’ Course Goals for Civic Capacity and Civic Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Goals</th>
<th>Civic Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civic Capacity</strong></td>
<td><strong>Behaviors:</strong> “apply,” “attend,” “develop projects which serve as devices for democratic engagement,” “engage,” “helping,” “influence,” “volunteer,” “observe,” “participate,” “practice,” “praxis,” “vote,”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary concepts and knowledge sets: history, government, democracy, “scientific literacy”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes: appreciation of diversity, cultural understanding, “a sense of public work”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills: analysis, application, oral and written communication, decision-making, deliberation, leadership, problem-solving, synthesis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The civic capacity and engagement course goals of faculty members were often directly related to the content influences noted in the contextual filters model: faculty members’ philosophies of education, their beliefs about the purpose of education, and their educational and community-related backgrounds (e.g., past employment, personal affiliations with non-profit organizations, individual volunteer work). The specific course goals cited by participants typically reflected the civic purposes participants discussed in the first interview. For example, a scientist expressed concerned about the scientific literacy of her non-major students – she wanted them to be able to understand and analyze public and policy issues and debates concerning science and considered these skills to be important aspects of citizenship. One of her specific course goals was that students be able “to read the newspaper critically.” An accompanying assignment, then, was for students to take advantage of the free local and national papers available on campus and to be able to discuss and analyze in writing some of the scientific issues covered in the press. She hoped
they would develop this civic capacity and be able to apply it in their lives outside of the classroom.

Civic engagement goals focused on disciplinary content application and problem-solving. Participants who actively engaged students in communities included civic engagement goals that required students to put their knowledge and attitudes to the test in real-world situations while practicing disciplinary and civic skills in ways that benefited society. Students were expected, for example, to “learn how to apply new and emerging sustainable building technologies to solve housing problems” while “help[ing] make a difference in some of the most disadvantaged communities in the U.S.” Participants also indicated they were often “more interested in praxis, in the actual doing” and practice of what they were teaching rather than students retaining specific content like names and dates. They were interested in honing students’ abilities to use the information they were learning and the critical thinking and analysis skills they were acquiring: “The goal of this course is to help students develop the vocabulary and skills to become productive contributors to sustainable building project teams.” In another course that considered the roles of individuals, businesses, and society in the economic system, students were told that “an important aspect of this course is illustrating theory through real-world examples, and demonstrating how theory enhances our understanding of real-world events.” Other students were expected to consider “democracy as a mechanism for public decision-making” and then to “develop projects which serve as devices for democratic engagement.” These students were engaged in an active learning project which created tools for other students to consider and practice free speech and to ponder aspects of public debate regarding the death penalty.

Participants’ narratives suggested that civic capacity and engagement goals were not always separable. Learning about the concepts, skills, and behaviors and practicing the application of these to real-world situations often go hand-in-hand. Participants articulated course goals focused
on getting students to “learn and practice theories and habits of civic and community engagement through readings, discussion, deliberation, and individual as well as collaborative action” or “learn[ing] about the range of ways that citizens do, can, and might participate in democratic decision-making and will observe and practice these forms in several communication mediums.” Both of these learning goals focus on civic theories and practices.

Communicating Course Goals

Course goals were not always explicitly stated, as evidenced by a review of participants’ interview transcripts and a document analysis of their course syllabi. Some participants viewed certain stated course goals – like examining the “emergence of democracy at Athens” (fall 2007 syllabus) – as related to knowledge or skill sets necessary for informed democratic engagement but neglected to explain to students how achieving such goals might contribute to their participation in democratic society. It appears, however, that increased participation within the PSA groups often corresponded with civic course goals becoming more explicit and more central to a course. Only a few participants explicitly described civic course goals in their syllabi. Others reported verbally articulating specific civic course goals to their students, included implicit statements of civic course goals in their syllabi, or had civic course goals in mind for students but did not communicate them directly to students.

A few faculty members reported communicating civic course goals explicitly and repeatedly throughout a course – in course syllabi, during class time, in descriptions of assignments. These participants tended to be PSA old-timers or faculty members with extensive pedagogical training. An old-timer, for instance, reported that she not only includes learning goals, but explicitly connects course topics and assignments to these course goals. Her claims were born out in her course syllabi, which clearly articulated civic capacity and engagement-focused course goals and course assignments. Another participant, a tenure-track faculty member and relative
PSA new-comer who had an educational and professional background in education theory and practice, reported the following course goals during an interview:

My goal for you leaving this class is that you'll understand just how much policy and politics influence your practice every day, but also learn what are the ways that you, as a teacher, can influence the policy system and have a voice in the process.

She hoped to teach her students about educational policy theory and the practices of policy-making and influencing policy (civic capacity), but she also hoped to inculcate in students a sense of political agency; she wanted them to feel informed and capable of making positive change in society through the political arena (engagement). While this participant clearly held civic engagement-focused goals for her students – and likely communicated these verbally to her students – the course goals listed in her syllabi were focused entirely on students acquiring knowledge specific to her academic field; the connections to civic capacity and engagement remained implicit.

In addition to delineating course goals in syllabi, participants attempted to convey their civic course goals during the first, and sometimes subsequent, classes. In the words of one tenured faculty member, in “the opening class I give them a background on what I'm trying to do in the course, why it's designed the way it is, and how it fits into questions of education and citizenship.” Some participants also shared with me that they try to convey how assignments connect to these course goals. Some participants use grading rubrics in which the various components of an assignment on which a student is to be assessed are clearly spelled out; many of these descriptions tie into course goals. Others either verbally in class or in writing within the course syllabi or separate written assignment instructions related how the assignment ties to one or more course goals.

Most participants indicated during interviews that they were interested in “capacity building” – in getting students to focus on the larger picture, on understanding guiding principles
and the application of course concepts and skills to real-world situations and problems. Participants indicated, for example, that they were “not particularly interested in specific facts...but more interested in philosophy, conceptual frameworks, fundamental principles, and concepts.” So while participants reviewed, for example, specific dates and mathematical proofs of equations being presented in class, they did not necessarily expect students to retain such information, but rather to understand overarching historical themes so as to apply lessons learned to current crises and to be able to comprehend and apply important concepts covered in a course to real-life situations. A tenured scientist indicated her hope that students would “gain the necessary understanding to think critically about global change issues when you hear media reports, purchase your car, home and other items, and cast your ballot in the voting booth.” Course goals related to enhancing students’ civic capacity focused on students being exposed to (and hopefully learning) information about topics including:

- the historical and contemporary mission of land grant universities, the role of students and other citizens in sustaining and transforming their polities and communities, and the relationship among media, culture and politics as they affect civic and community engagement.

Students in one course were expected to develop “a sense of ‘public work,’ an appreciation for the power and responsibility of design in shaping our world.” In the course of engaging in a semester-long design project, these students were also expected to begin to develop “the ability to think critically in the design process, using [their] perceptual, analytical, synthetic, and conceptual thinking skills.”

Participants who were PSA old-timers reported explicitly communicating to students (verbally and in writing) that they hoped students would leave their courses with knowledge and skills that they could and would use to help make the world a better place by remaining or becoming more engaged in their communities. Two relative newcomers to the PSA, but who
viewed their academic fields and course topics as closely linked to civic purposes and who were also involved with disciplinary associations that valued public scholarship, also made their civic course goals explicit to students. For example, one of the old-timers listed the following course “objective” in a syllabus:

   This course will provide you with the concepts, vocabularies, and faculties you need to engage with contemporary public controversies so that you might – whatever your major or particular area of academic expertise – intervene in such controversies for the benefit of the public good.

Another of the old-timers was similarly interested in his students gaining the information and abilities necessary to affect societal change. In keeping with his belief that teaching for “global citizenship” is an important educational purpose, he intended that his students have course experiences necessary to be “reflective, informed, and involved” citizens.

Old-timers were more likely to use the term public scholarship when describing course goals to students. For example, an old-timer indicated in her syllabus that students in one course “will learn about models of and opportunities for engaging in public scholarship”: she noted, “Every class I teach including my graduate seminars involve the theory of and practice of public scholarship.” All three old-timers spoke to me about describing the research and design projects they engaged students in as examples of public scholarship. No newcomers reported using the term public scholarship when describing course goals or activities to undergraduate students.

Many of the newest members did not even use the term civic engagement when communicating course goals and content to students. Instead they articulated specific knowledge and skills goals that they viewed as contributing to civic capacity and/or engagement. In conversations with me, however, new-comers indicated that the connection of their course goals to civic capacity and engagement might not always be apparent to students. One newcomer, for
example, indicated, “I don’t structure a class with civic engagement goals specifically in mind.” Instead, as a historian, he organizes his course around an historical “period or subject.” He offered as an example having taught a course on Alexander the Great: “there’s a subject that is, well, one can go many directions, but it kind of defines its material, or sets its parameters pretty clearly.” Rhetorically, he questioned (and answered):

So how, for instance, does a subject like Alexander the Great relate to civic engagement? Well, it's certainly not primarily a case study in civic engagement, when you're talking about a conquering monarch, on the other hand, practically any case study in leadership and motivating a community involves questions that are relevant to citizenship and leadership in a democratic state.

He explained that “one of the implicit questions I hope to encourage people to think about- and sometimes explicitly encourage people to think about- is what is the role of leadership even in a democracy.” He called these civic engagement goals “secondary goals,” commenting, “they're not things that I plan into the course plan, but they’re things that I expect to illicit as I go along and I think pretty much do find opportunities to do so. This participant, like others, indicated that while he valued civic purposes of undergraduate education, he did not always feel that he had the time or means with which to focus on the implications of his course’s historical content for current societal conditions. Though he hoped that his students would learn to use history as a tool with which to analyze and understand modern times, he didn’t make this goal evident to his students and it was not a central focus of his course efforts. He did, however, report in our interviews that he tries to encourage students to develop a critical perspective – the ability to critique our understanding of the past and apply lessons learned to current problems, which I think is constructive not just for the purposes of writing an essay in history but it’s essential for facing situations in life and society or in community whatever is beyond and that is how to take the experience of the past or our understand of the experience of the past and use it to make judgments about values and goals in the present.
Yet even this espoused civic course goal was not evident in his syllabi; rather the only course goals explicitly listed in his syllabi focused solely on disciplinary knowledge acquisition. Overall, there was a lack of explicit connection of listed course goals to civic capacity and engagement aims evident in the goals, objectives, and learning outcomes described in participants’ course syllabi.

Many participants in this study failed to recognize how they incorporate civic engagement constructs in their courses – at least initially. One of the tenured scientists initially said, “I am extremely interested in public scholarship, but my courses show no effect of that as far as I know, except so far as my courses do talk about public implications of science, but that is kind of an incidental thing.” Later in the interview, however, he reconsidered saying, “well, so let me disagree with myself” and went on to describe “a very unusual course” that is a collaborative effort between himself and a faculty member from education that incorporates service-learning experiences for university science and education students aimed at improving the science curricula at a local elementary school. The undergraduates design hands-on learning activities for the elementary school students, providing teachers with the tools and techniques necessary to engage their students in the activities. This is an example of service-learning or public scholarship because the students, while engaging in their own learning processes, were also providing a scholarly service (training and educational tools) to a community (teachers at a local elementary school). Other participants indicated that while they believed that the content and/or pedagogy of their courses contributed to students’ civic capacity and engagement and certainly intended for their teaching to do so, they did not expressly communicate such goals to students. Such course goals remained implicit, relying on students to make the connections themselves.

**Course Content**

Participants’ course content tended to be focused on civic capacity rather than civic engagement. A few participants, however, used course readings, lectures, and discussions to teach
students about public engagement in their fields, about making meaningful societal change as
practitioners of a given field, or about activism more broadly. Participants who were intent on
teaching for civic engagement tended to focus on students’ abilities to analyze situations and apply
disciplinary concepts and theories. Still, they often relied upon case studies or other simulations
rather than engaging students in real-life problem solving in the community.

Course content in undergraduate courses in which faculty participants sought to foster
students’ civic capacity and engagement tended to focus on key concepts faculty perceived as
integral to informed participation in democratic society. These key concepts, which are not
necessarily linked to disciplinary content in the field, included cultural competency, ethical
practice, and leadership. Participants also focused on exploring various definitions and
understandings of concepts including citizenship, engagement, and democracy in their courses.

