ENGAGING COMMUNITY: ORGANIZING WITHIN THE ACADEMY
FOR SOCIAL CHANGE

Leah Darcey Totten

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the
Department of Communication Studies.

Chapel Hill
2011

Approved by:

Steven K. May

Carole Blair

Sarah Dempsey

William Lachicotte

Dennis Mumby

Lawrence Rosenfeld

ABSTRACT

LEAH DARCEY TOTTEN: Engaging Community: Organizing within the
Academy for Social Change
(under the direction of Steven K. May)

In this study, I explore the challenges, tensions, and opportunities facing a major research-intensive public university related to public service and engaged scholarship as the university system and higher education in general increase emphasis on service and engagement. This project was designed in cooperation with the university's Center for Public Service to help the Center and the university community better understand the challenges, barriers, and opportunities relative to the experiences of undergraduate students and faculty.

Of particular interest are: why university students and faculty do or do not participate in public service; how their perceptions and experiences of public service relate to the institution's rhetoric of public service; the implications for the everyday well-being of the people of the university, as well as the university as a community; and the implications for the university and for the Center as they pursue their missions of service and engagement.

This project was designed as engaged scholarship to assist the Center in developing strategies that increase participation in and support of public service and

engaged scholarship in ways that are more inclusive, democratic, and effective, yet that

acknowledge the conflicts, tensions, and dissent inherent in collective action. Therefore,

this research is based in post-structuralist theory, utilizing reflexive ethnography and

rhetorical analysis methods.

The university faces the same challenge as most of public higher education:

responding to stakeholders' and the public's demands for increased contribution to the

public good while dealing with decreased public funding. The university

administration's historical rhetoric has characterized service as valued and valuable, yet

there is a disconnect between that rhetoric and faculty and students' perceptions of and

experiences with public service and engaged scholarship. Service and engagement have

become contested ground, and the related tension and challenges have implications for

individual, organizational, and community well-being, identity, and agency.

To Laney and Elliot, my favorite Tar Heels

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Without the assistance and support of a great number of people, I would never have completed my program of study, much less this dissertation. It is the product of much mental and social communion. Thanks first and foremost to Steven K. May, my advisor since the beginning of my master's work, for his diligence, great mind, mentoring, and patience. I owe a debt of gratitude to Lynn Blanchard, Mike Smith, and the staff of the Carolina Center for Public Service for their time, collaboration, and perseverance. Thanks also to my committee—Carole Blair, Sarah Dempsey, Bill Lachicotte, Dennis Mumby, and Lawrence Rosenfeld—for excellent instruction, challenging questions, and thoughtful critiques. Bill Balthrop, Robbie Cox, Della Pollock, and Julia T. Wood all have my deepest appreciation for helping shape my thinking in general and the early stages of this project in particular. My fellow graduate students set a high bar with their own work and were supportive in so many ways to help me reach it, particularly Jennifer Mease, Billie Murray, and Stace Treat. Many thanks to Vilma Berg and Gayle Henry for all they've done to improve life as a graduate student, whether it required cheerleading, chocolate, or comfy chairs.

My deepest gratitude goes to my parents, Doris and Robert Craft, for their never-ending support, and to my children, Laney and Elliot, who have sacrificed so much on behalf of my work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Terms

Academic unit: Any department, school, or college within the university's division of academic affairs

Academic unit head: The administrative head of any department, school, or college

Carolina Center for Public Service (CCPS): The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill organization charged with strengthening and supporting participation in public service and engaged scholarship

Core disciplines: Economics, English, foreign languages, and mathematics; disciplines identified as having a high percentage of undergraduate courses to meet the needs of the General College or of other undergraduate majors

General Administration: The office of the President of the North Carolina state university system, of which the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill is one of 16 universities

Humanities disciplines: American studies, communication studies, comparative literature, human sexuality studies, Jewish studies, philosophy, and religious studies.

Program: Any faculty-related research center, institute, or program

Physical and natural sciences disciplines: Biology, chemistry, computer sciences, geography, geology, and physics

Social sciences disciplines: Business, education, folk lore, history, journalism/mass communication, political science, social work, and sociology

Studies program: Any curricular education-related program or minor-only academic unit, such as the American studies program

UNC Tomorrow: An initiative of the University of North Carolina General

      Administration to increase service to and engagement with the state by state

      universities

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In this study, I explore the challenges, tensions, and opportunities facing the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill related to public service and engaged scholarship as the university system and higher education in general increase emphasis on service to and engagement with the public. This project was designed in cooperation with the Carolina Center for Public Service to help the Center and the university administration better understand the challenges, barriers, and opportunities relative to the experiences of undergraduate students and faculty.   The university's Carolina Center for Public Service is charged with ensuring that the university achieves its public service and engagement mission, which is to improve the well-being of North Carolina and its people. The Center's tasks include facilitating and fostering participation in public service and engaged scholarship, generally defined as a form of inquiry in which academic researchers collaborate with practitioners or communities in ways that benefit the practitioners or communities as well as generating knowledge. Part of the Center's task is to improve the outcomes of such work so as to benefit the people of the state.

Of particular interest are: why university students and faculty do or do not participate in public service; how their perceptions and experiences of public service relate to the institution's rhetoric of public service; the implications for the everyday well-being of the people of the university, as well as the university as a community; and

the implications for the university and for the Center as they pursue their missions of service and engagement.

The university faces the same challenge as most of public higher education: responding to stakeholders' and the public's demands for increased contribution to the public good while dealing with decreased public funding. The university administration's historical rhetoric has characterized service as valued and valuable, yet there is a disconnect between that rhetoric and faculty and students' perceptions of and experiences with public service and engaged scholarship. Service and engagement have become contested ground, and the related tension and challenges have implications for individual, organizational, and community well-being, identity, and agency.

The ultimate goal of this research is to improve the everyday lives of the people of the university, as well as the people of the state who might benefit from the efforts of the people of the university. This research was a form of engaged scholarship—a collaborative inquiry project of myself (the researcher) and the practitioners at CCPS to leverage knowledge from multiple perspectives, generate new discoveries, and help the Carolina Center for Public Service develop strategies that increase participation in and support of public service and engaged scholarship in ways that are more inclusive, democratic, and effective, yet that acknowledge the conflicts, tensions, and dissent inherent in collective action. The project is grounded in a post-structuralist theoretical foundation from an organizational studies perspective, utilizing qualitative and rhetorical analysis methods.

The Need for Change

The need is clear for interventions that effect social change, and higher education in general, its stakeholders and funders, and the public have called on higher education institutions to contribute more to the public good. Many public universities are placing a growing emphasis on public service and engaged scholarship as a mode of intervention. While the greater context of this phenomenon is discussed in chapter 2, Saltmarsh and Gelmon (2006) summarize the primary institutional factors related to this growing emphasis. First, universities have sought to reclaim the civic responsibilities inherent in many university mission statements. Second, institutions have increased incorporation of service learning into curricula, partly as an effort to develop student civic-mindedness and partly to improve the effectiveness of teaching and quality of learning. Third, faculty researchers have placed increased emphasis on experience as a form of knowledge and creation of "new knowledge that addresses the social challenges of the 21st century" (p. 30). Higher education institutions have therefore emphasized both experiential learning and the research of lay knowledge and experience related to social challenges.

These imperatives relate to our current age of globalization, technological revolution, economic flux, and social and demographic change, in which many people and communities in the United States are beset by complex threats to their well-being. Entrenched problems such as poverty, racism, and classism persist as well, preventing many people from achieving a healthy and reasonable quality of life while preventing many communities from achieving healthy civic cultures and economies.

In 2005, approximately 13% of all people and 19% of all children in America lived in poverty (Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2006). That same year, the federal poverty

threshold for a family with one adult and one child was $12,400, and the federal minimum wage of $5.15 for a full-time, year-round worker would yield only $10,712 annually. While poverty rates declined markedly from 1993 to 2000, the rates showed a major increase from 2000 to 2006, rising to levels not seen since 1994 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2006).

While some of North Carolina's metropolitan areas continue to grow and are perceived as having strong economic and social health, decennial Census data and related public policy studies show a two-decade trend of decline in the economic well-being and quality of life for rural North Carolinians, an increasing percentage of people in poverty in metropolitan areas, and an increasing gap between rich and poor (MDC, 2004). In 2005, 15% of all people and 21% of all children in the state lived in poverty. There was a lack of complete plumbing in 12,547 peoples' residences; 9,524 peoples' residences had no heat source; and 212,248 people's residences had no telephone access (U.S. Census Bureau, n.d.). Geographically, 10 of North Carolina's 100 counties qualified as "persistently poor" by federal government standards, meaning that at least 20% of each county's population was living in poverty during each decennial census since 1970 (U.S. Department of Agriculture, n.d.).

People living in poverty were twice as likely to be uninsured as those not in poverty (U.S. Census Bureau, n.d.). State health statistics reflect that poverty: 12% of children have no health insurance, compared to 11.2 % of children in the U.S. (Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2006). The National Institutes of Health argues that an inability to afford medical care contributes to the state's disproportionate share of cancer deaths—

3% of all cancer deaths in the country in 2003, though we had 2.8% of the country's population (North Carolina State Center for Health Statistics, 2004).

In terms of education, North Carolina ranked 40th in the country in high school diploma attainment, and below the national average in bachelor's degree attainment, with only one in four adults age 25 or older having earned a bachelor's degree. Approximately 985,000 adults age 25 or older have not completed high school; approximately 353,000 of those have not completed 9th grade (U.S. Census Bureau, 2006).

The Service Mission of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

In this complex situation, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill takes on the task of fostering individual, community, and state well-being, with service as a stated part of its mission. The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill is the oldest public university in the United States to open its doors, chartered in 1789 with a mandate "to consult the happiness of a rising generation, and endeavor to fit them for an honourable discharge of the social duties of life, by paying strictest attention to their education" (as quoted by Carolina Center for Public Service, "The Public Service Scholars Program," n.d.). "Social duties" has been interpreted to include civic engagement, given that legislators were concerned with creating a new republic that would be ruled by the citizenry instead of a monarch, and an involved and educated citizenry was their goal (Powell, 1972).

Edward Kidder Graham, UNC-Chapel Hill's President from 1913 to 1918, made this implied mission explicit when he enjoined the people of the state to "Write to the university when you need help" (Didow, 1999). The state was still recovering from the

Civil War, and Graham promoted a culture in which the university considered the state

and its problems to be legitimate fields of inquiry, study, and service. This culture was

reinforced during the post-World War II progressive era by William Friday during his

tenure as the state university system's president from 1956 to 1986. Beginning in 1991,

the university's faculty/staff Public Service Roundtable explored ways of increasing

public service work and scholarship. Michael Hooker, Chancellor from 1995 to 1999,

formalized the university's commitment to being a service institution, as reflected in

UNC-Chapel Hill's mission statement:

> The mission of the University is to serve all the people of the State, and indeed
> the nation, as a center for scholarship and creative endeavor. The University exists
> to teach students at all levels in an environment of research, free inquiry, and
> personal responsibility; to expand the body of knowledge; to improve the
> condition of human life through service and publication; and to enrich our culture.
> (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, "University Mission," n.d.)

Chancellor Hooker's and the Roundtable's work eventually resulted in the

establishment of the Carolina Center for Public Service (CCPS) in 1999. The Carolina

Center for Public Service is charged with leading the university's service to the people of

the state. It functions as a social change organization within the university and for the

state. Its mission is to: strengthen the university community's orientation toward service

to and engagement with the state, increase the university community's participation in

service to and engagement with the state, and improve the well-being of the people of

North Carolina through the university community's public service and engagement.

The Problem: Public Service and Engaged Scholarship as Contested Ground

Higher education is caught in a difficult position: facing decreased financial

support from federal and state governments, along with greater demand for contributions

to the public good. Higher education, in general, is placing increasing emphasis on

intervening in social problems as a primary mode of public service, as are the governing, legislative, and funding bodies to which universities are accountable. While higher education institutions attempt to publicize their current contributions to social well-being and strategize for increasing such efforts, public service and engaged scholarship are receiving more and more attention internally and externally (Saltmarsh & Gelmon, 2006). One of the challenges related to transforming service and engagement at universities, including UNC-Chapel Hill, is how the terms are defined and operationalized, and the implications for students and faculty, and for their participation.

In late 2006, the center formally defined the terms "public service" and "engaged scholarship" to guide its work:

> Public service is the application of knowledge, skills and resources for the common good. Engagement is public service that occurs in reciprocal and mutually beneficial partnerships between the university and the community. (L. Blanchard, personal communication, December 12, 2006)

By the end of 2008, the definitions had become more layered and specific, with "engagement" now defined as well:

- *Engagement* is public service that occurs in reciprocal and mutually beneficial partnerships between the university and the community.
- *Public service* is the application of knowledge, skills and resources for the common good.
- *Engaged scholarship*, while fully grounded as disciplined inquiry according to the highest academic standards, strengthens university-community relationships and contributes to the common good. (Carolina Center for Public Service, "About Engagement," emphasis in the original, n.d.)