A faculty member in a professional field indicated that because his “teaching style…is
very much based upon experiential learning,” he is “not as interested in the actual content as [he
is] that they get good feedback on how they behaved and reacted and worked on the project.”
That is, he – along with many of his fellow participants – wanted students to acquire skills and
behaviors such as teamwork, reflection, analysis, and synthesis in action, and the ability to work
with and across cultural differences.

Participants highlighted how examining public problems and issues through disciplinary
lenses focuses attention on specific aspects and suggests certain solutions. They also asked and
explored questions related to the public good in their courses, including: what is engagement?
What does it mean to enter a community as an outsider? How to act in ethical, culturally
competent ways? They also asked students to consider the intended and unintended
consequences and implications of specific decisions and/or policies.
In the *Reflections* and *PICC* studies, Stark and her colleagues (1988, 1990) found that faculty members reported that selecting course content was most often their first decision when planning an introductory college course. Participants in this study similarly indicated that determining course content was most often at the forefront of their course planning. Sometimes, however, participants’ discussed content and the learning goals they had for students in ways which were difficult to parse. For example, many simply described the disciplinary content that would be covered during the course in their syllabi, rather than articulating specific learning goals – they seemed to assume that learning the content was the extent of the learning goals they needed to share with students. In a few instances, participants indicated that they perceived the goals of the course as largely pre-determined by their discipline, program, or college (e.g., for a first-year seminar: introduce students broadly to the professional field and to important resources on campus).

**Course Instruction**

With regard to teaching for civic purposes, decisions about instruction tended to mean, first and foremost, decisions about whether or not to include a community engagement or public scholarship experience in a course. This usually meant that at least some decisions about instruction occurred very early in a participant’s course planning process. Participants cited the need to make decisions regarding community sites, timing, travel, and funding, among other considerations. They also indicated that contextual factors often precluded them from choosing to incorporate civically-engaging pedagogies, like service-learning, from their courses. Though some participants, usually PSA newcomers, indicated that they were focused on civic capacity and did not consider creating engagement opportunities for students, many participants indicated that they settled on alternatives to teaching in community contexts. For example, participants included active and experiential learning components in their courses. They worked to create classroom
environments and climates which mimicked communities, took advantage of course management technologies and online tools including chat rooms and blogs and other websites.

**Community Engagement as Instructional Method**

Half of the participants in this study had incorporated service-learning into at least one course. Some of these participants and many others, engaged their students with active learning techniques in the classroom. This is in keeping with recent research indicating that more “civic minded” faculty are more likely to engage in student-centered teaching practices (Lindholm & Astin, 2008).

They did so by attempting to mimic the civil dialogue and debate that our democracy values in their classrooms, by arranging short field-trips to local sites to observe such debates, by bringing in outside speakers to class who could relate some of the real-world difficulties of doing the work students were studying, or by having students watch videos of civic engagement projects. So for example, one participant has her students attend local school board meetings to examine educational policy making first-hand. Many other participants used their own experiences or relied on their students to bring practical examples of the application of the content they were studying to class. Some required students to clip relevant campus, local, or national newspaper articles or to submit class discussion questions tying course content to current events. Such a course focus was sometimes even highlighted in course summaries in syllabi; for example, one participant indicated, “An important aspect of this course is illustrating theory through real-world examples, and demonstrating how theory enhances our understanding of real-world events.” While these approaches still took more time and energy on the part of the participant, they were more easily achievable given constraints like class size and the institution’s geographic location than creating on-going service-learning or other public scholarship opportunities for students.
A tenured humanities participant had this to say regarding contemplating making changes to lecture-based course designed to make the pedagogy more engaging by incorporating a series of debates in his course:

to do such a thing requires basically retooling a syllabus in major ways and making some sacrifices as to what you’re not going to [teach], given the fact that you’re going to make an investment in a project like this. And, well, major changes like that are not easy to contemplate and uncertainty about how it will all work probably operates against it. I would say that if people could see such things in action that I’m pretty sure that most [of my] colleagues would acknowledge that it is a good thing. Whether they would immediately embrace it themselves or not is another question.

His concerns about still “covering [all] the content” upon adjusting the course reflect perennial debates about the proper balance of teaching for breadth of knowledge versus depth of knowledge, as well as for knowing facts and figures as compared to understanding how processes work and being able to critically analyze ideas.

All of the PSA old-timers were actively engaging their students in semester-long projects or shorter-term course assignments or research projects which involved them in thinking about, doing, reflecting on, and communicating with people engaged in real problem-solving and debate. New-comers varied in how much they engaged their students in community settings; six had done so to some extent. The newcomers who had never taught using community engagement as an instructional approach tended to focus on teaching for civic capacity, yet some also admitted that the amount of time and energy such a “major change” in their course design would require was “not easy to contemplate.” They perceived such instructional approaches would require “sacrifices” in terms of the coverage of disciplinary content and admitted to being uncertain as to how well the approach would work.

Those participants who taught using civically engaging pedagogies actively involved their students in research, design, and public communications projects. Participants’ students interviewed community members, investigated and assessed policy and practice alternatives based
on their discipline and course topic, attended community meetings and forums, designed and built houses and other structures and art installations for various publics. They wrote letters to the editor of the campus and local papers, as well as to papers in their hometowns; they authored larger opinion-editorial pieces, created documentary films, and taught others what they themselves were learning by offering public presentations or workshops. Such efforts entailed a great deal of planning, requiring extensive time and energy of participants. Participants indicated that planning such instructional experiences for students required that they navigate a variety of contextual factors which they perceived as constraints and even barriers to their efforts.

In addition to the influence of disciplinary associations and accrediting bodies, some participants pointed to organizations focused on service-learning or other civic engagement-focused efforts. They identified organizations including the Urban Service-Learning Institute, Campus Compact, and the American Association of State College’s and University’s American Democracy Project as marginally influential. Participants who mentioned civic-engagement-oriented associations had attended sponsored meetings and seminars or presented their own public scholarship and civically engaged teaching efforts at association conferences.

Participants identified pragmatic factors as a considerable influence on their decisions about instruction with regard to teaching for civic engagement. The “practical stuff,” as one participant called it, included a variety of limited resources such as funding, time, and energy. Other salient pragmatic factors were class size, institutional geography, travel considerations, and available staff support, facilities, technology, and text books. Pragmatic factors were most often identified as constraining faculty members' abilities to teach for civic purposes and, in particular, for teaching with engaging pedagogies including service-learning and public scholarship. These influences, however, were often difficult to disentangle from one another. For example, the institution’s rural geography limits opportunities for local service-learning partnerships as the
sheer number of students could overwhelm the community's governmental and non-profit infrastructure. Yet traveling to nearby cities would require increased time and financial constraints. While some of the pragmatic factors discussed might be general influence on courses of all kinds, some pragmatic influences, such as travel and funding seem particularly relevant to decisions about teaching for civic engagement. As one participant aptly put it, what can be accomplished, “all boils down to money and how many students you can serve with the resources that you have.” Participants believed this kind of “practical stuff” could make or break their ability to carry out course plans involving civic engagement and public scholarship.

Concerns about time echoed throughout the interviews of this study. Participants labeled teaching for civic engagement as “very time consuming,” particularly if done well. They were especially careful to indicate the significant amount of time -- of extra work -- that crafting a new course or a new community-engagement component of an existing class took. As one participant noted, “these kinds of projects require extraordinary amounts of time.” Another commented, “[i]t's not like this stuff is impossible, you just have to be organized and the first time you do things it always takes a hundred times as much time.” Some participants were able to re-offer the same course over a number of semesters which, while requiring minor reworking, made the process less time-consuming. However, other participants taught courses, like design studios, first-year seminars, or capstone courses, in which the courses' theme consistently changes to reflect current events or other external influence, necessitating the repeated need to recreate new learning experiences for students. Either way, however, the act of engaging students with real issues and real communities is “risky” in that it is less predictable, less controllable than a typical, classroom-contained course; problems occur, community partners' needs change, and other unavoidable circumstances arise.
Participants spoke of their teaching for civic capacity and engagement as frequently requiring a good deal more work than teaching a typical course. In the words of a tenured participant, “I think the number one barrier [to teaching in this manner] is the extra work.” Others commented: “it's going to be a lot more work because I have to develop it,” “there is a lot of energy involved in creating it,” “it takes all [this] extra work,” “it is a lot of extra, unrecognized effort to create experiences like that for students,” and “it's just exhausting.” Teaching for civic capacity and engagement or engaging students in public scholarship left other faculty members “physically wiped out” and “drained by the end of the day.” This was especially true for faculty members as they embarked on designing a new course or updating an existing course to include experiential elements. Similarly, a number of participants spoke of the additional energies required when working to get their departments to embrace the civic and community engagement minor or when attempting to create a new set of courses, minor, or other series of learning experiences for undergraduates based on the premise of teaching for civic capacity and engagement.

Some participants recalled that they initially taught courses incorporating civic capacity and engagement as overloads – that is in addition to the course load required of them. One tenured participant indicated that he taught one public scholarship course “as a course overload” until “the university started recognizing it [and] they [the department] were forced to deal with it.” Others spoke of “burning out” or struggling “to keep up with it” because of the extra time and energy required when designing and teaching public scholarship courses involving service-learning or other community-based or experiential learning components. Participants indicated that embarking on teaching public scholarship can be “very risky” or even “crazy.” Risky, because “the extra work required to put on educational experiences like this took away from my publication record.” Other participants concurred, indicating that as long as “you're doing some of the so-called more standard things in the classroom...[and] you're a good teacher and have good SRTEs
[Student Rating of Teacher Effectiveness]...then you're fine” and any “extra time in terms of institutional awards is better spent on research” rather than implementing instructional techniques like service-learning.

In addition to taking more time, teaching for civic engagement was perceived by participants to be challenging because of the institution’s location. Several participants noted that it can be difficult to teach for civic purposes through service-learning at a large institution situated in a relatively small town in a rural region. Echoing the thoughts of other participants, one faculty member described the institution’s location as “in the middle of nowhere… equally far from everywhere.” A tenured faculty member who had incorporated service-learning experiences into his courses for some time argued that service-learning had to be done in small classes due to the university’s location in a small town. His comments alluded to the fact that the sheer number of students would overwhelm a non-profit organization or community agency. This participant found it easier to plan service-learning experiences at her previous institution, a smaller public research university situated near a major city. Her attempts to design a similar course experience for her current students “flopped,” at least in part because “it's harder to figure out where to do things” in the smaller town which lacked options.

Other participants made similar statements, suggesting that it was difficult to find appropriate community placements for large courses. At least four participants, including two old-timers engaging their students with the help of long-term community partnerships, had traveled with students over spring and summer breaks to other cities, states, and even countries in order to create meaningful disciplinary and civic learning opportunities for students. At least three additional participants had incorporated travel to more local venues and events in order to incorporate service-learning or civic engagement activities into their undergraduate courses.
Throughout the course of our interviews, participants indicated that location, geography, or vicinity of the institution are important considerations with regard to teaching (and researching) for civic capacity and engagement or to foster public scholarship. One tenured faculty member whose on-going public scholarship project is located in a city four hours away argued “it's very important that [faculty just beginning public scholarship projects] start doing that work in a place close to the university.” Unsurprisingly, his advice intersects with other pragmatic factors – time and energy – which frequently arose during interviews with participants. Locating his project, he explained, took “a huge time commitment and it's also [required extensive] resources.” He encourages his colleagues to find places that are closer to the university in order to “minimize the burdens.” Two of the three old-timers taught courses (and conducted their own research) within the context of long-term community partnerships. These participants indicated that their partnerships helped to ameliorate the amount of time and energy they spent on course planning; location was pre-determined and travel needs were known in advance which meant that funds could be sought and raised on a regular schedule.

Closely related to the pragmatic influence of the institution’s rural location on participants' teaching for civic capacity and engagement was the issue of travel (itself compounded by other pragmatic influences including money and time). The absence of research venues tended to preclude community-embedded learning for students, a problem for faculty who engaged in public scholarship and wanted to include students in their research projects. Faculty members also reported that relationships built over the course of a public scholarship research project sometimes lead to opportunities for service-learning or other experiential learning opportunities for students.