The Carolina Center for Public Service's definitions are intended to focus its work to involve the university community in public service and engaged scholarship, as well as to change university culture to reflect a consistent understanding of public service and engaged scholarship.

But the university's culture is not a blank slate onto which this particular understanding of public service can be inscribed. The center functions in a context where the university has rhetorically constructed and maintained an official public memory of public service as valued and valuable, which is certainly in line with the center's mission. According to Bodnar (1992), official public memory normalizes a particular understanding of the past to serve political and disciplining functions in the present and future. However, the problem is that there is a disconnect between this official public memory and the faculty and students' perceptions of and experiences with public service. The Carolina Center for Public Service has found little consensus on the definition of public service in the university community beyond the university administration. The Center's staff contends that the lack of agreement around the concept of public service prevents discussion of, and participation in, service to address public problems, and these tensions and challenges are more problematic as the pressure increases to participate, to serve, and to engage.

The appearance of consensus, however, masks the fact that public problems are by nature political problems. The institution's dominant voices define what constitutes a public problem, determine which problems are worthy of intervention and what that intervention should be, who should conduct it, what literal and figurative costs are allowable or required, and what counts as success. Dissenting and marginalized voices are silenced, and some avenues for action are closed off, limiting the possibilities for individual and collective agency.

Within the university community, issues of contention include what counts as public service and engaged scholarship, what kinds of action are valued, how it is

incentivized or dis-incentivized, the personal and professional costs of participating or not participating, and how service and engaged scholarship fit into student and faculty careers. Whether and how these issues are resolved has significant implications for the Center and for the university as an institution. Perhaps more importantly, it has significant implications for students, faculty, the community within the university, and the people of North Carolina.

For the CCPS, its ability to achieve its mission of change within the university and progress for people of the state hinges on its ability to garner participation by students and faculty in public service and engaged scholarship. Its ability to maintain support by the university administration is tied to its ability to achieve its mission, and to do so in a way that that does not create or exacerbate negative perceptions of the university and its administration.

For the university, its ability to achieve its mission of public service relies on participation by faculty and students as well. Yet, whether and how it achieves that mission have implications within and outside the university. Not only must it maintain the support of its governing bodies, it must also maintain a favorable reputation among the people of the state. The university also has to consider its reputation among peer institutions nationally and the other universities of the state's public higher education system relative to garnering resources, including future students, top faculty, and funding. Last but by no means least, it seeks to maintain institutional neutrality while protecting the academic freedom of those engaged in scholarship that often is neither politically nor socially neutral.

Internally, the increasing emphasis on public service and engaged scholarship has resulted in conflict between and among disciplines with different definitions of service and that place a different value on service. These conflicts can be traced back to epistemological and ontological differences, yet the every-day implications are far beyond such academic debate: disciplines that meet administrative priorities in terms of the kind and quality of service and engagement rendered may be privileged internally.

The implications of the disconnect between the official memory of public service as valued and valuable and the everyday experience with and perception of public service may be most significant for faculty. As instructors, faculty must meet the increasing demand for service learning, which has been formally incorporated into the undergraduate curriculum as one of the options in the "experiential education requirement." Here again, what counts as "service" is under debate. For faculty members, research agendas, academic freedom, funding availability, and internal resource availability (from laboratory time to research assistant assignments to seed grants) affect how departments and administrators evaluate a scholar's work.

As scholars, faculty must also negotiate any conflicts or differences between the kinds of work the university values and the kind of work their disciplines value, since what the discipline values is what gets published but what the university values determines rank, salary, and resources. The university's emphasis on service could, therefore, create a catch-22 by affecting the ability of its faculty to generate publishable research while affecting the ability of those faculties to earn tenure if their publication record is not acceptable. In terms of potential future implications, if the university decides to include a public service or engaged scholarship requirement as an aspect of

10

tenure review, faculty who choose not to participate or whose departments or disciplines place little value on service may find themselves at a distinct disadvantage in tenure and promotion reviews.

For students, the ability to participate in public service is affected by the availability of service learning courses in their majors, the service-related organizations that are available to them, and their personal resources in terms of time and money. Students who must work to pay their expenses have less available time and money to invest in public service work in or out of class. Organizations with a public service component may also have membership fees, such as Greek organizations, or may depend on university approval of their goals to receive university funding. Public service is a component of a number of scholarships, housing opportunities in themed dormitories, and honors awards, affecting student opportunities in the present. It is also a major mode of social networking and a section of most future résumés, affecting student opportunities in the future.

Finally, and just as importantly, the state of service and engagement in a public university has implications for the people of the state. First, the quality of education that students receive and their level of commitment to active participation in civic life will have a profound effect on the future well-being of the state and its people. Second, the university's ability to provide technical assistance, knowledge, person-power, and other resources in the forms of public service and engaged scholarship may have a profound effect on the immediate and future well-being of the state and its people. These two implications bring this study back to the contention that public service and engaged scholarship are inherently political, because dominant voices determines what is defined

as a public problem, what interventions are deemed appropriate and worthy, what resources are made available, who benefits, and in what way.

Therefore, in this study I explore the challenges, tensions, and opportunities faced by a public university with a commitment to public service as it is in the process of attempting to increase participation in public service and engaged scholarship. This study is designed as an engaged scholarship project to assist the CCPS and the university in achieving their goals while increasing their capacity to do so in ways that are more inclusive of, and give greater voice and agency to, the people of the university community. It will do so by giving insight into why people do and do not participate in public service and engaged scholarship, examining how their behaviors relate to their perceptions of and experiences with service and engagement and its rhetorical construction by the university, and determining the implications of these findings for the university as a community.

Rationale

The University of North Carolina's public service mission reflects a growing national trend in higher education, as evidenced by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching's establishment of its first elective classification, Community Engagement Institutions, in April 2006. In Carnegie's invitation to apply for this elective classification, the foundation's director of classification characterized the Community Engagement classification as "a significant affirmation of the importance of community engagement in the agenda of higher education" (Carnegie Foundation, 2006a). The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill was one of 62 institutions to achieve the highest program classification: Curricular Engagement and Outreach & Partnerships

(Carnegie Foundation, 2006b), announced in December 2006. The university's high level of classification is a laudatory accomplishment, but given Carnegie's critique that all institutions needed to improve collaboration and engagement with communities, the classification does not mean that it is flawless in its public service and engaged scholarship work.

The Carolina Center for Public Service, in its commitment to increase participation in public service and engaged scholarship within the university community, faces some significant challenges that reflect society at large and greater social concerns. First, neo-liberalism and globalization have resulted in federal and state governments reframing social and human welfare services as the responsibility of other sectors and institutions, as well as privatizing, minimizing, or eliminating such services (Petersen, Barns, Dudley, & Harris, 1999). A better understanding of the processes and implications of participation in service and engagement are increasingly important, given that the public university functions as an ideological state apparatus (Althusser, 1978), wherein ideologies of the state are reproduced and normalized.

Second, we have little understanding of the ways in which people actually participate in civic life and their motivations for and barriers to contributing to the public good *in the present*. Much of the scholarly literature tells us how they were practiced *in the past* or gives prescriptions for how they should be practiced, but not how they actually are practiced in the present. To theorize participation in civic life and public service and engaged scholarship better from a communicative perspective, and to increase the potential for application of those theories to facilitate progressive social change, it is necessary first to understand how they are currently being practiced. While

the scholarly literature has much to offer regarding the study of social change, a number of concepts theorized through prescriptive, normative perspectives have inhibited or misdirected our understanding of social change (see literature review for specific examples) and its implications for the people, communities, and institutions involved.

Communication Studies and Social Change

Communication Studies has a significant role to play in addressing this problem. For example, Flanagin, Stohl, and Bimber (2006) contend that participation, civic engagement, and organizing form and mode have not been adequately theorized in collective action literature and do not reflect the current reality. They use a communicative approach to resolve the problem and develop a new model for understanding collective action as it is currently practiced. Given the particularly messy and difficult nature of social change efforts (Papa, Singhal, & Papa, 2005), and given the differences in contexts and problems to be addressed, theorizing a range of organizing modes—and understanding how organizing is actually happening—are critical. This example illustrates the potential value of my research to address a number of the current tensions in social change and organizational studies theories and concepts related to civic engagement and public service such as: the role of context in theorizing social change; conceptions of community; and the modes of, and barriers to, participation in social change efforts.

The latter two concerns relate directly to this study's design as engaged scholarship and to the third significant challenge faced by the CCPS, which is not addressed in the literature on social change and civic participation: What barriers to participation do people experience that cause them not to engage in public service and

social change efforts? How do the barriers relate to and affect community itself, the context of such efforts? With its foundations in political science and sociology, civic participation literature is rife with claims that people should feel a sense of duty to community that motivates them to be civically involved to ensure community well-being (Skocpol & Fiorina, 1999). In addition, prescriptions for consensus-based civic participation and utopian models of community prevent our understanding of community and social change by ignoring the realities of dissent and difference (Rothenbuhler, 2001). Such prescriptive, normative assumptions have framed public service, civic participation, and community in ways that limit what is researched and how we understand the results of that research.

The issues above are not just concerns for the CCPS or other university service and engagement programs, but also challenges for social change organizations and society in general. The Carolina Center for Public Service represents the university's administrative unit for service and engagement, putting it in a particular role with particular expectations from the community. It is competing for awareness in a complex environment, negotiating the multiple meanings of service and engagement held by different constituents, some of which are in conflict. It is in competition and partnership with other university programs and organizations focusing on a wide variety of social change projects and in competition for a variety of limited resources.

It is also attempting to shift the university culture toward a stronger service and engagement orientation which involves not only student, faculty, and staff attitudes, but also their time, attention and effort, which places it in tension with a range of forces from academic to social to athletic. It is a small organization that has had a significant impact

on, and presence within, the university; however, it provides an excellent case study of a social change organization and the realities of civic participation as well as the intersections of organizational rhetoric, social change, and the implications for community.

Organizational Communication and Social Change

In his 1998 International Communication Association Presidential address, Peter Monge called for organizational communication studies "to expand its horizons beyond large profit-making corporations and examine not-for-profit organizations, nongovernmental organizations, international labor unions, worker collectives, and even the worldwide influence of religious organizations" (p. 150). Organizational communication scholars have paid heed to the call, and the scholarship of such organizations and organizing has increased dramatically over the past decade. The discipline as a whole has made such strides in establishing itself as a legitimate and scholarly area of endeavor and in broadening its focus of relevant issues that scholars have called on their peers to increase their work on addressing social issues as they relate to organizations and organizing (Krone & Harter, 2007). Given that organizational rhetoric is "the creative process by which we enable shared grounds for action" (Hartelius & Browning, 2008, p. 23), it is necessary to study the effects and effectiveness of that process.

This study seeks to increase the knowledge within organizational communication studies about the interpretation of organizational rhetoric by the organization's constituents; the implications for those constituents; the implications for organizing for social change; and the realities of current modes of civic participation. These goals

16

reflect a set of central problematics addressed in social change and organizational communication studies. First, Cheney and McMillan (1990) argue for organizational communication studies to consider how dominant institutions—primarily defined by them as private corporations—affect public discourse. I argue that to develop a better understanding of how to foster and promote a more humane and democratic society with balanced market and social sectors, we also must consider the civil society sector and its social change organizations as a balancing force in shaping public discourse and public values, as well as public behavior and action for the common good.

Within organizational communication studies, scholars have proposed research agendas that relate to social change organizations, the civil society sector, and their function and practices within society—proposed research that this study incorporates. First, Lewis (2005) calls for empirical research and theory development in the civil society sector in general and notes the need to understand better how "organizations enable, ignite, and provide conduits for social capital within a community" (p. 246). The Carolina Center for Public Service's goal is to do exactly that: increase the state's social capital by providing the opportunity and motivation for community members to become engaged in collective work to improve individual and collective well-being. As "networks of cooperation and collaboration that exist in a community or region" (Smith, 2003, p. 37), social capital is essential to society's well-being, and it produces and is produced by people organizing "around causes and mutual interests" (Lewis, p. 245). This study should, therefore, increase our understanding of the process of building networks of cooperation and collaboration, particularly what inhibits or motivates individual participation.

Second, Finet (2001) makes a similar call for more research in organizational communication that analyzes "the embeddedness of organizations in complex and dynamic sociopolitical environments, and the reciprocal influences of each upon the other" (p. 270). The university and the CCPS are organizations working to improve the common weal while embedded in specific contexts that influence the ability to achieve their goals. This study situates the university within the greater sociopolitical environment of higher education, the nation, and state. In addition, by situating the CCPS in the sociopolitical environment of the context and rhetoric of service and engagement at UNC-Chapel Hill, this study explores the reciprocal influences of that context upon the CCPS and the CCPS's possible influence upon that context.

Third, I share Asen's (2004) contends that to achieve social change, it is critical that we understand how participation in civic life is enacted without a priori assumptions about how we think it is or ought to be enacted. My research is driven by questions about how social change organizations work to overcome social and economic problems in order to improve people's daily lives. These questions come from my desire to make a difference through working with people engaged in social change to help them figure out how to achieve their goals, but they also come from my personal commitment to my home state and alma mater. I've lived my whole life in North Carolina, and I never wanted to go to school anywhere but UNC-Chapel Hill. I believed Charles Kuralt when he said it was "the people's university" (which is still true though ironic given some of the findings of this study relative to that specific phrase), and I believed Bill Friday when he said the university system's highest calling is to serve the people of the state and improve their well-being.

Two degrees later and after more than nine years of studying and five years of teaching at UNC-Chapel Hill, I believe it as much as ever because it resonates with my own values. But I also have a much more complex understanding of what it means for an organization to fulfill such a calling, and the importance of it in a state where one of every five children lives in poverty (Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2006). The people of this state face significant challenges to their well-being, and the people's university still struggles to fulfill its mission to address those needs. As an engaged scholar, the question for me is not "How do you study something you love?" but rather "How can you not?"

Social Change in Everyday Life

While social change can occur in many ways, I choose to focus on collective action at the local level as a means of change due to my primary interest in people's everyday lived experiences as they relate to individual and community well-being. While top-down modes of change such as public policy eventually have effects on everyday life, I contend that community-based change efforts have a more direct impact on both individuals and the collective of a community. The processes and results of service and engagement are enacted at the individual and local level and have implications for individual and community experience. It is therefore critical to investigate how such efforts contribute to or prevent a more democratic and humane society and the implications for voice and agency, in terms of the process of the change effort as well as its outcomes.

This research draws on post-structuralist theories, primarily de Certeau's (1984) work on everyday experience of dominant structures and the implications for agency and

context. de Certeau contends that societal structures, such as the historical rhetoric of public service at UNC-Chapel-Hill, have intended as well as unintended effects: regardless of the intended effects, what the audience members make of and do with the rhetoric is of greater importance.

From this perspective, the rhetoric of service and engagement at UNC-Chapel Hill is dominant but not totalizing or fixed. In their everyday practices, people must make sense of and negotiate the intended and unintended effects of such a disciplining structure but are also able to subvert, get around, and overcome it. The focus is on agency: people such as the faculty and staff are not just passive consumers/subjects of disciplining discourses and practices, but rather users who produce their own understandings of, and modes for, negotiating the effects of those structures and practices. Therefore, to understand how public service functions at UNC-Chapel Hill, it is necessary to understand the rhetorical practice through which it is normalized, as well as the multiple and potentially conflicting ways in which it is made sense of and experienced by members of the university community.

The implications of the rhetoric of public service for people's everyday lives are a primary concern, given the personal and social tensions it may generate. Post-structuralist theories, including de Certeau's work, hold that an individual is comprised of multiple and possibly conflicting tensions and knowledge claims, resulting in differing and possibly conflicting interpretations for an individual as well as among a collective. By acknowledging the reality of difference, conflict, and potential dissensus in a collective, this theoretical perspective overcomes the problematic assumptions of commonality and consensus in much communication studies literature on social change

and community and opens up space for dissenting and marginalized voices, along with increased opportunities for individual and collective agency.

In addition, de Certeau argues that people are corporeal beings present in the physical world, entrenched in the material practices and structures of their society—working, playing, creating, and living as parts of the material systems of society. Social change efforts such as the CCPS is undertaking are inextricably intertwined with their material and social contexts and consequences—embodiment, geography, and economy can be as important as modes and means of communicating when attempting to engage people in social change work (Totten, 2004). To take into account all the motivations for, and barriers to, public service and engaged scholarship, it is necessary to reintegrate the social with the corporeal and material.

Community, the material and social context of the everyday, affects and is affected by dominant institutional and social structures. de Certeau's (1984) concepts of place and space provide ways for us to think about context as the phenomenon known as "community" and the possibilities for agency and change. He theorizes place to be the stable, fixed, distinct location ruled by "the proper" (p. 117), that which is normalized as appropriate, whereas space is open and negotiable. The instantiation of a particular concept of public service creates a formal place as it privileges a particular understanding and practice of public service. In doing so, it also marginalizes all other concepts and attempting to foreclose the possibilities of conflict, dissent, and change. However, the possibility for change is found in community as space—the unfixed and unruly, open and negotiable—where multiple and conflicting interpretations can open up the dominant social structure to question and change.

21

As an engaged scholarship project, this research privileges neither scientific knowledge nor the official public instantiation of public service but rather the knowledge of people working within and seeking to effect change in that instantiation. de Certeau (1984) contends that any "text" is open to interpretation by the reader and may have intended and/or unintended consequences. It is necessary to analyze how the meanings of and meanings *made* of a text shift relative to certain variables, including the perspectives of the audience or reader (Petersen et al., 1999). The researcher must use a variety of perspectives and methods to create a multifaceted and possibly even contradictory interpretation of a text or discourse. Therefore, this study is comprised of a rhetorical critique of the university administration's rhetoric of public service and engagement as well as a reflexive ethnography of how UNC-Chapel Hill faculty and undergraduates interpret and re-articulate that rhetoric, and how they make sense of and experience public service and engagement, and the implications in their everyday lives.

CHAPTER 2

ORGANIZING WITHIN THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY
FOR SOCIAL CHANGE

While social change can occur in many ways, this study focuses on organizing

collective action at the local level as a means of change. My primary interest is in

people's everyday lived experiences as they relate to individual and community well-

being, particularly issues of agency and voice. While many modes of change eventually

have effects on everyday life, I contend that community-level organizing efforts have a

more direct, immediate impact on both individuals and the collective of a community.

The processes and results of civic participation are enacted at the individual and local

level and have implications for individual and community experience within everyday

life. It is therefore critical to investigate how such efforts contribute to, or prevent,

individual and community well-being, agency, and voice in terms of the process of the

organizing effort as well as its outcomes.

This approach diverges from the majority of the debate over the role of higher

education in society, which generally positions service and engagement as a means to an

end: strengthening democracy (Kezar, Chambers, & Burkhardt, 2005). The logic is

generally that an educated, engaged citizenry is achieved through public service, and the

citizenry will contribute to community vitality, which is necessary to a healthy

democracy. Engaged scholarship brings the knowledge of the professoriate to bear on

challenges and barriers to social well-being, again in service of a healthy democracy. This approach, however, assumes that democracy in and of itself is not problematic. It leaves the reality of democracy unexplored, in that it does not always equate with benefits for individual and community well-being, and that the practice of organizing to serve and be engaged can have marginalizing effects. As Hauser and Grim (1994) note, "Democracy is, at best, a reflection of the culture in which it is situated, and it carries the price of permitting the wise and the foolish their say" (p. 1). Therefore, I shift the focus from the goal of a healthy democracy to the goal of individual and community well-being, agency, and voice.

Given that this study is concerned with issues of participation within the academy, I frame the university in and of itself as a community, a geographically bound collective with multiple ties, including but not limited to economy, history, and identity. I also conceptualize the publics served and engaged by the university communities, as do the major related organizations (e.g., The Carnegie Foundation, Campus Compact, The National Center for the Study of Higher Education Engagement) and much of the literature on service and engagement. Through this conceptual framework, I position participation in university-related service and engagement as organizational participation, and organizations as a mechanism of community participation and social change. Finally, I contextualize engaged scholarship and public service as approaches to social change from a communicative perspective. Before a discussion of the relevant literature, it is necessary to situate this project and my approach to social change theoretically.

Theoretical Foundations

This research is grounded in post-structuralist approaches to the individual experience of knowledge, social structures, identity, and agency. There is no single unifying grand theory that encompasses post-structuralism, but post-structuralist philosophers and theorists generally share the following beliefs and assumptions, according to Peterson at al. (1999):

1. Detailed, complex understanding that reflects the possibility of multiple truths and realities replaces essentialist, totalizing, naturalizing, or foundational concepts of truth and reality;

2. Reality is socially, linguistically constructed, and meaning is unstable; therefore, a surplus of meaning characterizes reality and its texts; it is fragmented, diverse, and fluid;

3. Ideology and dominant social structures influence what we perceive reality to be;

4. People are socially and linguistically structured—embodied, multi-faceted, symbol-using beings situated in various cultural or social fields with multiple subject positions; and

5. Since reality and social structures and institutions are constructed and not totalizing, human agency is not foreclosed.

Critics of post-structuralist approaches argue that it is nihilistic dogmatism, given its rejection of foundationalism and resistance to norms and specific goals. In response, Williams (2006) contends post-structuralists "strive to think and act for a better world" (p. 12) not through universal laws of truth and ethics as in Enlightenment and Kantian philosophy, but through flexible guiding principles. The Enlightenment ethic of "reason

in service of freedom" is replaced with the goal of "thought processes to achieve openness," with greater understanding creating the opportunity for progress.

This project is grounded primarily in Michel de Certeau's work on action within structures, the everyday experience of dominant social structures and the implications for agency and context, as well as his work on political voice and participation. de Certeau (1984) offers three "registers" (p. 103), or ways of reading and understanding everyday practice. The material register is the fixed manifestation of dominant powers that people must negotiate on a daily basis, such as the built environment, transportation options, and economic exchange. The imaginary register is how people imagine things to be in their own minds, how they make sense out of and interpret everyday experiences. The symbolic register is the use of common language that both normalizes the fixed manifestations of dominant powers, but also allows the flexibility necessary for the imagination of different interpretations and possibilities.

He uses "the city" as a metaphor to illustrate these registers. The city is a material location, understood and experienced differently from different subject positions, but normalized through language into a proper, fixed place understood in a particular way. But people also temporarily inhabit and move through the city, creating unfixed space— they imagine it differently through the flexibility of language, and they experience it differently in their individual negotiation of it. Their behavior is shaped by the way the place has been laid out, imagined by them, and normalized, but they navigate the city in the way they make sense of it, experiencing it in different ways. They create their own paths through it.

A fourth register is implied but not articulated—systemic/social. Given that people both experience and make sense out of their lives in relationship to others, I extend de Certeau's (1984) registers by making explicit this fourth register as a way of understanding everyday practice within social structures, from how people perceive and experience the material and its symbolic representation to how they perceive and experience systemic/social structures and their symbolic representation. Organizations and social institutions can be seen just like a city, something that we each make sense of and navigate in our own way, as well as in consultation and experience with others.

This helps us to see that while the university may present itself as a cohesive whole, there is no single "Carolina." Potentially conflicting views, conflict itself, and dissensus are masked as unruly space and are normalized into formal place. Some may seek to conform as closely as possible to the public framing of what "Carolina" is and the appropriate ways to experience it, but they still have to make their own way through the university. Others may see the university as something very different from its official presentation as a cohesive whole, with their imagination of different possibilities, and sometimes even with "the university" as nothing more than a stepping stone to the next opportunity.

The Carolina Center for Public Service works to support those who have committed to/created a particular navigable path through the university landscape to serve and be engaged, and helps others begin to navigate a path if they so desire and are in a position to do so. Part of the challenge is that the CCPS has to do so when the social and even institutional map of the university proper is constantly changing. They are themselves "creating a path through space" as they continue to pursue their mission.

de Certeau (1984) contends that societal structures, such as the official public memory of service at UNC-Chapel-Hill, function to organize belief and behavior: "sayings and stories… organize places through the displacements they 'describe' (as a mobile point 'describes' a curve)" (p. 116). But they have intended as well as unintended effects. Regardless of the intended effects, what the audience members make of, do with, and how they function within such structures is of equal importance. However, "the ambiguity of an actualization," (p. 117), how people negotiate and operationalize a structure, is not subject to determinism and offers multiple possibilities for action. From this perspective, the rhetorical characterization of service at UNC-Chapel Hill is a strategy, setting limits and boundaries—dominant—but not totalizing or fixed.

Given that meaning is unstable and people are not passive consumers (de Certeau, 1984), agency is not foreclosed. In their everyday practices, people must make sense of and negotiate the intended and unintended effects of such a disciplining structure but also may be able to subvert, get around, and overcome it. The focus is on the ability to act. People such as the faculty and students are not just passive objects of disciplining stories and practices, but rather users who produce their own understandings of, and modes for, negotiating the effects of those stories and practices.

de Certeau (1998) contends that the possibility to act and speak within the social realm hinges on opportunity as well as ability; dominant social structures such as official public memory can inhibit action and voice, including organizing vernacular voices and stories, leaving people in a situation where the best they can do is make do. Therefore, to understand how service functions at UNC-Chapel Hill, it is necessary to understand the rhetorical practice through which it is normalized, as well as the multiple and potentially

conflicting ways in which it is made sense of and experienced by members of the university community. It is also necessary to examine how student and faculty service and engagement practices align with and diverge from the rhetorical characterization of and normalized practices related to public service and engaged scholarship.

The implications of the rhetorical characterization of service for people's everyday lives are a primary concern, given the personal and social tensions that a normalizing rhetoric may generate. Post-structuralist approaches, including de Certeau's work, hold that an individual is comprised of multiple and possibly conflicting tensions and knowledge claims, resulting in differing and possibly conflicting interpretations for an individual or a collective. By acknowledging the reality of difference, conflict, and potential dissensus in a collective, this theoretical perspective overcomes the problematic assumptions of commonality and consensus in much communication studies literature on social change and community.