The shortage of appropriate local research and educational venues prompted some faculty members to incorporate travel into their courses. While experiences in cities, other states,
and even other countries can greatly enhance student learning by exposing them to ideas, peoples, and cultures different from their own, participants noted a number of difficulties. They described traveling with students as a mixed bag – they welcomed the opportunities to teach students ideas and skills in a hands-on environment, but also described incorporating elements of travel into their courses as “really hard,” “logistics problem,” “very risky,” and “unpredictable.” Travel also can be expensive or even cost-prohibitive.

Teaching by engaging students in communities could also be cost prohibitive. A participant, who teaches a public scholarship course that requires students live in another city for an extended period each summer, admitted that the course was “very expensive to run.” Participants discussed the time it takes to apply for funding or otherwise raise funds for such courses as a barrier to teaching for civic engagement. Engaging students in designing and implementing community projects can be expensive; in the case of design courses which typically involve building art installations, they can become more expensive when expected to be permanent additions to a local park, for example. Additionally, faculty participants indicated the need to apply for funding – from various, small institutional pots of money (i.e., their college, the PSA, various campus academic centers) as well as from various external grant-funding organizations. Participants discussed the need to be “creative in [obtaining their] own grant money,” indicated that they have figured this out via “trial and error,” and that it has required “thinking outside the box.”

All of the above pragmatic influences on faculty course planning for civic engagement – time, energy, location, travel, and funding – were further compounded by issues of class size. Five participants commented on the constraints imposed by the number of students enrolled in a course and whether they could “cap” course enrollments as an important factor in their decisions regarding the use of experiential learning pedagogies like service-learning in their undergraduate
courses. Class size did not, however, emerge as a contextual influence with regard to teaching for civic capacity – to teaching about ideas like democratic principles. A tenured newcomer commented that “in an ideal world, it [class size] shouldn't impact what we are doing.” She acknowledged, however, that it is a factor which faculty “pay attention to and change the pedagogy and content around.”

Small class size facilitated teaching for civic engagement. Participants, for example, cited an increased ability to foster class discussions, organize formal debates, incorporate service-learning experiences and other active-learning pedagogies, and craft a more extensive variety of course assignments. A tenured scientist indicated that the relatively small (and capped) enrollment of his multidisciplinary course which incorporated community engagement, was “very hands-on” and “a much better [learning] experience, and the students’ opinions reflect[ed] that.” In describing why they believed that active and experiential learning were well-suited to teaching for civic capacity and engagement, participants indicated understandings such as:

[M]odels of education like active learning offer great promise and bring new life into the classroom. Active learning models follow a pattern of ‘prepare – act – reflect.’ They can open new doors for critical reflection by students. Combined with service and applied in a community, active learning models offer students a chance to develop life-long learning skills that will help them be less insular and more likely contributory citizens.

When attempting to incorporate engaged-learning pedagogies into their courses with larger student enrollments, participants struggled with a variety of factors. For example, it was difficult, if not impossible, to balance “so many different [student] schedules” in order to plan out-of class trips to local community functions like school-board meetings. Decisions about course assignments and grading were influenced by class size; participants reported that they gave more exams, particularly multiple-choice tests, in large classes and required fewer oral presentations or
writing assignments that encouraged critical analysis. For example, one participant indicated that class size

is often an inhibitor of certain formats...I mean you can't have essays and papers written for classes that are more than 50 students or often many more than that, so you have to have different means of assessment which does, in fact, I think unfortunately reduce the level of writing skills [which] are very closely connected with critical thought, because writing is thought.

The abilities to think and write critically are considered – by participants and in the literature – to be important civic skills. Some participants resorted to “extra credit” activities to encourage students to attend various events – including speakers, programs, and community meetings. Typically, they required a short writing assignment tying the event to course content. One participant considered offering a limited number of students in one of his larger courses the opportunity to incorporate CIVCOM minor requirements (including a capstone thesis or project or the option to design an element of their course credit based on participation in a community organization and subsequent analysis of this activity) into their course experience.

Many of the faculty members in this study had the advantage of teaching smaller undergraduate classes including first-year seminars, honors courses, upper-level seminars, studios, and capstone courses. They described these courses as “more interactive,” more discussion-based, and more writing-intensive. Participants also applauded the relative ease with which to organize course travel in smaller classes. A tenured humanities faculty member indicated that she has “never taught a class with more than 27 people in it – ever, ever, ever” in her 20 year career. She has “guest-lectured in big [lecture] halls” which she admits to having enjoyed, but believes “it would be much more difficult to do my kind of ‘deliberating bodies' way of teaching in Corporate U’s larger halls.” She argued that “what we need [institutionally] are more resources to have more sections of a course and more faculty” members to teach them. She was about to teach an undergraduate course with an enrollment of 75 or more students, and said “[my] hunch is [that]
the first time I teach that class, other than conceptually, public scholarship probably will not play a role in practice.” That is, while she will review the concept of public scholarship and other ideas about democratic engagement in this course about the history of ideas, her usual repertoire of pedagogically engaging instructional techniques would not be included.

Other participants who taught large, traditional, lecture-style courses were able to weave a variety of active-learning pedagogies into their classes, including “periodic discussions,” group presentations, classroom demonstrations, and online discussions, to name just a few strategies. Participants asked students to conduct research projects, develop designs, solve case-studies, and make presentations in groups – as a means of learning the material, but also to develop and practice analytic and communications skills as well as their abilities to work in teams and across differences. Students were also asked to participate in formal debates, to analyze various forms of media, and to draft class discussion questions and learning activities based upon course topics and readings.

And, finally, some participants described themselves as adopting instructional methods that allowed them to move seamlessly from small seminars to larger lecture-style courses. One participant admitted, however, that doing so is “a little more difficult in a class of 100 than in a class of 12.” While he, like many of his peers in this study, found it more challenging to teach for civic capacity and engagement, and particularly to teach for civic engagement through actively engaging students in the classroom, in a larger course, he remained committed to teaching for such purposes regardless of class size. For instance, in his large microeconomics course every lecture I start the lecture by discussing, or having students discuss, or we have a group discussion – even though it's a class of 100 people or more – of some current issue that's in the newspaper today and how that relates to the materials that we're studying.
These discussions help students learn the material and also understand its applicability to real-world situations involving economic decisions and policy-making and the intended and unintended consequences of such policies—skills important to democratic society. Regarding this instructional strategy, the participant commented,

there's nothing new or profound about [that], but it's...one way in a large class....to connect the theory and the academic discipline stuff with what's going on in the real world in a way that causes people to think reflectively and analytically and to speak about their thinking in class.

Participants also implemented instructional strategies designed to make large courses at least psychologically smaller. Some did so by creating different avenues for course-based discussion, often relying on Blackboard-like learning technologies to foster ongoing discussions outside of formal class time. One participant organizes a “town forum” in her larger classes, in which each course section led by a teaching assistant chooses a representative to participate in a panel-style discussion during the larger lecture session about issues that their peers “think are important for the world today” with regard to the course content.

Overall, with regard to class size, there was some level of agreement among participants that, while challenging, it is not impossible to teach for civic capacity and engagement in larger courses. Participants, who by their own estimation had done so successfully, indicated the importance of using different strategies and techniques for fostering productive class discussions in larger classes. They also commented that it can take more time and effort to develop an appropriate degree of structure with which to manage such discussions and other active-learning instructional methods with larger courses. A tenured social scientist commented, that she's “not the type of person who walks away from discussion just because it's 200, 250 students in the class.” While she admits that “it's really difficult to get the conversation going” in such a setting, she utilizes “different techniques of trying to get that going even if it's making them come in [to
class] and [saying] 'okay, everybody stand up' and then saying, 'okay, anybody who's done this sit down, anybody who's done that [sit down]. And, unfortunately, the last five [students] standing up, I start talking to them” in order to force the beginning of a discussion. Another participant discussed how she learned through experience that “the larger the course got, the more very explicit structure you had to put into place.” As a result, she adjusts her instructional strategies and other elements of her courses according to class size.

**Classroom Climate**

One of the instructional decisions that participants’ spoke with me about was intentionally fostering a classroom environment or climate that reflected the democratic principles they were trying to convey. These faculty members valued communication across differences and respectful debate. One of these participants, a tenured social scientist, said

One of the things that I try to bring to my classrooms, whether it’s a large, introductory course like one of the courses I teach … or a senior seminar, even a course that’s not quite large enough that you can’t run it as a seminar, is the idea that everybody's ideas are valued.

Creating such a classroom environment as an important part of teaching for civic capacity and engagement because, he argued, valuing a diversity of ideas is important in a democracy. He also believed that it is “important, in public scholarship, to be critically reflective and reflexive…with respect to one's values and beliefs. And so, I try to engender that in the classroom as well.” He does so by encouraging his students to think about where they stand on a given issue and to also consider the issue from different perspectives. Other respondents set up certain parameters and expectations for their classrooms. One tenure-track participant considers his course syllabi to be a good place for “laying out my principles;” his syllabus informs students that they will encounter controversial ideas in class, and that they may not agree with him or their classmates, but that they should engage in respectful debate.
Another participant, a PSA old-timer, reported that based on prior teaching experiences she came to recognize “that the way to get undergraduates to engage with language and reading and writing and speaking was to get them to pay attention to public controversies.” In the course of teaching this and other courses early on, she “started thinking of the classroom as a protopublic space,” a concept on which she has since published and continues to put into practice. Building on the democratic concept that the U.S. Senate is the greatest deliberating body (though she acknowledged that this often is truer in theory than in practice), she found it useful to consider her students “deliberating bodies” – individuals making and advocating informed decisions about important issues. That is, they attempted to have the classroom community be a relatively safe space in which to practice the leadership, problem-solving, communication skills that they believed necessary to informed democratic participation. Treating her classroom as a “protopublic space” – and talking explicitly to her students about this vision – means that she seeks to model the civil debate and discussion needed in our larger communities on a micro-scale by allowing students to practice these skills and behaviors in the classroom. During the course of her interactions with some of her earliest students, she realized that students are “really reticent to, hesitant [to]… talk about difficult things, as a lot of people are.” She believes that it is essential to a health democracy that students “learn to talk together about difficult things,” and she communicates this goal explicitly to students and plans her course instruction around practicing this skill. By incorporating discussions of public controversies, she attempts to actively engage her students in honing their communication and deliberation abilities. Treating her classroom as a protopublic space was this participant’s attempt to foster a classroom environment conducive to fostering students’ civic capacity and engagement. In many ways, participants were embracing one participant’s notion of the classroom as a protopublic space in which students are “deliberating bodies.”
Participants indicated that their decisions about the sequencing of civic course content and instruction were somewhat limited. Most indicated that their predominant organizational strategy for determining the sequence of course content and activities was largely based on disciplinary-based course goals which most (though not all) participants viewed as distinct from their civic purposes of their course. Notably, those participants who integrated their civic course goals most seamlessly into their courses tended to be the “old-timer” members of the PSA. All three of the old-timers as well as two of the members with the most public-scholarship experience seemed to incorporate teaching for civic capacity and engagement throughout their courses in intentional ways. One old-timer went so far as to sequence his civic content and instruction over a three course – “prepare, act, reflect and share” – series. During the spring semester he focused teaching disciplinary concepts and principles as well as about the community in which students would be engaged. During the summer session students applied their new knowledge and engaged in community problem-solving. The fall semester entailed reflection and sharing with students making meaning of their experiences and educating others about their learning.

Most participants tended to think about teaching for civic purposes in discrete units – as something to focus on during a limited number of course sessions or readings, for example. When this was the case, the civic focus often fell at the end of the class, acting as a bookend of sorts for the course – a means by which to convey to students the larger meaning of course materials or to suggest ways in which the course material might have larger implications or a lasting significance in their lives.

Findings from the PICC study indicate that three-fourths of the faculty surveyed arranged their courses based on “the way in which major concepts and relationships [in the field] are organized.” Nearly 60% sequenced topics according to the way students learn, and just under half
organized theme in “the way relationships occur in the real world.” Participants in this study also reported that they tended to organize their courses around disciplinary content. Those who included community-engaged pedagogies, however, often considered real-world application and the processes of engaging in problem-solving in the way they sequenced their courses; this was particularly true of those faculty members in professional fields. For example, some participants sequenced their courses so that they first conveying content and then asked students apply their new knowledge to a given community issue or in a given community setting. For instance, a humanities professor spoke of creating a one-day service-learning opportunity late in the semester during which she hoped her students would be able to apply the various ethical theories they had been studying.

Participants’ thinking about the sequence of content being presented in a given course was based, in part, upon other courses being offered in their programs. Just over half of the faculty participants discussed the need to make cross-course decisions – decisions about form that went beyond the specifics of one particular course, but nonetheless affected the course in question. Cross-course decisions are different from larger curricular decisions involving groups of faculty members (such as planning content of one calculus course so as to build on the previous calculus course in a series). Instead, these decisions typically involve decisions about the goals, content, and instruction of a particular course that are linked to 1) other courses in a series (e.g., the three-part “course” that involves the same students in a sequence of interrelated courses over a number of semesters and usually taught by the same faculty member); 2) consideration of the a course’s form in light of its connection to an inter-departmental or inter-college minor (e.g., the civic and community engagement minor); 3) travel, funding, research, or community partnering decisions on the part of a faculty member that involve the course but may also have faculty research or service components; or 4) course decisions in light of a faculty member’s intent to
create a new undergraduate program of study or to change how an existing course fits into an existing program of study (e.g., counts towards general education requirements).

**Assessment & Evaluation of Student Civic Learning**

The vast majority of the participants in this study instead focused their assessment of student learning on the disciplinary knowledge and tools that students were expected to acquire in their courses; only a small number of participants indicated they assessed students’ civic learning in their courses. The few participants that explicitly assessed civic learning used a variety of course assignments requiring students to synthesize or reflect on their civic learning and to practice some of the civic skills central to the course. All of the old-timer PSA members, notably, were engaged in actively assessing their students’ civic learning. Two participants, both old-timers teaching for civic capacity and engagement in the context of ongoing community partnerships, had more comprehensively assessed students’ civic learning as well as the impact of their projects on the communities in which they were embedded.

Most participants reported that they relied on informal feedback from students to gauge the success of their courses and to make future decisions about various aspects of their courses. For example, one participant indicated that he began to intentionally incorporate more “analogies to contemporary situations” in his ancient history courses after noticing that his students seemed to pay more attention during these points in the lecture. Rather than only talking about the birth of democracy in Athens, he began to draw connections for students among early ideas, principles, debates, and tensions and issues in current American politics. Other participants measured their success in teaching for civic engagement by relying on informal observations of students and, in some cases, on feedback from alumni indicating their application of course content in their post-graduate lives.
Course Type and Level

Participants in this study described their teaching for civic purposes in many different types of courses: introductory courses, general education courses, first-year seminars, upper-level courses in a degree program, multi- and interdisciplinary courses, team-taught courses, multiple-semester course sequences, studio courses, and capstone seminars. Some participants indicated that the ways in which they incorporated teaching for civic capacity and engagement or public scholarship varied based on the type and level of the course (e.g., introductory versus advanced).

A number of participants also spoke about designing their teaching for civic capacity and engagement in light of how their course related to others in an undergraduate major or other program of study. Most often these respondents felt constrained by expectations of other colleagues in their programs, departments, and colleges. These feelings appeared to be held by those faculty members who believed that teaching with civic engagement (e.g., service-learning) was an “add-on” rather than an essential component of a course. A few, however, usually those teaching small seminar courses, indicated feelings of freedom with regard to course content and pedagogy. For example, one participant indicated that while he would love to incorporate more hands-on civic engagement learning experiences in one of his introductory course, but that his course was intended to be a “feeder course” for certain upper-level courses, as well as required for an undergraduate major and a minor sponsored by his program. He believed that he was responsible for introducing a set of ideas related to civic capacity, that students would be expected to put into practice (through civic engagement) in his colleagues’ more advanced courses. Here again course size also played a role: his general-education course had virtually no limit on enrollment, while the advanced courses were capped at a certain number of students.

Similarly, another participant, a faculty member in a professional field, indicated that there are generally three types of courses offered in his program – lecture courses, lab courses, and
studio courses. The lecture courses are more theory and history-laden and often based around a

text, while laboratory courses are “more technical-skills oriented.” Studios, however, are “designed
to take the lecture and the lab stuff and combine it;” they are focused on getting students to
synthesize their learning and analyze problems. Abilities to synthesize and analyze information
were considered by most participants to be crucial aspects of civic capacity. The influence of
course type or course level intersected with contextual influences. Specifically, participants
perceived that students’ characteristics varied somewhat according to their class year (e.g., more
developed academic skills and abilities) while students’ goals depended on whether the course
enrolled students majoring in the academic field.

The Reflections and PICC studies, which formed the basis for the Contextual Filters Model,
focused exclusively on faculty members teaching introductory-level college courses, and thus did
not examine the potential influence of “course type.” When faculty in these original studies were
asked if they believed they would answer questions about their course planning differently if they
were asked about advanced courses in their academic fields, 80% faculty indicated that they would
likely answer differently. A subsequent follow-up study of 322 four-year college faculty members
who had previously participated in the PICC study, demonstrated only “modest” differences in
faculty self-reports of what influenced their course planning of an advanced course in the same
field (Stark & Shaw, 1990). Stark (2000) reported that the follow-up study indicated that, “in
general, the differences faculty members reported seemed to fit the actual differences between
larger courses with diversely prepared students in introductory general education, and smaller
courses with better prepared students in upper division courses” (p. 427). The narratives of
participants’ in this study, similarly suggest that they perceived course level and course type as
influencing their course planning. However, with the exception of the differences in planning for
multi or interdisciplinary courses (as opposed to introductory or advanced courses one academic
field) and of the specific content-focused versus practice-focused courses of one participant, it appears that the number of students enrolled in a course (which tended to be smaller in upper-level courses) was more influential than course type on participants’ course planning.

**Teaching through Advising and Mentoring Relationships**

While the focus of this study was on undergraduate learning experiences in the context of a course, participants also spoke of the teaching and learning that occurred in the context of their mentorship of individual students, or small groups of students, through supervised capstone, thesis, or other research projects. At least seven participants had served as advisors to students completing the civic and community engagement minor’s capstone project requirement. Participants also advised honors students engaged in community-oriented research projects and sometimes involved other interested students in their own public scholarship projects. Interestingly, participants indicated that they engaged in planning and decision-making regarding goals, content, instruction, and sequence when working with students in these extra-course learning experiences. The difference in planning courses versus individualized learning experiences was the degree to which aspects of form were tailored to and even co-determined by individual students. Participants also indicated that context and again, in particular, pragmatic factors, influenced decisions regarding the design of these learning experiences.

Participants indicated students intent on fulfilling capstone and thesis projects expressed desires to “be engaged with my community,” “to have a purpose,” and to “serve a greater context.” Helping students achieve goals such as individual goals – as well as to learn the basics of conducting community-engaged research and to complete a capstone paper or project – became the goals guiding participants’ teaching. Participants indicated that the “content” of these teaching and learning interactions was usually based upon these goals and the skill-level of the student. Participants often assigned readings – articles, chapters, or entire books – to students. They often
required short writing assignments (e.g., a description of the students’ research questions or goals, a summary of their intended project and its aims) designed to keep the students on-track in terms of completing their paper or project. Instruction, then, typically occurred one-on-one; usually in-person, but sometimes continuing as conversations over email or the telephone as the students conducted their research or began their projects in home or other communities far from campus. The “sequence” of such student learning experiences often depended on when the student approached a participant to request that they serve as their advisor.

Participants acknowledged that working with students on capstone and other research projects is time and energy intensive, but also found it personally rewarding to work with highly motivated students. In the words of one participant:

For me, it’s been fulfilling to work with these students; it’s really time intensive – they come with all this passion, more than any other student I’ve worked with in this department. They already have the vision; they already have the chutzpah to do it, they just need a little guiding along the way.

Participants also indicated that they needed to help students navigate contextual constraints including locating suitable community sites for their research or other projects, to help them navigate the institutional and community research permissions processes, to obtain funding for research materials or travel, and to fit their projects into their course loads and academic timetables.

Conclusions

Participants who were more involved in the PSA were best able to translate their broad ideas about civic engagement as an educational purpose into specific course goals, content, and assignments. Newer members experienced greater difficulty in channeling sometimes ephemeral purposes into concrete learning outcomes and instruction. Study respondents reported benefiting from their participation in the PSA – they perceived it as a source of, ideas about and examples of
the practice of teaching civic engagement and gained insights for navigating institutional influences on their course planning. The PSA was also lauded as a source of opportunities and assistance for participants; the PSA’s course grants and seminars provided much needed course funding as well as space for creative thinking.

Viewing the PSA again from a sociocultural learning perspective suggests that there is a learning curve of sorts in this community of practice. Old-timers are more adept at the practice of teaching public scholarship and civic engagement; newcomers tend to be more tentative. PSA members learn about how to more effectively plan and execute their courses through, for example, trial and error as they navigate various local influences, from more experienced colleagues, and by exchanging war stories and successful approaches.

The forms that teaching for civic capacity and engagement take lay at the heart of this study. Participants – each with their own backgrounds and beliefs – considered and navigated sets of nested contexts as they planned their undergraduate courses. In keeping with Stark et al.’s (1990) findings and contextual filters model for faculty course planning, participants in this study indicated that their course planning necessitated decisions about course content (content), intended learning outcomes (goals), material sequence (sequence), and instructional methods (instruction). Those participants who taught for civic purposes by actively engaging their students in community contexts, identified related decisions regarding off-campus instructional sites and course travel. Participants’ narratives suggested the addition of a set of community influences acting on participants’ course decisions; they identified course planning decisions related to instruction, like locating community partners/sites and arranging course travel. Working with and in communities necessitated participants’ balancing of differences in timetables (e.g., academic semester versus community on-going needs), staffing, and other needs.
CHAPTER 7: DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

A growing consensus identifies education for civic capacity and engagement as an integral component of college curricula (AAC&U, 2002, 2004, 2005; Spellings, 2006). According to a study conducted by a cadre of national higher education associations and accrediting bodies, these goals are among "a few key outcomes that all students, regardless of major or academic background, should achieve during undergraduate study" (AAC&U, 2005, p. 2). This apparent consensus, which reflects higher education's historic civic and public missions, should be an impetus for institutions and researchers to seriously consider how faculty members are teaching for civic engagement, as well as how to better equip them to do so.

Only a limited body of research exploring how postsecondary faculty members plan their courses and, in particular, how they align their teaching practices with specific educational purposes exists. Stark et al.'s (1990) empirically-grounded contextual filters model of faculty course planning provides a framework to guide examinations of how college and university faculty members translate their commitments to educational purposes such as civic engagement into course plans appropriate for their discipline or field. By overlaying a sociocultural learning perspective on this model, I emphasized the learning that underlies the curriculum planning process for faculty engaged in teaching for civic purposes. Although higher education institutions in the United States have long claimed to teach for citizenship, only recently have explicit goals related to the development of civic capacity been included in college and university curricula.

Gherardi et al. (1998) argue that the previously dominant model of learning "which implicitly conceptualized learners as individual actors processing information or modifying their mental structures" has been replaced by "an image of learners as social beings who construct their understanding and learn from social interaction within specific socio-cultural settings" (p. 275).
Examining the learning and course-planning processes of faculty members, including how they make sense of ideas and materials they encounter in a voluntary, multidisciplinary group focused on research and teaching related to public scholarship, can inform future professional development for faculty who seek to incorporate civic engagement into their courses. Understanding how faculty members adopt a particular educational purpose or purposes, how they translate these, implicitly or explicitly, into educational outcomes, as well as how they plan educational activities (e.g., reading, writing, problem solving) to achieve these outcomes has practical implications for both the preparation of future faculty in doctoral programs and professional development activities for current faculty in colleges and universities. As more stakeholders, including regional and disciplinary accrediting bodies hold institutions and their faculty accountable for a growing array of learning outcomes, it is imperative that institutions allocate scarce resources in ways that effectively prepare future faculty members for their roles as teachers and scholars, and help current faculty to teach in ways that are consistent with the historical mission of higher education and the needs of contemporary society.