In addition, de Certeau (1984) argues that people are corporeal beings present in the physical world, entrenched in the material practices and structures of their society—working, playing, creating, living as parts of the material systems of society. Social change efforts such as public service and engaged scholarship are inextricably intertwined with their material and social contexts and consequences—embodiment, geography, and economy can be as important as modes and means of communicating when attempting to engage people in social change work (Totten, 2004). To take into account all the motivations for and barriers to civic engagement for public service, it is necessary to reintegrate the social with the material.

Post-structuralist approaches reject such dichotomies—social/material, mind/body, reason/experience—as socially constructed and maintained within the given field of social ordering principles (Bourdieu, 1984). Such principles determine what is valued, what is acceptable, and what is "true." Social institutions, such as universities and communities, implement and reinforce these ordering principles or appropriate ways of being and thinking through knowledge statements, policies, and rules (Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1982). As a knowledge statement, a rhetorical characterization maintained by the university functions to reinforce desired beliefs and behaviors related to service and engagement, but it also functions to narrow our ability to understand the realities of, and possibilities for, service and engagement.

de Certeau's (1984) concepts of place and space provide ways for us to think about community—the material and social context of the everyday—and the possibilities for agency and change. He theorizes place to be the stable, fixed, distinct location ruled by "the proper" (p. 117), that which is normalized as appropriate, whereas space is open and negotiable. The instantiation of a particular construction of service and engagement creates a formal place, a *particular* kind of community, as it privileges a particular understanding and practice. As a result, it also marginalizes all other constructions of service and engagement, which forecloses the possibilities of difference, conflict, dissent, and change. However, the possibility for change is found in community as space—the unfixed and unruly, open and negotiable—where multiple and conflicting constructions of service and engagement can open up the dominant construction to question.

As an engaged scholarship project, this research project privileges the knowledge of people experiencing their everyday lives within the dominant structure of the

university, as opposed to scientific knowledge (the researcher's scholarly knowledge). de Certeau (1984) contends that any "text" is open to interpretation by the reader and may have intended and/or unintended consequences. It is necessary to analyze how the meanings of and meanings *made* of a text shift, including the perspectives of the audience or reader (Petersen et al., 1999). The research must incorporate a variety of perspectives or methods to create a multifaceted and possibly even contradictory interpretation of a text. Therefore, this study is comprised of a rhetorical analysis of the university rhetoric of service and engagement, as well as a reflexive ethnography of how the UNC-Chapel Hill community makes sense of and experiences public service and engaged scholarship.

Higher Education and Social Change

Higher education as an institution is part of the context in which every university operates, as is the national sociopolitical context. It is necessary to understand these contexts in order to understand what is happening to and within universities and the implications for students, faculty, and the university community.

Scholars of higher education contend that it has held a social charter to benefit the public good since it was established in the United States, and the charter historically involved educating the citizenry, civic education, research and leadership on addressing social issues, critique of public policy, and economic development. Over time, the focus shifted to individual benefits, and in the 1980s, critics of higher education began to call for reclamation of the broader social charter (Kezar et al., 2005).

Significant economic and political factors were related to the nascence of this trend, particularly for public higher education. After decades of post-World War II social progressivism, neoliberalism emerged in the mid-1970s and became official federal

31

policy in the U.S. with the election of Ronald Regan in 1980. Government down-sizing, reformation or elimination of social support programs, deregulation, recession, and trickle-down economics began to result in more people and communities in need, and fewer and fewer government supports to help them (Martinez & Garcia, 1998). Social interventions were left to the civic and market sectors; the response was the advent of the social entrepreneurism movement (Drayton, 2006) and the corporate social responsibility (Carroll, 1999) movement in the early 1980s, both of which were operationalized in a widespread manner over the next decade (May, Cheney, & Roper, 2007).

State funding for public universities reflected the national economic situation (Kane & Orszag, 2003). Nationally, state appropriations for higher education decreased relative to personal income from 1977 to 2003, with the most significant decrease between 1985 and 1999. State appropriations decreased relative to overall state spending for the same period, in part due to federally mandated state expenditures for Medicaid, which increased by 67% between 1980 and 1998. Justifying state appropriations became a battle over the relevance and impact of higher education. Critics argued, in part, over whether colleges and their faculty members who engaged social problems were progressive social actors or stoking the coals of liberal anarchy, and whether universities were ivory towers or the cradles of a healthy democracy (Kezar et al., 2005).

As appropriations went down, revenue had to come from somewhere. Tuition accounted for an increasing share of university revenue, from 13% in 1977 to approximately 19% in 1997 (Kane & Orszag, 2003). While neoliberalism contributed to turning citizens into just taxpayers, tuition hikes in an atmosphere of "the market rules"

contributed to turning students into consumers demanding a stronger return on their dollar and put universities into a different role with their student bodies.

Most accounts of the current trend of increasing emphasis on service and engagement within higher education pinpoint its origin as the initial coalition of Campus Compact in 1985. The coalition of universities had goals to provide leadership in addressing social problems, to strengthen the civic education and engagement of students, and to strengthen campus-community relations. The original foci were public service and service learning.

In 1988, George H. W. Bush was campaigning for president and institutionalized the laissez-faire approach to dealing with social challenges through his "thousand points of light"—he called on community organizations and individuals to deal with the problems of poverty, homelessness, and drug addiction, given the large federal deficit and limited federal budget. Responsibility for public problems shifted more and more from the government to non-governmental institutions, including universities receiving federal tuition and research support. State budgets momentarily fared better, in that university appropriation cutbacks related to the early 1980s recession were balanced out in the mid-1980s with the subsequent recovery.

Boyer's publication of *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* in 1990 marked another sea change in higher education's response to the increasing demands for higher education to yield a higher impact on society. Boyer highlighted the role of faculty in applied and engaged research, in addition to public service, and he argued that colleges and universities needed to ensure their relevance to the realities of contemporary life and end the old debate of discovery versus teaching. He describes four

types of scholarship recognizing the diversity of contributions that faculty can make, "the scholarship of discovery; the scholarship of integration; the scholarship of application; and the scholarship of teaching" (p. 16). The scholarship of application later became referred to as engaged scholarship in higher education research and higher education in general, given the negative connotations of "applied scholarship" in some disciplines. Regardless, universities now had an additional argument regarding their relevance to the public, and engaged scholarship joined public service and outreach as a public good. Faculty and administrators at UNC-Chapel Hill and other universities took Boyer's arguments to heart and initiated committees and working groups inside of universities, and conferences and workshops between and among universities.

The advent of another recession in the late 1990s resulted in more state appropriation cutbacks for public higher education. However, this round of cutbacks was not balanced out in the subsequent economic recovery (Kane & Orszag, 2003). Instead, state governments began to emphasize performance measurement as a budgetary analysis tool, demanding higher returns on investment and measurement of outcomes. Higher education responded by placing an increasing emphasis on individual benefits related to degree attainment, such as increased earning potential, at the rhetorical expense of making the case for how higher education benefits society at large (Kezar et al., 2005), the outcomes of which are much more difficult to quantify. Pressure increased to demonstrate a public return on the investment of public appropriations, and higher education responded by focusing on its civic responsibility to serve and engage the public.

The public dialogue initiated by the original Campus Compact continued with its 1999 publication of the *Presidents' Declaration on the Civic Responsibility of Higher Education*, reasserting the role of higher education institutions in upholding the original social charter of contributing to the public good. The Carolina Center for Public Service was formally established the same year. In January 2001, the Kellogg Foundation's *Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities* published their vision statement relative to public service, engaged scholarship, and university engagement with the communities they serve (Kellogg Commission, 2001). Just prior to the publication, one of the commission members and statement co-authors, James Moeser, was sworn in as the chancellor of UNC-Chapel Hill.

The year 2001 marked the last high point for state appropriations, as well. The average appropriation of $6,773 per student in 2006-07 reflects a decrease compared to a high of $7,368 in 2000-01, in 2006 dollars (College Board, n.d.). Universities such as Carolina continued to face demands to do more for the public good and less state revenue per student with which to do it.

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching's established its first elective classification, Community Engagement Institutions, in April 2006. In Carnegie's invitation to apply for this elective classification, the foundation's director of classification characterized the Community Engagement classification as "a significant affirmation of the importance of community engagement in the agenda of higher education" (Carnegie Foundation, 2006a). The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill was one of 62 institutions to achieve the highest program classification: Curricular

Engagement and Outreach & Partnerships (Carnegie Foundation, 2006b), announced in December 2006.

Community as Context

Given that university public service and engagement are meant to benefit "community," and that universities are communities themselves, community is both the context for organizing for social change, and the eventual context of the related intervention or assistance. The literature on higher education and the public good, however, does not define community. The discipline of Communication Studies, along with much of the social sciences, has struggled with the concept of community, creating a rich but complex set of perspectives, in complementary as well as contradictory ways. Scholars across and within disciplines have debated what community is, how to achieve it, how to maintain it, how to "fix" it, and how it functions. Fernback (1997) notes that the term community "seems readily definable to the general public but is infinitely complex and amorphous in academic discourse. It has descriptive, normative, and ideological connotations … [and] encompasses both material and symbolic dimensions" (p. 39).

When considered in terms of a geographically bounded location, community takes on a dual meaning: it is both a material place to which people are tied through history, economics, desire, and kinship, as well as performed social relations between and among the people within that material location. "Community is often defined as a place," according to Rothenbuhler (2001), "but investigators are often also implicitly concerned with one of a variety of more abstract definitions of community: Community as place, or as process, institution, interaction, feeling, cognition, structure, or others" (p. 65).

Parsing the difficult concept of community into more readily theorized and researched segments—assuming it is either action or structure—has resulted in an abundance of scholarship with tenuous ties to other scholarship and, in some cases, with no ties at all. This fragmentation is problematic because it prevents a coherent approach to theorizing community and developing effective models for community participation and community change, both subjects of this study.

Although scholars have no single universally agreed-upon definition of "community," most definitions are based on the concept of "community" as a group of people with something in common (Etzioni, 1998; Frazer, 1999; Moemeka, 1998; Rothenbuhler, 2001), or a group that is "aligned around a common interest" (Barksdale, 1998, p. 93). Buber (1958) defines community as a "living togetherness, constantly renewing itself" (p. 135), implying community is defined by sets of relationships, a perspective shared by other scholars (Etzioni, 1998; Frazer, 1999; Moemeka, 1998).

According to Frazer (1999), community members have in common goals, principles, laws, meanings, goods, and structures. These elements are made common through communication and remain that way through communicative relationships. Frazer's inclusion of goods and structures connotes the inescapable materiality of community, socially enacted, as it constitutes and occurs within community, geographically and economically defined. However, her definition excludes communities of identity and communities of affinity, which may exist without explicit laws, goods, or structures. Her definition also assumes a commonality or consensus in meanings and principles, neither of which may be true.

"The enduring importance of locality" (Shepherd & Rothenbuhler, 2001, p. x) remains a theme, implicitly or explicitly, in much of the communication research regarding community. However, Rothenbuhler (2001) argues that communication is a means for the accomplishment of community rather than just a medium of relating to a physical place or information about it: "Communication is the primary mechanism by which ideals become social realities; thus, communication is the major tool for the accomplishment of community" (p. 169-170), and "community is formed in communication" (p. 171). Similarly, Weick contends that people play a "proactive role … in creating our world" (as quoted in Morgan, 1997, p. 141). Creating such systems of *shared* meaning requires processes of communication, and the concept of "creating our world" holds implicitly that these processes of reality construction are ongoing in nature (Morgan, 1997) and require sustained coordination and maintenance.

While these social constructionist approaches share an ontological foundation that privileges communication, they divorce the enactment of community from its context, which is a particular problem when considering social change at the community level. The notion of lived experience *in situ*—be it a physical or virtual context—prompts a reexamination of the assumptions in civic participation research about the public's duty to community. With its foundations in political science and sociology, civic participation literature is rife with claims that people should feel a sense of duty to community that motivates them to be civically involved to ensure community well-being (Skocpol & Fiorina, 1999). This prescriptive, normative assumption frames civic participation in ways that limit what is researched and how we understand the results of that research.

In addition, this structural perspective fails to question the effects of "community" itself on those who live within it, separating the context of civic participation from the process of it. While a communicative perspective on community reframes it from a structure to a process, it does little to call into question or disrupt the utopian model of community as something that exists already, and is good. Theoretical and empirical research on community has, most often, positioned community as an ideal standard and reified object, creating a normative model of something that *is* and is characterized by happiness and unity.

This model ignores the reality of community on two fronts: (a) community as social enactment or performance, and (b) community as a collection of diverse people with varying identities and potentially competing needs (Rothenbuhler, 2001). Rothenbuhler's contention aligns with both my experience of community as well as my theoretical conceptualization of it. If one defines community as some form of people-in-relationship within social and material structures, then conflict, dissensus, oppression, and marginalization are inherent aspects of community because people have varying identities and competing needs, all within a dynamic context. In addition, the utopian model fails to take into account the influence of organizations on community and potential for negative effects (Deetz, 1992).