**An Overview of the Study**

A primary goal of this study is to contribute theoretical and practical knowledge about the role of faculty interactions in the development of educational goals and practices by extending our understanding of how faculty members design courses consistent with their beliefs about educational purposes, and the influence of particular professional experiences, such as participation in the Public Scholarship Associates (PSA) group, on their educational beliefs and teaching. Two research questions guided the study:

- How, if at all, does faculty participation in the Public Scholarship Associates (PSA) group, a multidisciplinary, civic-engagement-oriented group of faculty, influence teaching-related learning and/or practice?
How, if at all, do faculty members at a research university align their undergraduate teaching practices with their implicit and/or explicit ideas about civic engagement as an educational purpose?

To explore these questions, I examined the course planning activities of faculty engaged in the Public Scholarship Associations. The PSA is not a professional development program per se (as in a workshop or learning community associated with a teaching and learning center), but rather a voluntary association of faculty members from a variety of disciplines interested in building students’ civic capacity. I explored whether and how participation in this group shaped or supported faculty members’ committed to civic education as an educational purpose.

The contextual filters model of faculty course planning (Stark et al., 1990) served as a jumping off point for this investigation of how faculty members make decisions about course content, pedagogy, and assessment in courses intended to foster undergraduate students' civic capacity and engagement. Figure 9 depicts the contextual filters model, modified for use as the conceptual framework for this study. Briefly, the original model contends that faculty background characteristics (content) interact with contextual filters such as college and program goals and student characteristics (context), to influence decisions about course plans (form). In Figure 9, the original model is now embedded in a sociohistorical context to draw attention to the fact that all higher education institutions are situated in specific temporal and cultural contexts that shape them, as well as the thinking of the individuals who are members of those institutions. The sociocultural learning perspective is also reflected in my decision to use dotted lines to frame the content, context, and form components of the model. Sociocultural learning theories hold that learning occurs in our interactions with the world around us and that learning is powerfully influenced by the social, cultural, and historical particulars of this world. The dotted lines explicitly denote the potential influence of such factors on course planning. The modified model also includes the Public Scholarship Associates group as a contextual influence on faculty course
planning. The thick shaded arrow between context and content suggests that participants’ engagement in the PSA group, and their interpretations of other contextual factors, have the potential to influence their beliefs about the civic purposes of education.

Figure 9: Contextual Filters Model in Sociocultural Framework

The conceptual model provided a foundation for data collection and analysis. A qualitative, phenomenological approach focused on how faculty members made meaning of the ideas of civic engagement and public scholarship, how their participation in the PSA group influenced that meaning-making, and how this influenced their course planning (including, for example, selection of course content and instructional methods). The data collection strategy relied on a series of three semi-structured interviews with each of 14 faculty participants. These interviews corresponded to the three main components of the contextual filters model – content,
context, and form. In addition, I observed PSA meetings and events, and collected course syllabi and other documents from the PSA group.

Analysis occurred iteratively throughout and following the data collection period, and involved a combination of both inductive and deductive coding. Analysis focused on how participants made meaning of their participation in the PSA and any impact it had on their thinking about civic educational purposes and course designs. Interviews were transcribed and interviews, memos, and documents were analyzed using a combination of *a priori* and open coding techniques to identify emergent themes in participants’ narratives. The conceptual framework provided the *a priori* codes, but I remained willing to modify or discard this model based on emergent data. Analysis also involved the development of a series of analytic memos that served as “think pieces” (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003, p. 114) in which I explored initial ideas and emergent themes.

Trustworthiness was addressed via the employment of reflective memos (Ashworth, 1999), theoretical and methodological triangulation (Denzin, 1978, 1989; Maxwell 1996; Polkinghorne, 1983), member checks, and peer debriefing (Creswell, 1998; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Writing reflective memos aided in surfacing my personal perceptions of the PSA and its members, including participants in this study. By using multiple data collection methods (i.e., interviews, observations, document analysis) and multiple theoretical frameworks (the contextual filters model and sociocultural learning perspectives), I sought to expand the range of explanations I considered in order to ensure greater validity. Participants reviewed in the presentation of data in drafts of Chapters 4, 5, and 6 as a member check; this allowed me to ensure that participants’ identities were adequately protected and to gauge their reactions to my interpretations of the data. Finally, a peer debriefer reviewed my coding, analysis, and findings chapters, challenging me to further consider my methods and claims.
Like any study, this research effort has its limitations. I sought not to make generalizations, but surface themes related to my research questions, refine the contextual filters model, and spark questions in need of further study. I did so by interviewing faculty at a single institution who were all members of an elective professional development group. I was not able to gain access to all members of the group; some were on sabbatical or otherwise unavailable. These faculty members might have shared different experiences and perspectives than those I interviewed. In addition to securing the participation of all PSA members – an ethnographic and longitudinal approach might have more effectively documented the effects of participation in the PSA on course development over time. Instead, I relied on participants retrospective reports of their experiences. Participants were also varying articulation and reflective about their involvement in the PSA. I also did not observe participants’ teaching; while the study was focused on participants’ course planning (rather than teaching), observing them in the classroom might have surfaced additional questions about their course goals and instruction, for example.

On a further methodological note, more than half of the participants spontaneously reported that our conversations had provided a space for them to reflect on their current teaching practices and to envision improvements. Some inserted a short comment amidst an answer to one of my queries: “while you were saying that, I feel like I had a bit of an insight;” others spoke at length about what they had learned during our time together:

I said to a friend of mine, 'oh I was doing this interview with a graduate student,' and she said 'oh that was nice of you.' And I said, 'Actually, no it's not.' I said 'It's really fun.' And she looked at me and she goes, 'in what way?' And I said, 'because I'm really thinking about what I'm doing in the classroom, which I wasn't.' I mean I don't want it to sound like I'm just going into the classroom with sheer abandon, but the connections you are asking me to make, I had never made before and it's made me think about it.

My questions prompted participants to think out loud about – to consider or re-consider –their course decisions. They thanked me for getting them to reflect on their beliefs about educational
purpose and their teaching practices: “I mean this is like, this conversation is making me, [making] it come together and it's really great – thanks!” Participants reported that our conversations “planted a seed” in their thinking about future instructional approaches; they indicated intentions to arrange field trips, to be more explicit with students about course civic capacity and engagement, and to more intentionally incorporate conversations about public scholarship, its meaning and application, into undergraduate classes. Participants’ reflections on their course planning and teaching practices related to fostering students’ civic capacity and engagement suggest that creating spaces and periodic times designed to encourage such reflection would be a good starting point for increasing civic-focused curricular design.

Summary of Findings

In answer to the first research question regarding the influence of Public Scholarship Associates group on teaching-related learning and/or practice, I found that the influence of the PSA on participants’ learning about civic education as well as on participants’ teaching for civic and community engagement varied based on participants level of engagement in the PSA community and its activities. Many identified the important role that their interactions with other members of the PSA group played in the evolution of their understanding of public scholarship and in their implementation of a variety of educational practices. These faculty members understood that they were not learning to teach for civic capacity and engagement in a vacuum; they implicitly acknowledged that their teaching and learning were not solitary activities, but instead were mediated by their interactions with peers, texts, and ideas from the PSA group. Participants’ stories underscored the influence of both formal (e.g., faculty seminars) and informal (unplanned conversations) interactions on their teaching for civic capacity and engagement.

The breadth, complexity, and strength of a participant’s beliefs about educational purpose tended to vary according to a number of factors including, 1) the extent of their participation in
the PSA (those more centrally and extensively involved in the group tended to articulate the most comprehensive visions and to be very clear about what they viewed as their particular role in teaching for civic capacity and engagement), 2) experiences that encouraged participants to consider and reflect upon their ideas about civic engagement (e.g., involvement in university outreach, participation in related national organizations and initiatives), and 3) their perception of the place of civic engagement in their academic field. Participants varied most in terms of how well they were able to articulate their beliefs about civic educational purposes; those more engaged in the PSA group tended to have more well-defined beliefs and to more closely align their teaching with those beliefs than newcomers to the group. The ways in which participants self-identified – for example, as activists or change agents – also appeared to influence their teaching for civic capacity and engagement both directly and indirectly. Their personal and professional backgrounds and experiences often served as the impetus, the motivation, for them to engage in efforts to teach for civic capacity and engagement.

These findings are consistent with the premises of the sociocultural perspective on learning. Members of the PSA varied in their levels of engagement in the group, with some more experienced members taking more central roles and shaping the ideas of the community; newer members tended to hover on the periphery of the community but some moved to more central locations as they learned more about public scholarship and civic education through the group’s activities. Changes in identity – for example the development of new identities or the strengthening of identities as individuals committed to civic education and public scholarship – are also consistent with the assertion that learning not only changes what we know but who we are (Packer & Goicoechea, 2000; Wortham, 2004, 2006).

With regard to the second research question, I found that participants actively sought to align their course planning and teaching with the civic-educational purposes to which they
ascribed, and that they did so while navigating a variety of contextual enablers and constraints. Participants’ specific beliefs about educational purposes varied in explicitness and emphasis, often corresponding to their level and period of engagement in the PSA community of practice and their perceptions of the status of civic education in their academic fields. Similarly, participants’ decisions about course “form” tended to be influenced by the learning they experienced through their involvement in the PSA as well as their views of their discipline. Striving to embody their ideas about civic educational purpose in their undergraduate teaching, participants made and modified decisions about their courses – including desired learning outcomes or course goals, course content, pedagogy and instructional methods, and course sequence. As might be expected in a research university the influence of the faculty reward systems, particularly the emphasis on research in promotion and tenure, emerged as a strong influence. Two participants with long-term community-partnerships and most of the faculty members actively engaging their students in community-based learning were already tenured. Tenure-track participants (and their tenured counterparts) understood that by spending time involving their students in civic engagement and public scholarship projects they were running the risk of not spending enough time on research and publication. As a result, many tenure-track participants indicated that they were settling for focusing their teaching now on fostering students’ civic capacity while “laying groundwork” for more extensive civic-engagement oriented teaching efforts after earning tenure. Thus, the local context influenced PSA newcomers in particular, as they made decisions about how much time and energy to focus on their teaching for civic engagement.

For many, the institution’s mission as a public land-grant university suggested a supportive context for civic engagement and public scholarship, but some participants questioned the university’s commitment to that mission. Participants also considered alternate ways to promote the development of student’s civic capacity and engagement, for example, through
advising undergraduate theses or engaging students in faculty-lead public-scholarship and/or research projects. Because the study focused on how faculty members seek to promote students’ civic capacity and engagement, connections with agencies and organizations in the communities surrounding the university were additional salient contextual influences on course planning. The mission, needs, and activities of these organizations with which faculty sought to partner shaped course goals, instructional approaches, assignments, and how course sessions were sequenced.

The premises of the contextual filters model were largely supported by the data. Individual faculty noted how their prior experiences and personal beliefs interacted with their beliefs about education to influence their decisions about how and what to teach. Beliefs about the place of civic education and public scholarship in participants’ were also influential – although in different ways depending on how participants assessed support for civic engagement in their field. Those who did not view their fields of study as supporting this engagement were, accordingly, more cautious about their involvement.

The local (institutional) context also strongly influenced the decisions participants made about their courses, in keeping with the premises of the model. The research setting and the focus on civic engagement as a learning outcome for students, however, suggested some influences that were not particularly strong in the studies from which the contextual filters model is derived. In addition, the study suggested that there is more interaction among the content and context influences than specified in the original model. The model portrays content influences as stable and unidirectional but the this study suggested that contextual influences related to professional development may affect faculty members’ beliefs about the purposes of education (a content influence), suggesting both a more dynamic model of course planning is needed.

**Theory Development**
Findings from this study suggest the need for modifications to the conceptual framework which guided this study in order to best reflect participants’ perceptions of what influenced their course planning for civic purposes. The revised framework (see Figure 10) presented here incorporates elements originally posited and incorporated into the guiding conceptual framework in Chapter 2 – including the role of the PSA as a potential site of learning for faculty members and the inclusion of the sociohistorical context (as a potential influence on participants’ beliefs about civic purposes and course decisions). It also includes two additional sets of contextual influences, namely 1) institutional mission and leadership, and 2) faculty rewards, which emerged from participants’ accounts. Recall that the original studies from which the contextual filters model was derived did not include faculty from research universities; the addition of mission/leadership and faculty rewards as additional contextual filters reflects the role of the research university setting on faculty course planning.

For some kinds of course planning, for example, that conducted for service-learning or civic engagement courses, influences outside the institution may become more salient influences on faculty decisions. In this study, community influences on participants’ course planning for civic engagement were also evident. In Figure 10, I have incorporated this, as well as the above additions, into the contextual filters model in shaded boxes, recognizing that the explicit addition of community partners may only be salient for particular kinds of courses that require community engagement. In the following sections, I offer a set of propositions to guide theory development and related research on faculty course planning generally as well as course planning for civic capacity and engagement.
**Proposition 1a:** Content influences on course planning, specifically views of the academic field and beliefs about educational purpose, are dynamic rather than stable.

Faculty members’ course planning and teaching experiences can influence beliefs about educational purposes, and may even inform their views of their academic fields. Through their participation in a community of scholars like the PSA, and through their reflection on their teaching and course planning, participants learn. In this study, participants’ situated learning about the practices of public scholarship and teaching for civic capacity and engagement affected both their beliefs about civic purposes and their place in their academic fields. They also changed how they identified as scholars.
Stark and her colleagues understood that academic planning is subject to influences outside, as well as those inside, the institution but did not depict these external influences in the contextual filters model. I explicitly embedded the model in a sociohistorical context to illustrate how content and context factors which influence course planning can change over time, and how external influences (like the national civic engagement movement and accreditation standards) may shape their planning as well.

**Proposition 1b: A reciprocal relationship exists between content and context elements of the contextual filters model.**

I posited in Chapter 2 that participation in the PSA and participants’ related learning about civic ideas and pedagogies might influence not only their course planning but also the civic educational purposes to which they ascribed. The shaded arrow in the guiding conceptual framework of the study was intended to graphically represent this proposition. The findings of this study suggest that context – and enabling contexts like the PSA, in particular – appear to influence aspects of content, such as the specificity and breadth of their beliefs about civic educational purposes and their views of the place of civic engagement in their academic fields.

While participants spent most of our interview time discussing how they attempt to translate their beliefs about civic educational purposes into concrete course goals, they also indicated, to varying degrees, that they continue to revise or at least make more explicit and specific their beliefs about the civic purposes of undergraduate education and the role(s) they intend to play in achieving these purposes. Stark et al. (1990) indicated that while the contextual filters model suggests that faculty members’ course decisions are influenced primarily by their individual backgrounds and characteristics, which are then “filtered” – or moderately influenced – by various contextual factors, “in rarer instances, faculty beliefs about the purposes of education may change as well. In this study, participants’ involvement in the PSA and their learning appear
to have influenced participants’ thinking about civic purposes and their role in teaching
undergraduates about their academic fields. This suggests the addition of a reciprocal arrow
between content and context exists. Faculty members’ academic fields, their tenure status, and
other personal and professional characteristics also appeared to influence their PSA participation,
which in turn seemed to influence -- either by highlighting, reinforcing, reminding, or fostering --
the idea that teaching for civic capacity and engagement is indeed an important purpose of higher
education, and particularly public higher education.

**Proposition 2: Local contexts can be catalysts for faculty learning, as well as influences on course form.**

Some of the contextual influences identified by the contextual filters model can be viewed
as sites of potential learning when viewed from a sociocultural learning perspective. For example
the model includes “external influences” such as civic engagement conferences or disciplinary
association meetings, and other potential sites for learning through interaction might include:
events sponsored by a campus teaching and learning center (“facilities, opportunities, and
assistance”), or conversations with peers (“advice available on campus”). Participants in this study
indicated that their teaching for civic purposes had been influenced by – that they had learned
from – their participation in disciplinary and other national organizations and in faculty
development offerings, in addition to from their participation in the PSA.

These social interactions occurred in the particular sociohistorical context in which
participants live and work. By embedding the “context” portion of the contextual filters model in
a larger “sociohistorical context,” I indicate that faculty might be influenced not only by various
institutional factors and their participation in potential learning opportunities, but also that these
factors and activities occur in a specific time and place. While a participant might indicate that he
felt most influenced, at the time of our interviews, by a particular contextual factor, that same
participant might acknowledge having been more influenced by a different contextual factor at some previous point in time or may experience a particular context differently in the future as a new policy is put in place, new colleagues join a group, or a participant’s experiences change his perspective.

Proposition 3: Planning for civic engagement (and service-learning) courses is influenced by perceptions of institutional mission, particularly perceptions of what counts for promotion and tenure in the home institution.

In addition to the nine sets of contextual factors included in Stark et al.’s (1990) contextual filters model, participants in this study repeatedly identified the role of institutional mission – public, land-grand, and most of all the research university mission – and of faculty reward structures on their teaching for civic capacity and engagement. Participants indicated that they perceived the research university mission and the corresponding expectations for tenure and promotion as taking precedence over all others. Accordingly, they reported carefully weighing the amount of time and energy they spent on planning and executing civic engagement activities for their undergraduate students.
Proposition 4: Once instructors have decided to incorporate engagement in a community into a course, subsequent course decisions are influenced by that community’s characteristics and needs.

Participants – tenured and tenure-track alike – who decided to incorporate civic-engagement activities in their courses, reported that their planning of these activities was influenced by an additional set of influences. The missions, needs, and time-frames of the communities or community-based organizations with which faculty sought to partner their classes often influenced specific course goals, instruction, assignments, and the sequence of the civic-engagement experiences in a given course. While courses typically work on a semester-based time-frame, community needs span greater periods of time. Participants reported engaging their students in one-day to semester-long community projects and also indicated that at times they chose to bring students to a given community over semester breaks, often meaning that students’ participation in this portion of the course had an additional travel cost or was an optional component of the course.

Implications for Future Research

Study findings and data analysis contributed to the propositions for theory development offered above. Here, I offer five recommendations for future research, suggesting the further testing of the contextual filters model and an examination of course planning and teaching practices related to civic capacity and engagement on the part of other populations of faculty members and in other institutional contexts.

Recommendation 1: Continue to test and refine the contextual filters model in different institutional settings.

The findings of this study, based on the experiences of faculty members in a single research university, require further testing. Future studies may validate the emergent model
described here or suggest additional refinements. The revised model should be explored in a variety of institutional contexts, including other research universities, which were not part of the studies that contributed to the development of the original model.

**Recommendation 2: Research should explore the influence of course type and course level on decisions about the form of a course.**

The findings of this study also suggest that planning for certain types of courses, such as those that incorporate service-learning or community engagement, may be influenced by contextual influences external to the institution. This finding contrasts with those of the *Reflections* and *PICC* studies, which suggest only minimal variation in course planning by course type. For instance, the model could be applied to faculty planning interdisciplinary courses, graduate courses, or to course planning for other kinds of institutional or programmatic curricular goals (e.g., diversity, liberal education).

**Recommendation 3: Focus future research on extending understanding of how different faculty populations plan to teach for civic capacity and engagement.**

Researchers should also examine how different faculty populations plan to teach for civic engagement; for example, faculty without access to a community of practice focused on teaching for civic purposes and contingent faculty. How do faculty members who are not engaged in a PSA-like community of scholars navigate contextual influences on their course planning for civic engagement? Where do they learn to plan and teach for civic capacity and engagement, and from where do they draw support? Examining the experiences of adjunct or fixed-term faculty members is also important. Anecdotally, from my experiences as a graduate student member of
the PSA, I believe that there are similarities and dissimilarities in the contextual influences and experiences of this group of faculty members and those with tenure or on the tenure track.

**Recommendation 4: Future research must more closely examine the role of sociohistorical context on faculty course planning.**

While I embedded the contextual filters model in a larger sociohistorical context based upon my understanding of Stark et al.’s (1990) and Lattuca and Stark (2009) conceptualizations of faculty course planning, this context was not a focus of my study. Still, it occasionally surfaced in faculty members’ discussion of national political events and trends. As such, it deserves further examination in studies of teaching and learning for civic engagement and in studies of course planning generally. It is clear, for example, that civic engagement is part of the national discussion about the goals of higher education in the U.S., and that education for citizenship has been an espoused (if not achieved) purposes of colleges and universities in the U.S. since the 1700s. Such societal characteristics and concerns may or may not be recognized by participants, yet still influence course decisions. For instance, some faculty may decide to incorporate discussions of current political debates during a presidential election year to explicitly focus on citizenship; others may avoid discussions of politics entirely because of fears of repercussions from organizations such as FIRE that have specific political agendas. Future studies might explore such sociohistorical influences by asking faculty about them and/or by examining course planning over time at a given institution to identify the role these influences in faculty decision making.
Recommendation 5: Research and assessment efforts should evaluate the effectiveness and impact of course planning for civic engagement.

In addition to testing the emergent model of faculty course planning for civic purposes, research and assessment efforts should evaluate the effectiveness of course plans intended to enhance students’ civic capacity and engagement. Faculty in this study did not always articulate clear civic learning goals or communicate them to students, raising the question of whether students were actually learning what instructors intended them to learn. Moreover, the vast majority of participants in this study did not assess students’ civic learning, focusing instead on assessment of disciplinary knowledge and skills. We need studies about students’ civic learning, as well as those that examine how and when students translate what they are learning about civic engagement (capacity) into civically engaging behaviors.

Implications for Institutional Practice and Policy: Potential Sites of Influence

Although the findings from this study are suggestive at best, they do suggest some steps colleges and universities might consider to foster faculty members’ learning about how to teach for civic purposes. Participants learned through conversations and other interactions with colleagues in the PSA about civic ideas and teaching practices; their learning, and the development of their practice, corresponded to their level of involvement in the group. Old-timers had spent more time in the group and had more experience with the practice of public scholarship and teaching for civic engagement; they served as exemplars for newer associates and helped to create the group’s learning curriculum by publishing volumes of essays and creating new programs and initiatives. Institutions of higher education interested in supporting and advancing faculty efforts to engage undergraduates in connecting and applying their growing disciplinary knowledge to civic and community concerns through engagement with democratic purposes, processes, and projects could create professional development opportunities akin to the PSA.
In addition to PSA, participants identified a number of enabling settings, but also contextual constraints, on their ability to teach for civic capacity and engagement. Participants indicated a desire for more opportunities for faculty interaction around teaching for civic purposes – within the PSA and in other departmental and college contexts. Their interview narratives raised a number of potential practice and policy strategies, including creating opportunities for reflection, mentorship, networking, and exchange of ideas; increasing institutional support for teaching for civic purposes by creating staff positions designed to aid faculty in identifying potential community partners and by allocating small pools of money for course development and faculty and student travel for civic engagement courses. Participants also indicated that their course planning for civic capacity and engagement was strongly and negatively influenced by their perceptions of the promotion and tenure system; they perceived it as privileging research over teaching and feared that the extra time and energy required to create meaningful civic engagement opportunities for students would be to their detriment during performance reviews. Concerted efforts on the part of postsecondary administrators to increase and/or enhance reduce constraints and provide incentives and supports would likely result in more teaching for civic capacity and engagement in undergraduate education.

Recommendation 1: Allocate institutional resources to establish and support robust intellectual communities around civic engagement/public scholarship.

Participants, particularly tenure-track faculty members, expressed a resounding desire for more learning interactions akin to the PSA. Regardless of tenure status, however, participants echoed each other’s desire for more interactions with peers and more experienced mentors to aid them in developing their understanding of public scholarship and their practice thereof, particularly during the periods of graduate school and early career. It should be noted though that
some of the tenured faculty members also indicated a desire for continued interactions of this kind.

Collectively, the learning and development that faculty participants identified regarding their understanding and practice of teaching for civic capacity and engagement, was focused predominantly on acquiring the language associated with these topics, an awareness of various campus, larger higher education, and community opportunities, resources, and advice that might aid faculty members in their efforts to teach in this manner. This kind of learning was clearly tied to participation in the Public Scholarship Associates group.

My findings regarding faculty learning in a multidisciplinary civic-engagement oriented community of practice suggests that 1) we need to further study/spell out best practices for creating and fostering such “intellectual communities” (Walker, Golde, Jones, Bueschel, & Hutchings, 2007). Walker et al. (2007) posited that strong intellectual communities are 1) “diverse and multigenerational,” 2) “flexible and forgiving,” and 3) “respectful and generous” (pp. B6-B8). Members of intellectual communities also 4) “engage [newcomers] fully,” 5) “collaborate on the curriculum,” 6) “share research across boundaries,” 7) “open classroom doors,” 8) “set aside time for reflection,” 9) “create physical space for community,” and 10) “encourage social events” (pp. B6-B8). The PSA can be described as a robust intellectual community according to Walker et al.’s definition; its members have accomplished all of these tasks in a variety of ways.