"Duty to community" may serve as an effective rallying cry for people who have experienced their community in positive ways. Many people in a university community do experience it in positive ways, but there are also negative experiences. Given the sometimes exclusionary, disciplining, marginalizing, conflict-generating nature of community (Joseph, 2002), not everyone experiences "community" in ways that catalyze

a sense of duty to it, and possibly quite the opposite. It is necessary to keep in mind that collective agency can be used for ill as well as good, another strike against participation for some. According to Campbell (2005), "agency can be malign, divisive, and destructive" (p. 7). Therefore, research that challenges the assumptions and normative prescriptions regarding civic participation and community in much current scholarship is necessary.

Public Service as Organizational Participation and Civic Engagement

Since the Campus Compact's Presidential Declaration in 1999, higher education has shifted from promoting public service to institutionalizing it through public service centers, service learning courses; formal incentives such as service requirements, scholarships, grants, and awards (Battistoni, 2006). This shift was motivated by a desire to reinvigorate the role of higher education in public life, primarily through increasing student and faculty civic engagement. Higher education was responding to critiques of irrelevancy in addressing public problems, and ineffectiveness at providing students with the "concepts or language to explore what is political about their lives" (Harwood Group, 1993, pg. xii) as accused by the Kettering Foundation.

The dual goals of serving the public good and strengthening democracy allow us to situate public service and engagement within the realms of organizational participation and civic participation. To achieve their goals, higher education institutions must increase organizational participation, or at least participation related to engagement with the greater society.

Efforts to increase organizational participation can create such paradoxical situations, though often unintentionally; they can inhibit, frustrate, or even prevent

participation. Stohl and Cheney (2001) identify four categories of paradoxes of participation that relate directly to this study. The "paradox" in general is that efforts to increase inclusion, participation, and democratic voice within an organization can result in exactly the opposite—exclusion, inability to participate, and silencing of voice. Of course, universities are not immune from such paradoxes.

First are paradoxes of structure—the rules, regulations, and systems that relate to both the opportunity and ability to participate. Second, paradoxes of agency relate to people's effectiveness and sense of effectiveness within the organization and involve issues of authority, autonomy, and cooperation. Third, paradoxes of identity relate to feelings of membership, inclusion, and personal boundaries, and involve issues of voice and representation. Fourth, paradoxes of power relate to the location, nature, and exercise of power, and involve issues of control, leadership, and privileging consensus over oppositional voices. These paradoxes reflect the fact that efforts to increase participation in an inclusive and democratic way have both intended and unintended, potentially damaging effects. But they also reflect that any collective including a university is dynamic and changing, given that it is socially constructed and situated within a dynamic and changing environment.

External forces may not only necessitate participation and input by organization members, but also further complicate participation as individual needs and goals come into conflict (Cheney, 1999). Cheney primarily considered the forces of globalization and marketization. Both affect higher education, but so do other dynamic forces, including: trends in higher education, the dominating opinions within different academic disciplines, public demand, funding streams, and legislative bodies' agendas.

41

Institutional rhetoric thus becomes a critical tool in efforts to clarify the impact of such forces on a community, as well as to motivate and direct civic participation and collective action.

Cheney (1991) argues that a primary function of institutional rhetoric related to social change is to elicit the audience's identification with the rhetor, which is necessary to achieve agreement and participation. Identification through rhetoric also functions beyond a person's subject positions, however; we can be persuaded to identify others in particular ways, and in relationship to others in particular ways (Burke, 1969). Given the politics of representation of "the other" and speaking for "the other" within social change (see, for example, Alcoff, 1991; and Allahyari, 2001), how institutional rhetoric positions the audience member relative to the "other" who will benefit from service and engagement becomes a critical issue. Hauser and Grim (2004) drive this point home by arguing that rhetoric is not only a means of catalyzing and organizing participation, but also of audience manipulation and potential exclusion from public participation.

While those who identify with and are persuaded to act by organizing rhetoric are a concern, so too are those excluded by the rhetoric, implicitly and explicitly. Wander (1984) refers to this population as the third persona, the people "whose presence, though relevant to what is said, is negated through silence" (p. 210) in a rhetorical act or artifact, and they "exist in the silences of the text, the reality of oppression" (p. 215).

A post-structuralist approach to the negation of presence and attendant oppression allows a more complex understanding of both persona and the process and results of exclusion. Given that people inhabit multiple subject positions, rhetoric can function to negate some aspects of our subjectivity while focusing on and including other "preferred"

subject positions. Identification with anything holds inherent division from something else (Burke, 1969). This process of identification divides us from aspects of our selves, potentially pitting us against aspects of our selves or even erasing those subject positions from the societal perspective. Individual agency may be inhibited when a person's understanding of ways in which they are marginalized is negated through exclusionary rhetoric—whether the exclusion is intentional or unintentional. Unintentional and problematic consequences also become apparent when considering civic participation as a social structure instead of as a communicative process.

In the ever-increasing literature on "civic engagement" that is the domain of government scholars, political scientists, and sociologists, civic involvement is almost uniformly treated from an ontological basis of "structure," as in a set of systems that produce specific outcomes (see, for example, Skocpol & Fiorina, 1999). The burden for failure to participate in the systems is placed on the people with lamentations of everything from apathy to laziness to too much time spent in front of the television or surfing the Internet (Asen, 2004). What is left under-examined are the relational and organizing processes that people *are* engaging in to participate in society and/or to bring about social change (Mayo, 2000).

Robert Putnam (2000) addressed the relationship between organizations and social change in his widely acclaimed *Bowling Alone*, an exploration of the role of social capital—defined as civic engagement—in a community's ability to foster and maintain vitality. Putnam contended that social capital had declined with the aging of the generation prior to the baby boomers and that democracy itself was at risk if the trend continued. His solution was for people to increase their civic engagement by increasing

their involvement in social groups, thereby increasing social trust, knowledge, and networks.

While a number of scholars have critiqued Putnam's contentions about what would foster progressive, equitable, social capital, I know of no critiques that challenge the idea that civic engagement and participation of some kind are critical to society's well-being. Asen's (2004) arguments indicate a two-fold problem with Putnam's study: first, Putnam made assumptions about what constituted civic engagement that resulted in an overly narrow definition of the concept; and second, he conducted a longitudinal analysis that was too short. The result, according to Asen, was that Putnam prescribed more of what had declined, as opposed to figuring out what was actually going on and whether it was working. For example, Ladd (1999) contends engagement and participation are shifting to decentralized, more informal groups. Sirianni and Friedland (2001) argue that various civic innovations now address the social issues that civic organizations previously addressed.

In the wake of the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks, Putnam (2002) conducted a new study and found that while people's attitudes had changed to reflect a greater appreciation for the importance of civic engagement for community well-being, their behaviors did not reflect this change; they were no more engaged than before the attacks. Schmeirbach, Boyle, and McLeod (2005) studied patterns of civic engagement after 9/11 and determined only a two-month spike in the percentage of people engaged civically, with no long-term change in patterns of engagement.

For social change scholars and practitioners, the findings by Putnam (2002) and Schmeirbach et al. (2005) raise the question: If people believe civic participation to be

important, are they participating in ways that have not been captured by researchers? And if they believe civic participation to be important but are not participating, why are they not participating?

Asen (2004) contends that to achieve social change, it is critical that we understand how participation in civic life is enacted without *a priori* assumptions about how we think it is or ought to be enacted—an implicit critique of Putnam's prescription about what civic engagement *should* look like. I propose a shift in the question at hand from what constitutes civic participation or engagement to how people participate and are engaged, or are prevented from doing so. This shift constitutes a concern with participation as a mode instead of as a singular event, accomplishment, or set of association or group memberships, following the lead of Asen (2004) in his efforts to change the concept of citizenship by refocusing the question from what citizenship is to how citizenship is enacted.

This shift allows us to consider agency within dominant institutional and social structures. As Asen (2004) contends, "Mode denotes a manner of doing something, a method of proceeding in any activity. Mode distinguishes the manner by which something is done from what is done. Mode highlights agency: someone is doing a deed" (p. 194). Given that the understanding of faculty and student experience is often limited to anecdote and assumption, research findings on the reality of their participation in and perceptions of service and engagement can create a solid foundation for future efforts, both theoretical and practical.

Community Participation for the Public Good

Community participation is an umbrella term that includes a group of terms used in different areas of scholarship to indicate an active involvement with community or in public life, such as civic participation, civic involvement, civic engagement, community engagement, community building, public involvement, and public participation. Scholars concerned with participation as a means to strengthen democracy generally use one of the "civic" terms; those concerned with individual and community well-being generally use one of the "community" terms; and those concerned with public life more generally use a variety of the terms.

The likelihood of civic participation is determined in part by whether people have the opportunity and ability to voice their perceptions and experiences from their subject positions. Encouragement and support at the interpersonal level are major factors in both opportunity and ability. In a study of the relationship between community storytelling and civic participation, Kim and Ball-Rokeach (2006) found that, in a context where key community storytellers encourage talk about the community, people were more likely to feel a sense of belonging, to have a strong sense of collective agency, and to participate in community change efforts. The implicit critique of the effects on voice of community stratified into dominant and marginalized populations is made explicit by Fraser (1992):

> In stratified societies, unequally empowered social groups tend to develop
> unequally valued cultural styles. The result is the development of powerful
> informal pressures that marginalize the contributions of members of subordinated
> groups both in everyday contexts and in official public spheres (p. 120).

The paradox is that attempting to encourage participation through a common arena or a single public sphere may actually have the reverse effect, silencing or excluding already marginalized voices.

Fraser (1992) states it would be more effective to un-bracket inequalities for the purpose of analyzing them, as well as to create a multiplicity of spheres wherein otherwise marginalized voices have the opportunity to "formulate oppositional interpretations of their identities, interests, and needs" (p. 123). The "subaltern counterpublics" (p. 123) prevent the erasure of marginalized voices by the dominant voices. They provide an opportunity to "regroup," to discuss issues of personal and collective concern, and to prepare to challenge the dominant voice(s). It is within this dialectic "that their emancipatory potential resides … enabl[ing] subaltern counterpublics partially to offset, although not wholly to eradicate, the unjust participatory privileges enjoyed by members of dominant social groups in stratified societies" (Fraser, p. 124).

Zoller (2000) concurs and highlights the problematic side of striving for consensus in collective deliberation in community building. She contends, "The risk of consensus is exploitation: to exclude multiple interests, and to frame the debate in terms of the dominant group, thus creating and reinforcing social inequities" (p. 204). Part of the goal of this study is to identify areas of dissensus and the multiple interests involved as a means of identifying and addressing the inequities within the university relative to public service and engaged scholarship.

Organizing for Social Change

The national movement for higher education institutions to make greater contributions to the public good and to address society's ills is based in part on the belief that such institutions are potential mechanisms for social change. Collective efforts to address social challenges are inherently communicative and inherently organizational in nature. Mumby and Stohl (1996) observe that "communication is constitutive of

47

organizing and has political consequences that both enable and constrain the possibilities

for collective behavior" (p. 58). Those political consequences and constraining

possibilities are a concern for Depew and Peters (2001) as well; they note the appeal of a

mechanism, such as an organization or volunteer group or university, "to sustain

serendipitous public interactions" (p. 19) to work collectively in addressing social

challenges.

Given the particularly messy and difficult nature of social change efforts (Papa et

al., 2005), and that such efforts are not homogeneous given the differences in contexts

and problems to be addressed, theorizing a range of organizing mechanisms and modes is

critical, as is examining why people do or do not engage in such work to begin with and

how they are enabled and constrained by their context.

Scholarship across disciplines has tended to frame nonprofit organizations as the

primary mechanism of social change, while also characterizing them as homogeneous

and as the organizational "other" in antithesis to for-profit and governmental

organizations. These assumptions prove inaccurate or incomplete in light of much recent

research and theory, including: the wide range of organizations classified as nonprofits

(Najam, 1996); varying theories on what mechanisms foster social change (Flanagin et

al., 2006); and how unincorporated groups, for-profit companies, and public agencies

have all served as mechanisms for social change. These complexities make it necessary

to reframe such phenomena as "social change organizations" for the sake of accuracy and

to open up how social change is operationalized.

Flanagin et al. (2006) contend that participation, civic engagement, and

organizing form and mode have not been adequately theorized in other collective action

literature and do not reflect the current reality. In response, they use a communicative approach to resolve the problem. With no a priori assumptions about what collective action for the public good looks like, they exam how it is currently enacted, enabling them to reconceptualize collective action from the perspective of communication along axes of mode of interaction (from face-to-face to mediated) and mode of engagement (from loose and self-directed to formal and organizationally managed).

This move redefines what "counts" as a social change mechanism, ranging from anonymous online networking that results in spontaneous protest action, to a local community building program organized by city government and staffed by local volunteers who work regularly together, to a public university chartered and funded by state government, private individuals, and corporations while working to contribute to the public good.