Yet despite the PSA’s successes, participants identified limitations in the group’s “curriculum” for its members. My findings suggest that creating robust learning communities dedicated to teaching for civic capacity and engagement should develop mentorship and/or apprenticeship opportunities for newcomers. New and tenure-track participants repeatedly indicated a desire for more one-on-one mentorship and conversations about strategies for identifying community partners and effective course design for building civic capacity and
engagement. As Lave and Wenger (1990) have suggested, learning in communities is enhanced as newcomers engage in a kind of apprenticeship with more experienced and skilled members of that community.

Institutions of higher education that do not host groups like the PSA would do well to allocate the time and resources necessary to create such learning-centered, relationally-based faculty communities. By creating the spaces for faculty members to learn and collaborate regarding civic educational purposes, institutions could foster more robust undergraduate learning experiences for their students.

**Recommendation 2: Pay attention to how civic capacity and engagement are talked about, prioritized, and embedded in mission statements, strategic plans, and the curriculum.**

Participants reported varying perceptions of their institution’s commitment to advancing student civic capacity and engagement; many felt that such goals were not a top priority, despite the institution’s status as a public and land-grant university. This finding suggests that college and university administrators would do well to consider how undergraduate learning goals, and in particular goals related to civic learning, are presented in a variety of institutional contexts and documents, from mission statements to strategic plans and intended student learning outcomes in general education and undergraduate major programs of study.

**Recommendation 3: Recognize and reward faculty teaching for civic capacity and engagement**

Participants overwhelmingly perceived that public scholarship and teaching for civic capacity and engagement were undervalued across the institution. Participants indicated that “public recognition is very important,” particularly to tenure-track faculty members and suggested
that “one way to make public scholarship popular is to help the younger faculty to get money...even if it's a small amount of money, [as] of course it would be, and obtain recognition.” Recognizing and rewarding faculty members for their efforts to actively engage students in public scholarship and civic engagement educational experiences would likely encourage this faculty to continue their work and might embolden other faculty members to incorporate teaching for civic capacity and engagement into their undergraduate courses.

**Recommendation 4: Structure campus partnerships and collaborations in order to avoid duplication of efforts and the expense of more resources.**

Participants indicated, often carefully sidestepping the potentially politically charged and thorny issue, their perception of a duplication of efforts and a political chasm between the public scholarship initiatives of the PSA and efforts on the part of the institution’s outreach division. Many of the principles and people involved in public scholarship and in outreach scholarship will overlap, yet leadership, resources, and structures are rarely shared and may result in competition for scarce resources. Administrators should work to eliminate duplication of efforts and instead nurture networks for collaboration and resource sharing, especially in times of economic duress.

**Recommendation 5: Future faculty members should have forums in which to reflect on their beliefs about educational purposes and how best to align their teaching practices with these purposes and their views of their academic fields.**

This study also has implications for the preparation of future faculty members. Most participants reported limited, if any, pedagogical or other teacher-preparation training during graduate school. This finding is consistent with previous research (Golde & Dore, 2001; Walker, Golde, Jones, Bueschel, & Hutchings, 2008). Faculty members were not encouraged to think about or articulate their ideas about educational purposes, let alone civic educational purposes, or
to consider the public or civic roles of colleges and universities or academic fields during their graduate training. Based on these findings, faculty members and administrators responsible for graduate student education should consider ways in which to engage future faculty members in thinking about the practice of teaching as well as about the practice of public scholarship in their academic fields. In particular, future faculty members should learn about effective teaching practices, broadly, and to consider how to design courses and educational experiences that are consistent with specific educational purposes and related learning outcomes.

**Institutional Policies**

This study also has implications for institutional policy. Its findings suggest that college and university administrators, particularly those at research universities, should examine how the terms under which faculty members are hired and rewarded influence their goals for undergraduate education.

**Recommendation 1:** Consider innovative ways to incorporate civic engagement teaching and/or research in faculty contracts so that these will be rewarded in annual performance assessments and promotion and tenure reviews.

During the course of data collection and analysis, participants’ contracts – the specifics of the roles they were hired to fill – emerged as influences on their teaching for civic capacity and engagement. Specifically, two participants were contracted for substantial outreach and extension responsibilities. One of these participants did not have explicit undergraduate teaching responsibilities; instead, her teaching for civic capacity and engagement efforts were focused on teaching individual or small groups of undergraduates by involving them in her own public scholarship research and by serving as their thesis or capstone project advisor. The other participant was expected to carry an undergraduate teaching load. Both participants, however, indicated that their outreach and extension responsibilities tended to carry over into their teaching;
they felt that their community engagement and teaching efforts were mutually beneficial and that they were able to draw on their outreach and extension experiences in classroom conversations about the importance of and the practice of civic engagement.

In terms of institutional policy, then, university administrators should consider the formal (and informal) conditions under which faculty members are hired. While extension responsibilities are often limited to land-grant institutions and, even then, to specific colleges and academic fields, any institution of higher education could revisit the language included in faculty contracts.

**Recommendation 2: Alter rewards policies and cultures to reflect institutional commitments to civic engagement.**

As important as the conditions of faculty hiring, at least in the eyes of participants’, were the content, clarity, and consistency of faculty reward policies. Participants repeatedly raised tenure and promotion expectations – which they perceived as privileging faculty research over teaching – as the largest barrier to their efforts to teach for civic capacity and engagement. They indicated that they had no clear understanding of how “public scholarship gets recognized as scholarship of some sort,” and that they believed that “more credit should be [given for this type of work] in the tenure process.” Public scholarship and teaching for civic capacity and engagement need to be transparently addressed in tenure and promotion policies; they should be considered genuine scholarship when they engage students and communities in issues of deep academic and public concern.

Administrators at research universities interested in advancing undergraduate civic learning and engagement would do well to thoughtfully consider and address such concerns regarding tenure and promotion policies and institutional cultures. Even when official documents and policies suggest that an institution places value on public scholarship in the form of teaching and research – as they did in the case of the institution in this study – it is evident that changes in
written policies do not always result in changes in culture. Not only do policies need to be written and revised to reflect institutional commitments to advancing civic engagement, but efforts need to be made to shift the tenure and promotion cultures at university, college, and departmental levels. A combination of a shift in policy and symbolic efforts to underscore the value the institution places on civic engagement and public scholarship (e.g., through some of the recommendations for practice included above), may convince faculty members that an institution is moving beyond the rhetoric of mission statements and public relations to a real commitment to contributing to the public good.

**Conclusions**

Efforts on the part of institutions of higher education to educate students for productive lives as informed and engaged citizens depend, at least in part, on the curricular efforts of faculty members. If we hope to be successful in these efforts, we must understand how faculty members think about civic education and teach for civic capacity and engagement. This study sought to contribute to that understanding by examining on faculty course planning and civic engagement.

The combination of a sociocultural perspective on learning and the use of the contextual filters model of faculty course planning (Stark et al., 1990) provided a valuable starting point for this examination of how participants planned undergraduate courses with civic purposes in mind. The findings suggest that local contexts shape faculty course planning for civic capacity and engagement, acting variously as incentives or barriers to faculty efforts to teach for civic engagement. Viewing faculty course planning for civic purposes through these lenses underscored the dynamic nature of faculty decisions about course form; as faculty learned through their participation in the Public Scholarship Associates community of practice, they continually revisited their ideas about their courses, shaping their efforts to align their courses with their developing sense of teaching for civic capacity and engagement. Participation in the PSA was a
clear influence on these course decisions, but it also influenced faculty members’ identity development as public scholars and teachers of civic engagement. Institutions that wish to encourage the development of students’ civic understanding and engagement should take note of these findings, which suggests an effective approach to preparing faculty to teach for civic purposes.
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FACULTY RECRUITMENT LETTER  
[COURSE DEVELOPMENT GRANT RECIPIENTS]

Title of Study:  Teaching for Civic Capacity & Engagement: A Sociocultural Examination of how Postsecondary Faculty Members Align Teaching with Purpose

Principal Investigator:  Jennifer M. Domagal-Goldman  
Higher Education Program  
400 Rackley Building  
University Park, PA 16802  
[Phone #] | [jmd530@psu.edu]

Dissertation Chair:  Dr. Lisa R. Lattuca, Associate Professor & Senior Research Associate  
Center for the Study of Higher Education  
400 Rackley Building  
University Park, PA 16802  
814.865.9754 | lattuca@psu.edu

Dear [Insert Faculty Member’s Name],

My name is Jennifer Domagal-Goldman and I am a doctoral candidate in the Higher Education Program at The Pennsylvania State University. I am recruiting faculty participants for my dissertation study, “Teaching for Civic Capacity & Engagement: A Sociocultural Examination of how Postsecondary Faculty Members Align Teaching with Purpose.” I hope to interview faculty members who are Public Scholarship Associates to understand how they incorporate public scholarship and/or civic engagement into their undergraduate courses.

You have been identified as a potential participant because you are received a [INSERT YEAR] course development grant. Participation in my study involves three hour-long interviews over the course of the 2007-08 academic year. Would you consider participating in my study?

I hope you will agree to participate in this study as I believe I can learn much from you about this topic. Thank you in advance for your consideration. Please do not hesitate to contact me by phone [###-####-#####] or e-mail [jmd530@psu.edu] should you have questions or want to discuss further your interest in participating in my research.

All the Best,

Jennifer
APPENDIX B:
FACULTY RECRUITMENT LETTER
[“A CAPACITY TO SUSTAIN DEMOCRACY” SEMINAR PARTICIPANTS]

Title of Study: Teaching for Civic Capacity & Engagement: A Sociocultural Examination of how Postsecondary Faculty Members Align Teaching with Purpose

Principal Investigator: Jennifer M. Domagal-Goldman
Higher Education Program
400 Rackley Building
University Park, PA 16802
[Phone #] | jmd530@psu.edu

Dissertation Chair: Dr. Lisa R. Lattuca, Associate Professor & Senior Research Associate Center for the Study of Higher Education
400 Rackley Building
University Park, PA 16802
814.865.9754 | lattuca@psu.edu

Dear [Insert Faculty Member’s Name],

My name is Jennifer Domagal-Goldman and I am a doctoral candidate in the Higher Education Program at The Pennsylvania State University. I am recruiting faculty participants for my dissertation study, “Teaching for Civic Capacity & Engagement: A Sociocultural Examination of How Postsecondary Faculty Members Align Teaching with Purpose.” I plan to interview faculty members who are Public Scholarship Associates to understand if, how, and why they incorporate public scholarship and/or civic engagement into their undergraduate courses.

You have been identified as a potential participant because you are participating in the “A Capacity to Sustain Democracy” faculty seminar/Course Development Grant Recipient [or were identified as a potential participant by Dr. Mary Lou Munn/Jeremy Cohen.]. Participation in my study will require your participation in three, hour-long interviews over the course of the 2007-08 academic year. In addition, participants will be observed during meetings of the “Sustaining Democracy” seminar.

I hope you will agree to participate in this study because I believe I can learn much from you about this topic. Thank you in advance for your consideration. Please do not hesitate to contact me by phone [###-####-#####] or e-mail [jmd530@psu.edu] should you have questions or want to discuss further your interest in participating in my research.

All the Best,
Jennifer
APPENDIX C:
FACULTY FOLLOW-UP RECRUITMENT PHONE SCRIPT

Title of Study: Teaching for Civic Capacity & Engagement: A Sociocultural Examination of how Postsecondary Faculty Members Align Teaching with Purpose

Hello, Dr. [Insert Faculty Member’s Name]:

I am following up a letter I wrote you two weeks ago to request your participation in my dissertation study on how faculty members incorporate public scholarship into their undergraduate teaching. I identified you as a potential participant because you are a Course Development Grant Recipient/Participant in “A Capacity to Sustain Democracy” faculty seminar/were identified as a potential participant by Dr. Mary Lou Munn/Jeremy Cohen.

Since I had not heard from you, I wanted to make sure that you received my letter and to schedule a time for us to discuss your participation. The study will require that you participate in a series of three hour-long interviews over the course of the 2007-2008 academic year. I will also be observing the “Sustaining Democracy” Seminar this year. Do you have any questions about my study? [If “yes” answer questions; if “no” move on].