Public Service and Engaged Scholarship from a Communicative Perspective

Scholarship on the academy's service in the public interest has primarily been situated in the disciplines of education, higher education, and academic administration, but is emerging strongly in other areas of scholarship. Communication scholars have long engaged in public service, outreach, community-based participatory research, action research, and critical research, all of which fall under the heading of service and engagement in the higher education literature (Kezar et al., 2005). Most recently, the August 2008 special issue of the *Journal of Applied Communication Research* (Barge, Simpson, & Shockley-Zalabak, Eds.) on engaged scholarship in organizational communication specifically and in the discipline more generally is an indicator of its increasing importance. The issue primarily discusses engaged scholarship at a meta level,

49

including practical concerns of conducting such research (Barge et al., 2008; Barge & Shockley-Zalabak, 2008; Simpson & Seibold, 2008), ethical considerations (Cheney, 2008), and the opportunity for different ways of knowing and theorizing (Deetz, 2008).

Other recent communication studies research related to engaged scholarship and service learning focuses on five topics: faculty engagement (Cheney, Wilhelmsson, & Zorn, 2002; May & Mumby, 2005); incorporating service learning into the communication studies curriculum (Artz, 2001; Gibson, Kostecki, &Lucas, 2001; Keyton, 2001; Sapp & Crabtree, 2002; Tolman, 2005); incorporating service learning into the business communication curriculum (e.g., Dubinsky, 2006; McEachern, 2006; Worley & Dyrud, 2006); the implications of service learning and university approaches to service for the community and society (Arney, 2006; Crabtree, 1998); and the status of service learning in communication studies curricula (Oster-Aaland, Sellnow, Nelson, & Pearson, 2004; Panici & Lasky, 2002;).

These "how-to" articles, case studies, and justifications illustrate a growing commitment to the scholarship of engagement and public service, in particular service learning. This research makes a contemporary case for the discipline's contribution to the public good while making visible the complex and overlapping nature of discovery, teaching, and serving the public good. For example, service learning is not only a pedagogical tool but also a form of action research in many cases. Service learning is generally perceived as a mode of experiential learning for students, but it is also a mode of applying the knowledge and skills of the academy to address social problems and concerns in collaboration with or assistance to service learning sites.

Communication studies research on social change programs independent of the academy—such as local volunteer efforts to improve communities and increase civic participation—contribute to our understanding of university-based service and engagement. For example, Barge's (2003) research on community-building programs focuses on effective design for local volunteer programs, critical to many scholars engaged in community-based participatory action research. Zoller's (2000) research on counter-publics and their role in community building makes salient the issues of power and conflict in how social change efforts are undertaken and the implications within any community, including the academy. Such research provides a deeper understanding of the role of communication within the practice of organizing for social change, but with an outward gaze that focuses on the scholar or student at the site of community interaction.

This study redirects the gaze inward, to focus on the experience of the scholar and undergraduate student within the university to provide a better understanding of their experience of service and engagement. This area of study is referred to as the "scholarship of engagement" (Kezar et al., 2005) in higher education research, and it is barely a nascent area of inquiry in communication studies. Dempsey (2009) argues that even a best practices model of university/community research collaboration can face challenges stemming from the assumptions of scholars and structures within the university. The collaboration was grounded in values of inclusion and equity, and researchers utilized a dialogue-based process to prevent the politics of knowledge from creating power inequities. Even at the planning stage, contested issues amongst researchers and community collaborators included the definition of community, research goals and approaches, access to data, communication practices, and the mode of

collaboration itself. Dempsey's findings indicate that for scholars—and by implication, the academy—practice is informed by theory, and theory is challenged and informed by practice. They highlight that context, subject position, voice, and agency affect each other in complex and unexpected ways when working for social change, which is a fundamental aspect of this research.

Within communication research, organizational rhetoric is of particular importance to this study as a means of understanding the relationship between the organization and its sociopolitical context, and between the organizations and its constituents when interpreting changes in that context. As Finet (2001) argues, "Institutional rhetoric promotes alternative interpretations of the meaning and significance of such changes, especially the degree to which they represent social problems and what policies and actions represent appropriate solutions" (p. 274). Organizational rhetoric studies of social change efforts by Cheney (1991, 1999) reflect the function of communication in framing social problems and issues within the greater society. The communicative and relational practices of organizations thus play a significant role in enabling engagement and participation in social change by framing problems and solutions, and the degree of "appropriateness" of their interpretations and solutions is a direct reflection of the cultural context.

To understand the impact of any particular organization's rhetoric, though, it is necessary to ask the audience, as it were. Traditional methods of rhetorical criticism that focus on the content and context of written or spoken texts do not analyze the actual impact of the text, leaving the audience out of the equation. Within the realm of material rhetoric, Blair and Michel (2004) argue that to determine whether rhetoric has any

impact, it is necessary to analyze its appropriation and re-articulation by those who encounter it. This study extends their work from material rhetoric to written and spoken rhetoric, investigating whether and how members of the UNC-Chapel Hill community appropriate and re-articulate university rhetoric related to service and engagement. Thus it becomes possible to determine the actual consequences, intended or unintended, of the rhetoric itself. It also helps us to develop a better understanding of the dynamic relationships between and amongst organizational rhetoric, context, organizational members, and participation in public service and engaged scholarship in higher education.

My goal in this study is to increase the capacity of the CCPS and the university to improve the well-being of the people of the university community in everyday life, thus strengthening efforts to improve the well-being of the people and communities they serve. This research project is designed to assist the CCPS in achieving its goals of supporting and facilitating participation in service and engagement while increasing their capacity to do so in ways that are more inclusive of, and give greater voice and agency to, the people of the university community. Therefore, to achieve a greater understanding of how students and faculty perceive and experience service and engaged scholarship, including related university rhetoric; how their perceptions and experiences relate to participation in service and engagement; and the implications for their daily lives and the university as a community, this study explores the following research questions:

1. How do university students and faculty perceive and experience public service and engaged scholarship within the social structure of the university community, including related university rhetoric?

2. How do their perceptions and experiences relate to their participation in public service and engaged scholarship?

3. Given student and faculty perceptions and experiences, what are the implications for their everyday lives and for the university as a community?

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This study will better inform the CCPS and the university community about how service and engaged scholarship are individually perceived and experienced, how those perceptions and experiences are related to university rhetoric, and how those perceptions and experiences relate to participation in service and engagement. The Carolina Center for Public Service's mission is to strengthen the university's service and engagement, and it does so by supporting and promoting service and scholarship that are responsive to the public good. This research project is designed to assist the CCPS and the university in achieving their goals while increasing their capacity to do so in ways that are more inclusive of, and give greater voice and agency to, the people of the university community during an era with decreased funding. It will do so by providing insight into why people do and do not participate in public service and engaged scholarship, examining how their behaviors relate to their perceptions of and experiences with service and engagement and its rhetorical construction by the university, and determining the implications of these findings for the university as a community.

This project began when I approached the CCPS about their needs and the possibility of collaborating on a research project that would address those needs. After determining the general research questions and research methods collaboratively, I developed the full research prospectus and protocols, which the CCPS reviewed and

approved prior to submission to my dissertation committee. I prepared the IRB

application and gathered and analyzed the data; the CCPS provided background

information, clarified information I encountered elsewhere, and provided perception-

checking.

Within the scholarship of engagement, this project is community-based action

research. According to Reason and Bradbury (2001), "action research is a participatory,

democratic process concerned with developing practical knowing in the pursuit of

worthwhile human purposes" (p. 1). Action research is invested in producing reflexive

and practical knowledge that benefits people in their everyday lives, contributing to the

increased well-being of people and communities, and contributing to emancipation from

systems and structures that marginalize people (Reason & Bradbury, 2001). It privileges

the knowledge of research participants over scientific expertise but uses rigorous methods

to analyze and interpret participant knowledge for emancipatory purposes.

To achieve such ends, this study utilizes reflexive ethnography and rhetorical

analysis. As Conquergood (1992) notes, it is at the intersection of ethnography and

rhetoric that we come to an understanding of reality not as essentialized "being" but

rather a socially constructed "process of becoming" (p. 81). The ongoing, everyday

communication and practices of individuals and of the institutions and systems within

which they live, learn, and work constitute this process of becoming. This ongoing

interaction, influence, and change represent a "repertoire of invention" (Conquergood, p.

80), recognized within ethnographic and rhetorical theories founded in post-structuralist

thought in the areas of social critique and emancipation.

It is from this intersection of rhetoric and ethnography that we can see the means of systemic control—the attempted influence through organizational rhetoric, and organizational behavior as a rhetorical practice of persuasion. We also can see the effects of that control, as well as the potential means of agency—individual sense-making and everyday practice on the part of the organization's constituents. In de Certeau's (1984) terms, we can see not only the strategies of oppression and the maintenance of a formal and static Place, but also the tactics used in response to those strategies to get by in the everyday, and the potential for disrupting Place in favor of the dynamic Space wherein marginalized voices become clear.

The rhetorical analysis provides the necessary background to address the study's research questions through analysis of the ethnographic portion of this study: How do students and faculty perceive and experience public service and engaged scholarship within the social structure of the university community, including related university rhetoric? How do their perceptions and experiences relate to their participation in public service and engaged scholarship? Given student and faculty perceptions and experiences, what are the implications for their everyday lives and for the university as a community?

Given the use of multiple methods with multiple participant populations, I have organized the research design section of this chapter as follows. First, I discuss the research site—the university itself—including relevant historical background in the area of service and engagement. Second, I present the research design for the reflexive ethnography. This section discusses reflexive ethnography relative to this study and then is organized by method: focus groups, the participants, and data-gathering process; interviews, the participants, and data-gathering process; and then, field and participant

57

observation and the data-gathering process. The section concludes with a discussion of the analysis of the ethnographic data. Third, I present the research design for the rhetorical analysis. This section discusses this study's particular approach to rhetorical analysis, the data-gathering process, and the analysis itself. It concludes with a description of the final stage of analysis—triangulating the findings of the reflexive ethnography with those of the rhetorical analysis.

Research Site

Chartered in 1789, the university opened its doors in 1795 and received its first legislative appropriation in 1881. Public service was articulated as central to the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill's mission by President Edward Kidder Graham in 1914 (UNC History, n.d.). Graham served as president from 1914 until his death in 1918. He was the child of a progressive reformist family of educators, and his stated goal was to extend the boundaries of the university to those of the state (Powell, 1972). He "urged the university to embrace 'the state and all its practical problems' as a legitimate field of study" (UNC History, n.d.). When the faculty roundtable on service presented its proposal for the CCPS, it included Graham's university slogan, in that he urged the public, "Write to the university when you need help" (Didow, 1999). He established an extension division to deal with such requests, as well as correspondence courses, a high school debating union on social topics, and a bureau of community drama. Under his guidance, faculty and students founded a North Carolina Club and individual county clubs that researched social and economic challenges, and financed and published the research.

This bold willingness to address social challenges continued after Graham's death and reached another pinnacle under the hand of Howard W. Odum in the 1920s, a sociologist who grappled with controversial issues such as racism and poverty. He established the Institute for Research in the Social Sciences in 1924 and directed it for 20 years, the last seven of which he was also president of the Commission of Interracial Cooperation (Powell, 1972). In its early incarnation, the Institute brought about social change by researching social, economic, and demographic trends, then applying interdisciplinary knowledge to deal with the related social challenges. An alternative model of public service and engagement was practiced by the university's Institute of Government, founded by law professor Albert Coates in 1932 (Powell, 1972). Coates took a systems perspective that focused on structural change, eschewed controversy, and insisted on apolitical research and solutions based in the law. The Institute's engagement focus was to educate, train, and provide technical support to public officials, an apolitical approach to better enable them to deal with local and state matters.

The university was developing, even then, a negative reputation of liberal progressivism with some critics and defended itself under the mantle of academic freedom. The political era, however, was very different from today, and the dominant one-party system meant that as long as supporters in the Legislature out-numbered opponents, funding was safe. As the university grew in the post-WWII boom era, admitting returning soldiers and later women, service and engagement became increasingly decentralized into discipline-based schools, departments, centers, and institutes. Institutional neutrality prevailed at the university administration level, with the

59

pursuit of academic freedom reserved to individual faculty and the silos within which they worked.

During the post-World War II progressive era, university system President William Friday was a strong champion of higher education's obligation to serve the higher good during his tenure from 1956 to 1986. At the university level, however, administrators focused on dealing with growth and competing for state appropriations while developing a national, and later international, reputation for excellent education and the best tuition bargain.

Beginning in 1991 and partly prompted by Boyer's (1990) work and the growing critique of public higher education, the university's faculty/staff Public Service Roundtable explored ways of increasing public service work and scholarship. Michael Hooker, Chancellor from 1995 to 1999, formalized the university's commitment to being a service institution with a restatement of service, along with research and teaching, in the university's mission. Their work resulted in the Carolina Center for Public Service in 1999. One of Hooker's primary initiatives was to reconnect the university with the people of the state, and vice versa, and to explore ways in which the university could better contribute to public well-being. He personally visited each of the state's 100 counties as part of that work, attempting to demonstrate that Carolina cared about its own backyard, it was the university of the people, and it was responsive to criticism that said otherwise.