May I count on you as a participant?

IF NO: Thank you very much for considering my request. If you change your mind, please feel free to contact me by phone ###-###-#### or e-mail (jmd530@psu.edu). I wonder if there anyone else you think would be willing to participate.

IF YES: Okay, that’s great! I will contact you soon to find a time for the first interview that is mutually convenient. In the meantime, it would be helpful for me to have a copy of your CV and any syllabi from courses you’ve taught that incorporate public scholarship or civic engagement themes. Are current versions available on the web? (If not, “Would you please email them to me at jmd530@psu.edu?)

Thank you again for agreeing to participate. I’ll be in touch shortly.
APPENDIX D:
FACULTY INFORMED CONSENT FORM FOR SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH

Faculty Informed Consent Form for Social Science Research
The Pennsylvania State University

Title of Project: Teaching for Civic Capacity & Engagement: How Faculty Members Align Their Undergraduate Teaching Practices with Their Commitment to Civic Capacity Building, Civic Engagement, and/or Public Scholarship.

Principal Investigator: Jennifer M. Domagal-Goldman
Higher Education Program
400 Rackley Building
University Park, PA 16802
[Phone #: jmd530@psu.edu]

Advisor: Dr. Lisa R. Lattuca, Associate Professor and Senior Research Associate
Center for the Study of Higher Education
400 Rackley Building
University Park, PA 16802
814.865.9754 | lattuca@psu.edu

1. Purpose of the Study: The purpose of this research study is to explore how Penn State faculty members who are also Public Scholarship Associates align their undergraduate teaching practices with their commitment to civic capacity building, civic engagement, and/or public scholarship.

2. Procedures to be followed: Participation in this study involves three hour-long individual interviews that will be recorded for the purposes of data analysis. You will be asked interview questions about your background characteristics (e.g., prior educational and work experiences, beliefs about educational purpose), campus-based influences on your teaching, your involvement in the Public Scholarship Associates, and your undergraduate course planning and teaching practices. You will also be asked to provide the researcher with current copies of your CV and relevant course syllabi. In addition, you may be observed in the context of Public Scholarship Associates meetings and events.

3. Benefits: This research can enhance our understanding of how public scholarship can be realized in the context of undergraduate teaching and learning. It will also advance the literature related to course design in higher education. This information could also help institutions of higher education to create specific measures to encourage faculty members to incorporate civic engagement and/or public scholarship in their courses. On an individual level, participation in this study may result in increased reflection on your undergraduate teaching practices.

4. Duration of Interviews: Each of the three individual interviews will last approximately 60 minutes and will be digitally audio-recorded. Recordings will be destroyed on May 1, 2013.

(a) All recordings will be stored in a locked cabinet in the principal investigator's office.
(b) Only the principal investigator, Jennifer Domagal-Goldman, and her Dissertation Chair, Dr. Lisa R. Lattuca will have access to the recordings.
(c) Recordings will be transcribed by the principal investigator or a professional transcriptionist.

___ I authorize the researcher to AUDIO tape my interviews.
___ I do not authorize the researcher to AUDIO tape my interviews.

ORP USE ONLY: IRB# 26906
The Pennsylvania State University
Office for Research Protections
Approval Date: 11/05/2007
Social Science Institutional Review Board
5. **Statement of Confidentiality:** Your participation in this research is confidential. Please note, however, that the institution (Penn State) and the Public Scholarship Associates group will be identified by name in written descriptions of the study (e.g., dissertation, publications, presentations). The data will be stored and secured in either a locked cabinet at the principal investigator’s home office or on her password-protected personal laptop computer in a password protected file. In the event of a publication or presentation resulting from the research, personally identifiable information will not be shared unless you provide specific permission below. Participants will be able to review transcripts of their interviews as well as review their participation on a final summary of their participation in this study; you may make changes to the authorizations below after reviewing these materials, as well as at any other time during your participation in this study.

Each interviewee will be assigned a pseudonym that disguises her or his real identity. All transcripts and subsequent coding, written description, analysis, and publications will use this assigned pseudonym.

Please choose among the following sets of options:

___ I **authorize** the researcher to directly quote portions of my interviews in publications/presentations.

___ I **do not authorize** the researcher to directly quote portions of my interviews in publications/presentations.

___ I **authorize** the researcher to identify my academic discipline or field in her writing.

___ I **do not authorize** the researcher to identify my academic discipline or field in her writing.

___ I **authorize** the researcher to identify me by name in light of my published writing(s) regarding public scholarship.

___ I **do not authorize** the researcher to identify me by name in light of my published writing(s) regarding public scholarship.

6. **Right to Ask Questions:** Please contact Jennifer Domagal-Goldman at [Phone #] with questions, complaints, or concerns about this research.

7. **Voluntary Participation:** Your decision to be in this research is voluntary. You can stop at any time. You do not have to answer any questions you do not want to answer. Refusal to take part in or withdrawing from this study will involve no penalty or loss of benefits you would receive otherwise.

You must be 18 years of age or older to consent to take part in this research study and be a member of the Penn State Public Scholarship Associates. If you agree to take part in this research study and the information outlined above, please sign your name and indicate the date below. Signing this form below acknowledges that you read and understand the information in this form and consent to take part in this research project. You will receive a copy of this form for your records and future reference.

Many thanks for your time and participation!

Participant Signature for **Interviews:** ___________________________ Date: ____________
Researcher Signature for **Interviews:** ___________________________ Date: ____________

Participant Signature for **Observations:** ___________________________ Date: ____________
Researcher Signature for **Observations:** ___________________________ Date: ____________
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FACULTY DATA FORM

Research Study:  Teaching for Civic Capacity & Engagement: How Faculty Members Align Teaching with Purpose
Investigator:  Jennifer M. Domagal-Goldman

All answers will remain confidential. Only Jennifer Domagal-Goldman will have access to this information. Your answers will be used only for the purposes of this study. Answer only those questions you feel comfortable answering.

Name: ________________________________________________________________

Faculty Title: __________________________________________________________

___ Tenured  ___ Tenure-Track, non-tenured  ___ Instructor/Adjunct/Non-tenure track

Penn State Campus: _____________________________________________________

Penn State College: _____________________________________________________

Department/Program: ___________________________________________________

Administrative Responsibilities (if any):

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

Please list all undergraduate courses you’ve taught in which you incorporate public scholarship or civic engagement.

Course Name & Number: ______________________________________________________________________

Term Taught (e.g., Spring 2006): ______________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX F:  
FACULTY INTERVIEW GUIDE  
[INTERVIEW #1: CONTENT]  

CONTENT: Educational background, prior discipline-related work experience, religious/political beliefs, view of academic discipline/field, beliefs about educational purpose

Preliminary Interview Questions

As you know, I’m interested in exploring how faculty plan and teach undergraduate courses that incorporate civic engagement, public scholarship, service-learning, etc. Can you tell me about courses you’ve taught in the last year or so that do this?

For example, what were your goals for students in the course? Why?
  Probes:
  • Course title and code
  • Required course for students in your program? Gen ed?
Is this a course you’ve taught before? Have you always incorporated ps/ce in it? Have you changed anything about the course? Are there still parts of the course you would change?
Would you teach the course differently now? Why?
  Probes:
  • Determine how faculty member defines public scholarship, civic engagement, civic capacity, etc. in context of courses taught.
Let’s talk a bit about how you got involved in doing this type of teaching?
  Probes:
  • What motivates your interest in public scholarship?
  • How does it relate to your discipline? Are others in your field of study interested in civic engagement/public scholarship? Do you interact with others outside Penn State regarding civic engagement or public scholarship?
  • How aware and supportive is your department of your public scholarship/civic engagement efforts (teaching/research/service)? How supportive do you think the College of XX is of such efforts?
  • Do you have work experience outside of academe that is related to your discipline/field? Do these influence your teaching in any way? How?
Tell me about your educational background. Were you interested in civic engagement/public scholarship issues as an undergraduate? In graduate school? What was the source or catalyst for that interest?
  Probes:
  • Did you have any formal training in teaching? What kind? What was the focus?
  • Would you say you have a philosophy of teaching? How would you describe it? Where did it come from? Has it changed over time? Why?
  • Where does civic engagement/public scholarship fit into your educational philosophy? Where does it fit in your work in general? In your life outside of the university?
APPENDIX G:

FACULTY INTERVIEW GUIDE
[INTERVIEW #2: CONTEXT]

CONTEXT: student characteristics, student goals, pragmatic factors (available textbooks, class size, time of day…), external influences (discipline, accreditation requirements…), teaching & learning lit., campus advice, facilities, opportunities & assistance (Schreyer Center for Teaching, course development grants…), program and college goals, other influences (institutional mission, PSA…).

Interview Questions
During our last interview we focused on how you got involved in teaching public scholarship. We focused mostly on your personal characteristics and experiences. Today, I’d like us to explore institutional, disciplinary, and other influences on your teaching.

A lot of people think that civic engagement is important but they don’t necessarily do it in their classrooms. Penn State is a land-grant institution so theoretically this type of work is part of our mission. Yet not everyone is doing this work. Are there particular things about this place that you feel enable you to do this work? Are there factors that are barriers or that constrain your work?

Probe for information on department context, college context, institutional context, disciplinary context, accreditation, and other contextual influences listed above.

- Changes over time in the influence of any of these elements?
- Do your department colleagues know about your public scholarship work?
- Have you ever presented any of your public scholarship work at a conference?

What role, if any, do you see the Public Scholarship group on campus playing on your course planning and/or teaching?

Probes:

- Does your public scholarship-related research and/or service inform your teaching? How?
- Have you found any of the PSA events particularly informative or helpful to your teaching?
- Have you benefited from meeting colleagues across the university? How?
- Have your ideas about education and teaching changed at all as a result of your participation in this group? How?
- Have your ideas about research and/or service changed? How?
- What about your understanding of your discipline? Is there support for public scholarship in your discipline?
FORM: Goals (learning outcomes, purpose), Content, Sequence, Instruction (pedagogy)

Interview Questions

During our last two conversations together we’ve talked about influences on your course planning. Today I’d like us to focus on actual courses you’ve taught.

Tell me about how you integrate civic engagement/public scholarship into your classes. If you do this in more than one class, let’s discuss them one at a time.

Probes:

- Is this an overarching goal for your courses or something you concentrate on for only one or two class sessions? Do you communicate this goal to students? How? Does it depend on the level of the course (e.g., first-year, senior capstone)?
- What do you do in your courses that is specifically related to public scholarship? Do you use this term with your students? Do you think the students get it?
- What’s the relationship between your public scholarship/civic engagement learning goals for students and your content/disciplinary goals? Do you think that incorporating public scholarship/civic engagement positively influences student content learning?
- Do you think about public scholarship and civic engagement in your courses more in terms of the way you teach (pedagogy) or what you teach (content)? Both?
- Have you used service-learning in your course before? Can you share an example with me?
- How do you assess students’ civic capacity/engagement/public scholarship?

One of my goals is to help encourage other faculty members to do this kind of work. How would you do this? What kinds of supports would you put in place?

Is there anything else that I should have asked you about your courses or your work in general? Is there anything else we should be talking about?

[Show interviewee the conceptual framework for the study.] This framework has helped me develop the questions I’ve asked you during our three interviews. I’d like to know if you think anything is missing. Are there other things that you feel influence the way you plan and teach courses that involve civic engagement/public scholarship?
Hello [INSERT PARTICIPANT NAME],

As you may recall, I interviewed you for a study on teaching public scholarship during the 2007-08 academic year. As promised, I have attached a draft of Chapter 4 for you to review the sections in which you are quoted, paraphrased, or otherwise depicted.

To facilitate your review, I have assigned you the number [INSERT #] and marked those sections of the chapter in which you are quoted or depicted by highlighting this number in parentheses (this number will not be included in the final draft of the dissertation). Also, please note that although I identify Penn State as the research site, I am not identifying participants by name.

Please let me know if you believe I have misrepresented you or your experiences as well as whether you are comfortable with the degree to which I have identified you.

You may provide any comments in a reply email or as comments (e.g., via Word’s “track changes” feature) in the document itself. I can also be reached on my cell phone at [Phone #].

If I do not hear from you by June 1, 2010 I will assume you have no concerns about the draft.

Thank you again for your participation and assistance,

Best,

Jennifer
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