Upon Chancellor Hooker's death in 1999, William McCoy served as acting and interim chancellor for one year. His public addresses focused on administrative issues and the chancellor search. He was succeeded by James Moeser, chancellor from 2000 to

2008. Moeser shared Hooker's commitment to the social contract between public higher

education and the society, having co-authored the Kellogg Commission's *Report on the*

Future of State and Land-grant Universities. In 2003, he established "Carolina

Connects," an initiative to document and publicize the many ways in which Carolina

contributes to the public good. Despite ongoing cuts to state appropriations during his

tenure, he successfully completed the largest endowment and fundraising campaign in the

university's history, raising $2.38 billion and doubling the university's endowment to

more than $2 billion.

In September of 2006, Moeser created a new executive position, vice chancellor

of service and engagement, to institutionalize leadership and administration of such work.

He appointed Michael Smith, Dean of the Institute of Government. In February of 2007,

the university system's general administration launched a new system-wide and widely

publicized effort to apply the resources of the system and its constituent universities to

meeting the challenges of the state. From February 2007 through December 2008, the

universities catalogued their current work to benefit the state and other resources that

could be brought to bear; system and university officials met with the public across the

state to assess needs and challenges; and then university administrators prepared plans for

how their campuses could respond to those needs and challenges.

In July 2008, former dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, Holden Thorp, was

inducted as the university's newest chancellor. Data-gathering for this study concluded

in August 2008, but a few developments after that date are important to note relative to

this study's conclusions. Implementation of the UNC-Tomorrow plan, the system-wide

mandated program to increase service to and engagement with the state, began in January

2009. In May 2009, Thorp announced that he was dissolving the office of the vice

chancellor for service and engagement due to state budget cuts. Not long after, the

budget for CCPS underwent significant cuts and organizational consolidation resulted in

the CCPS absorbing the student service learning program, known as APPLES.

As of the 2008-2009 academic year, UNC-Chapel Hill was a public, majority

undergraduate, full-time four-year, selective university with very high research activity,

according to the Carnegie classifications system (Carnegie Foundation, n.d.). Accredited

by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, the university offers bachelor's,

master's, and doctoral degrees in the liberal arts, sciences, health, and professional fields.

Out of a total student population of 28,567, undergraduates numbered 17,895 (UNC

News, 2008). It had 3,450 faculty members and offered more than 70 undergraduate

majors (University of North Carolina, 2009). The annual state appropriation of $547

million equaled 22 percent of the university's budget, and reflected a one-time reduction

of five percent. The administration anticipated additional decreases in state

appropriations the following fiscal year, potentially to be offset to a degree by federal

stimulus grants (Office of the Chancellor, 2008).

Research Design: Reflexive Ethnography

The goal of ethnography, according to Madison (2005) is to provide insight into

the human condition and individual experiences within a particular context to enable

improvement, emancipation, or change. Given that this study is concerned with how

members of the university community perceive and experience service and engaged

scholarship and its rhetorical construction and the implications in their everyday lives, I

utilized multiple ethnographic data-gathering methods: focus groups (students and CCPS

staff), interviews (faculty, administrators, and CCPS staff), and field and participant observation. This study was conducted with approval of the Institutional Review Board, study #07-1409.

Reflexive ethnography (Davies, 1999) is a response to the crisis of representation—the dialectical tensions of modernism/postmodernism, subjectivity/objectivity, and self/other that have arisen in the postcolonial era. These tensions have presented ethnographic researchers with seemingly irresolvable problems regarding whether and how a researcher can ethically and accurately observe, interpret, and re-present specific people, cultures, and contexts given the researcher's own perspectives, attitudes, and beliefs. Davies applies a critical realist and symbolic interactionist perspective to ethnography, resulting in a concept of reflexive ethnographic practice: incorporating reflexivity without devolving into complete self-absorption, thereby maintaining the capacity to develop valid knowledge about specific and contextualized social realities. Reflexive ethnography involves understanding self, the relationship between self and other, between self and other and knowledge generation, and between self and other and social structures.

Reflexive ethnography therefore requires politically positioning oneself, clarifying the relationship to the other, positioning self and other relative to the research process, and positioning self and other relative to the research context (Denzin, 2003). I am a member of the UNC-Chapel Hill community, and I was working and teaching within the same structures and community context that I was researching. Davies (1999) positions reflexivity primarily as an individual practice, but it is an individual, communal, and disciplinary practice for me. I approach data-gathering with the attitude that my

perceptions and knowledge are provisional, and that my subjectivities are under constant construction. I do not mean to imply an attitude of incredulity or skepticism, but rather curiosity and suspended preconceptions. As Napolitano and Pratten (2007) argue, the theoretical perspectives advanced by de Certeau serve as a sound basis for the practice of such ethnography:

> de Certeau provides a potentially productive synergy of registers with which to engage the study of human subjectivity that defies neat theorisation and invites a focus on ethnographic details. De Certeau sees processes of "othering" and religiosity as fundamental registers of everyday social formations in this context, and points us to privilege the plurality of histories, phenomenologies and embodied narratives that compose an ethnographic field over reductionist singular interpretations. (p. 4)

Having spent 10 years as a student and five as an instructor at the university, I am a member of the community. Denzin and Lincoln (2003) refer to "outsider" researchers becoming members of the community they research as a conscientious "role-taking" as a member of the community. I consider my data-gathering and analysis process to be the opposite—a reflexive and conscientious role-taking as a researcher within the community. It is akin to Gramsci's (1971) concept of the organic intellectual, one who rises up out of the community which s/he studies, with the intent of addressing the problems and challenges of that community. While the similarities between my everyday life and those who participated in this research allow me particular insights into their experience, the differences in those everyday lives also allow me to challenge my own sense-making and interpretations, ensuring that I both honor and accurately re-present their voices (Madison, 2005).

Within the discipline of communication studies, ethnography is concerned with communicative symbols and behaviors and their relationships to social structures and

64

systems (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002). It allows the researcher to gain insight into what is

being said (and what is not), and how that is produced by and is reproducing or

challenging existing social structures. Ethnography also allows the researcher to compare

experiences of multiple participants and determine how those experiences conform with

or diverge from the experiences of others within the same social context. The researcher

can capture the individuals' perspectives and experiences, such as those related to public

service and engaged scholarship, to better understand both what sense participants make

out of them and what influence the university's rhetoric does or does not have within that

process. Through the act and art of bricolage, it "makes the world visible in a different

way" (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003, p. 5). It is both strategic and pragmatic, in that it allows

us to understand a particular social issue in new and different ways, and act on it in new

and different ways.

    Focus groups. The first data-gathering method of the ethnographic research is

focus groups, utilized with students and with CCPS staff. Focus groups are particularly

appropriate for exploring the relationship between cultural context and individual

experience, reflecting the importance of context and multiple subject positions in

poststructuralist theories. Morgan (1988) argues that, "focus groups are invaluable for

examining how knowledge, ideas, story-telling, self-presentation and linguistic

exchanges operate within a given cultural context" (p. 5), while privileging participant

knowledge over researcher expertise. The participants become the expert informers, and

the researcher becomes the curious observer.

    Focus groups allow participants such as students to discuss and consider the

subject at hand from multiple subject positions—before and during college, as a member

65

of different organizations, as a member of different demographic and socio-economic groups. But focus groups also allow them to discuss the subject as people in the common context of the university community. Given that student life and organizational life are social by nature, and that much sense-making occurs through interaction, focus groups created a situation that reflects these characteristics. This approach reflects the fact that public service and engagement are most often collective endeavors, utilizing collective sense-making in constructing individual perceptions of dominant social structures, and one's possibilities for agency within such structures.

Within focus groups, participant interaction has the potential to produce high-quality data, in that participants question, confirm, challenge, and affirm each others' contributions, emphasizing the plurality of voices and knowledge (Wilkinson, 1998). It also allows for voicing individual and/or marginalized perceptions and experiences outside of the collective and normative experience. It replicates the cultural context in which perceptions and experiences of service and engagement are shaped, while allowing discussion and comparison of those perceptions and experiences. Commonalities and differences, consensus and conflict, may come to the fore within the collective interaction.

Focus groups took place between September 2007 and April 2008. I utilized eight focus groups with students and one with CCPS staff.

Focus group participants—students. I conducted eight focus groups with four to eight undergraduate students each over age 18, with a total of 42 students. I recruited first through university informational e-mail and received only one response. I then recruited through e-mail to instructional staff to be forwarded to students; flyers posted in

66

university classroom buildings, the student union, and dining halls; and the CCPS public service listserv newsletter and the Campus Y listserv. To facilitate recruitment, I offered a $10 cash incentive, delicious baked goods and snacks, and a selection of tasty beverages. No first-year or sophomore students responded.

There were 42 student participants, of which 28 (67%) were women, and 14 (33%) were men; 28 were seniors and 14 were juniors; and 37 were four-year students and five were transfer students. Of the 28 women, there were 14 white seniors, 4 white juniors including 2 transfer students, 3 African-American seniors, 3 African American juniors, 1 Asian-American senior, 1 Middle-Eastern-American senior transfer student, 1 multi-racial junior, and 1 Indian-American junior. Of the 14 men, there were 6 white seniors including 1 transfer student, 2 white juniors, 3 black seniors including 1 transfer student, 2 black juniors, and 1 Pacific Islander junior. One participant was foreign-born but a long-term American resident, and 1 was an international student. In-state students totaled 38, and 4 out-of-state students participated.

Relative to the general undergraduate student body, which was 58% female and 42% male, women were over-represented in the study population. African Americans were also over-represented, with 26% of the study population as opposed to 11% of the undergraduate population. Caucasians and other racial/ethnic backgrounds were slightly under-represented (Office of Institutional Research and Assessment, 2006a).

Students were enrolled in the following majors and curricular programs: African and AfroAmerican studies, anthropology, biology, business, communication studies, computer sciences, education (primary and secondary), environmental science and studies, exercise and sport science, folklore, history, human sexuality, international

studies, journalism and mass communication, Latina/o studies, political science, psychology, public policy and administration, management and society, nursing, recreation and leisure studies, religious studies, romance languages, social and economic justice, sociology, and women's studies.

One participant was a Public Service Scholar—a program managed by the CCPS— and three were former scholars. Thirty-nine of the students participated in public service on a regular or semi-regular (at least monthly) basis; three male participants did not—each participated in limited public service a few times a semester as required to maintain membership in a student organization. Every student self-reported to be an active member in at least one student organization. Thirty-one were members of student organizations devoted solely to public service. All participants either selected or were assigned a pseudonym to protect their confidentiality.

Focus group participants—CCPS. I also conducted a focus group with CCPS regular staff, excluding work-study students and graduate student assistants. I issued the invitation via e-mail with the permission of the director, with no incentive beyond food and beverage offered. Participation was voluntary, and four out of five staff members participated.

I attempted to conduct a focus group with the CCPS's undergraduate public service scholars, students who have committed to a rigorous program that includes specialized courses in public service and social change as well as a requirement to undertake 300 hours of public service in three years. I recruited through the CCPS public service listserv newsletter, but only one student responded. That student participated in a regular student focus group.

Focus group data-gathering. Focus groups with students were loosely structured conversations guided by a general set of questions (Appendix A) and lasted between 60 and 80 minutes. The general content of the questions focused on general impressions of public service, whether they think it is important to the university, why they do and do not participate, the kinds of service they participate in, and their background and experience with service prior to college. Focus groups were held on campus—within the students' actual social environment—in a conference room that offered a reasonable degree of privacy. I moderated the focus groups, which were audio-recorded, and an observer took notes. After welcoming participants, explaining the focus group process, distributing and collecting consent forms, distributing the cash incentive in envelopes, and participant introductions, I conducted a focusing free-writing exercise to center the participants' attention on the subject at hand (Bloor, Frankland, Thomas, & Robson, 2001). The focusing question was, "What comes to mind when you think of public service?" Students wrote their responses and retained them for reference during the discussion. Discussion began with responses to the free-write exercise, and moderation was limited to encouraging discussion, probing for more information where appropriate, and interjecting new questions. The eight focus groups yielded 136 pages of single-spaced transcription.

The focus group with CCPS staff members proceeded as described above without the focusing exercise and with a different set of guiding questions (Appendix B). Questions primarily concerned the staff's perceptions of the practice of service and engagement at the university, their general operations and programs, and the most significant barriers to their ability to achieve their mission. It lasted 68 minutes and was

held in the CCPS conference room. The data were not included in the analysis, as the discussion was primarily for my background information before interacting with study participants.

Interviews. The second aspect of the reflexive ethnography was interviews. Interviews took place between January and April, 2009 and were loosely structured one-on-one interviews with faculty and university administrators. I also conducted such interviews with CCPS staff, from a desire not to impose on the whole staff while discussing individuals' program responsibilities. The CCPS interviews were for background information only.

I chose to interview faculty and administrators for several reasons. Given the political nature of a higher education institution, I wanted to increase the possibility of ensuring confidentiality and of obtaining more candid comments from participants. Interviews have the advantage of moving beyond social scripts, such as the politically correct responses an employee should provide when discussing their employment, to individual experience and emotional responses (Mitchell, 1999). This increases the possibility of personal disclosures. Interviews also allow the researcher to develop the trust and rapport necessary for potentially controversial disclosures in cultural contexts of a political nature, such is the case with faculty when discussing their experiences with the university.

Next, while there are some commonalities to faculty and administrator experiences, the variety of disciplines, research areas, research methods, teaching approaches, and professional experience had created problems in faculty workshops I attended. The differences in terminology alone often became a conversational roadblock

70

and sometimes even made attendees defensive when they were misunderstood by other faculty. Interviews, however, are well-suited to developing an understanding of the participant's jargon (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002). This approach also prevents the researcher from making assumptions about definitions and about commonalities of experience by seeking clarification of meaning and specificity within interviews, and making comparisons across interviews.

In addition, from a post-structuralist perspective, interviews are particularly well-suited to "understanding the social actor's experience and perspective" (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002, pg. 171), in that participants can speak on the subject at hand from multiple subject positions as the co-creation of discussion takes place between participant and researcher. Interviews also allow collection of information about processes which cannot be observed, such as what influences people's behaviors and beliefs (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002), including information such as why respondents do or do not participate in service and engagement, and what university administration rhetoric and action have influenced them. It is an excellent method "for viewing the interaction of an individual's internal states (social attitudes and motives) with the outer environment" (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002, p. 179), which helps the researcher better understand the other, but also makes it less likely that the researcher will make assumptions about attitudes and motives.

Interview participants—faculty. I conducted one-on-one interviews with 24 academic affairs faculty, all over age 18. I recruited participants first through university informational e-mail, e-mail to department managers requesting it be forwarded to department faculty, the CCPS listserv, and flyers sent directly via university mail. I received four responses. I revised the recruiting protocols with IRB approval and sent e-

71

mails directly to all academic affairs faculty outside of my department. No incentive was offered beyond a snack and beverage, in the case that the faculty member preferred to meet off-campus. To represent a range of experiences, I attempted to interview a diverse set of participants based on participation and non-participation in university-related service and engagement, length of employment at UNC-Chapel Hill, sex, race and ethnicity, academic discipline, research focus, and stage of career (junior, mid, and senior-level faculty; non-tenure track, tenure track, and tenured). All faculty selected or were assigned a pseudonym to protect their confidentially.

Also to protect the confidentiality of the participants, I aggregated their relevant individual information instead of providing individual descriptions. Participants included seven full professors (29%, and including three endowed), eight associate professors (33%), six assistant professors (25%), and three fixed-term (13%). Regarding rank, the total Academic Affairs faculty population was 43% professor, 20% associate professor, 17% assistant professor, and 20% fixed term (Office of Institutional Research and Assessment, 2006d). Within the study population, full professors and fixed-term faculty were under-represented relative to the academic affairs faculty composition.

Five (21%) were women and 20 (79%) were men; one was African-American and 23 were white. Demographically, the total Academic Affairs faculty population was 38% female, 62% male (Office of Institutional Research and Assessment, 2006b); and 94% white, 6% African American (Office of Institutional Research and Assessment, 2006c). Within the study population, women were under-represented and African Americans were slightly under-represented relative to the academic affairs faculty composition.

Four direct or co-direct a university academic center, institute, or program. Two were academic unit administrators, and four were past academic unit administrators. The minimum length of employment at Carolina was two years, the maximum was more than two decades, and the average was 16 years. Disciplines and program areas represented include American studies, biology, business, chemistry, communication studies, comparative literature, computer science, economics, education, English, folk lore, foreign languages, geography, geology, history, human sexuality studies, Jewish studies, journalism/mass communication, mathematics, philosophy, physics, political science, religious studies, social work, and sociology.

For the purposes of de-identifying faculty but still placing their comments in the context of their disciplines, I substitute the broader academic area for the specific discipline. "Social sciences" refers to business, education, folk lore, history, journalism/mass communication, political science, social work, and sociology. "Humanities" includes American studies, communication studies, comparative literature, human sexuality studies, Jewish studies, philosophy, and religious studies. "Physical and natural sciences" includes biology, chemistry, computer sciences, geography, geology, and physics. While the remaining disciplines—economics, English, foreign languages, and mathematics—could be included in the previous categories, I have chosen to designate these disciplines as "core disciplines," because the extremely high numbers of general-college and non-major courses offered by these departments create different demands on their faculty members.

All faculty members described themselves as conducting departmental, university, and discipline-related service of some kind; 12 described themselves as conducting

engaged and/or applied scholarship; 12 described themselves as not, but probing revealed that 3 actually did conduct engaged scholarship without realizing their work fit the university definition. Of the 12 who did not describe themselves as conducting engaged scholarship, 6 expressed a desire to do so but cited a variety of barriers or challenges, past negative experiences, and potential negative consequences as preventing them from doing so. The same and similar issues were echoed by faculty conducting engaged scholarship.

Interview participants—administrators. I conducted interviews with executive-level university administrators who had a direct effect on university mission, rhetoric, and practices related to public service and engaged scholarship at the time data was gathered. Those administrators included the chancellor, the provost, the vice chancellor for student affairs, the vice chancellor for service and engaged scholarship, the vice chancellor for research, and the dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. I assigned gender-neutral pseudonyms to administrators who participated, given the additional need for protecting confidentiality of such a small population where individuals are more easily identified.

Interview participants—CCPS. I also conducted individual interviews with CCPS staff members so they would have an opportunity to discuss their individual program responsibilities without imposing on other staff members' time. Participation, again, was voluntary, and I invited staff members via e-mail. Three of five staff members agreed.

Interview data-gathering. Interviews with faculty and administrators were loosely structured conversations guided by a general set of questions (Appendix C and Appendix D), though not restricted to those questions. Faculty interviews primarily

concerned their definitions of public service and engaged scholarship, any related activities in which they participated, why they did or did not participate, and how public service and engaged scholarship were perceived within and by their department, discipline, and the university. Administrator interviews primarily concerned their perceptions of public service and engagement within higher education in general and the role of each in the university, definitions and examples of public service and engaged scholarship, and barriers to participation.

Interviews with CCPS staff were unstructured conversations guided by prompts (Appendix E) related to their perceptions of public service and engaged scholarship from the perspective of their individual job responsibilities and related experiences. These interviews were for background information only.

All but one of the interviews were audio-recorded, with the exclusion at the faculty member's request. Participants had the opportunity to choose the interview location to protect their privacy to the degree they thought necessary or for the sake of their convenience. Only one chose to be interviewed off-campus. Interviews lasted between 48 and 134 minutes and were conducted in one sitting, with the exception of the 134-minute interview with a faculty member, which was conducted in two sittings. Faculty interviews resulted in 549 pages of single-spaced, typed, transcription. Administrator interviews resulted in 111 pages of single-spaced transcription.

Field and participant observation. The final data-gathering method of the ethnographic research was field and participant observation. I spent one year actively in the field after IRB approval, from September 2007 through August, 2008. Though observation as a method has come under critique during the crisis of representation as a

75

colonialist attempt to define those observed and their culture (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003), reflexive ethnographic practices address many of the related concerns. I approach observation as an opportunity to better understand participants' contexts so that I may better understand what they share in interviews and focus groups, as well as to develop practical recommendations to overcome challenges and barriers identified during analysis.

Field and participant observation data-gathering. As a part of everyday fieldwork, I documented representations and manifestations of public service and engaged scholarship in university life: from the newspaper, to informational e-mails, to student organization promotions, event promotional boards, flyers, speeches, and events. I reviewed 34 documents directly related to the founding and history of the CCPS, its current operations, and the Chancellor's and UNC system's visions of service and engagement, and another 82 documents related to faculty, students, and the history of and everyday life at the university. I assisted at four of the CCPS's public events and attended three other CCPS-sponsored events. I also attended a workshop on engaged scholarship with a CCPS staff member, and a faculty development institute on designing service learning courses. I developed and taught courses with public service components and service research components.

The reflexive practice of observation and participation has several implications in research practice. In my daily field notes, I kept dual notes, separating observation from my interpretation of the account and interrogation of my interpretation. I cycled through states of immersion and distance with the site and with my data, and the different perspectives acted as a self-checking mechanism. At the close of data-gathering, I

76

removed myself from the university's daily life through a nine-month teaching assignment in the comparatively different context of a regional state university. I engaged in frequent perception-checking with participants while gathering and analyzing data. My colleagues were also a perception-checking resource throughout the research process and particularly as I drew conclusions from my analyses—whether a conclusion was supported, valid, and relevant was tested in conversation and in review. My field observations and related reflections yielded 164 single-spaced pages of transcription, supplemented with 239 related digital photographs.

Data analysis. To analyze the ethnographic data, I employed a modified grounded theory approach utilizing open and axial coding. Focus group, interview, and field note transcriptions resulted in 960 single-spaced, typed pages. I offered all participants the option of reviewing the coded transcript and initial analysis of their session; those who selected this option had the opportunity to edit, redact, or add to their original comments, to ensure they had been adequately de-identified, and to check my perceptions in the initial analysis. I used AtlasTI qualitative analysis software for coding and initial analysis. Given the post-structuralist perspective of this research and the necessity of identifying multiple, conflicting, and contradictory understandings of and experiences with public service, I coded and analyzed the data using a modified grounded theory approach that focuses on participant understanding of the phenomenon in question (Lindlof & Taylor, 2002). I analyzed the transcripts inductively. The first step in this process was line-by-line open coding, wherein I identified concepts as they occurred in the transcripts and classified them according to their meanings or characteristics (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Where possible, I used a speaker's own words as the code label. As

77

new codes emerged, I re-analyzed previous transcription to determine whether uncoded data explicitly or implicitly reflected the new codes, completing a hermeneutic circle of "interpretation and reinterpretation" (Register & Henley, 1992, p. 471).

I then utilized axial coding, linking categories "at the level of properties and dimensions" (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p. 123), including linking categories that were similar to, supporting of, conflicting with, and contradictory to each other. As a method of perception-checking (Davies, 1999) following the rhetorical critique and final analysis, I reviewed my initial findings, practical implications, and proposed organizational responses with research partners and participants, including CCPS staff, two university administrators, two faculty members, and two undergraduate students.

Research Design: Rhetorical Analysis

In parallel with my conceptualization of community as a dynamic space and place, I approach rhetoric not as a static product or a singular text, but rather as an ongoing process of meaning-making within a dynamic context. Brummett (1991) argues that rhetoric is a process of influencing and managing meaning that includes "rhetorical struggles over how society will be ordered" (p. xiii), and I would argue that the claim also applies to how organizations will be ordered.

I define organizational rhetoric as the management of meaning by organizing entities in ongoing relationship with their constituencies within a dynamic context, an amalgamation and extension of concepts from Cheney (2005) and Crable (1990). By *organizing entities*, I refer to an organizing structure, such as the university, its administration, or administrative units. By *organizing*, I refer to the social constructionist perspective in organizational communication of organizations as communicatively

78

constituted processes in a state of becoming (Putnam, 1983), which aligns with poststructuralist theories. By *entities*, I acknowledge that at the point a process results in communicative interaction with an audience, the organizing process transforms however briefly into a generative structure—in rhetorical terms, into a rhetor (Crable, 1990), a problematically stable thing. Cheney (2005) refers to such a rhetor as an institutional actor, but my concern is that that term implies a reified and possibly rational, cognizant being—an implication with which I disagree, and which is antithetical to poststructuralist thinking.

These dynamic relationships and processes contribute to a "signifying field" (Barthes, 1974, p. 112) within which people make meaning of their perceptions and experiences. They must navigate multiple manifestations of the organization's voice, as well as multiple vernacular voices (Bodnar, 1992) that may or may not contradict or be in competition with the organization's voice. They experience an ongoing deluge of rhetorical fragments, "a world of discontinuous and chaotic signs, a melange of bits, some of them supplied by fellow humans, some of them natural, some accidental" (Brummett, 1991, p. 69). They navigate this mélange not as passive or incidental receptacles but rather as active searchers who incorporate and order salient information and order it into coherent meaning through logics based on social experience. Making meaning out of rhetorical fragments is a process of intersubjectivity, of social relations and negotiations through which we, as members of a community, work to make sense out of and construct our reality (Brummett, 1976).

In addition, the meaning the community or constituency produces out of what rhetoric they are exposed to, what sense they make of it, may differ from what is intended by an organizational rhetor (de Certeau, 1984). First, "the text" is fragmented and in a struggle

with multiple conceptions and subject positions, as well as in competition with the greater melange. Second, when the organization and its constituencies are in ongoing relationship, fragments of the organization's rhetoric may be in repeated circulation and may become most salient. As such, they may be re-articulated in ways contrary to the organizations' intentions and needs, or resist change as the organization's needs and related rhetoric change. Salient fragments of unfixed symbols condense into nodal points (Zarefsky, 1986) around which constituents "congregate," potentially to the exclusion or erasure of alternative rhetoric. These nodal points reflect not only what aspects of administrative rhetoric gain traction with faculty and students, but also form the basis of their understanding of the "official" definitions of and attitudes about public service and engagement and those who do or do not participate.

For an organization to achieve its mission within such a context, it must elicit from its members identification with that mission, constituting a collective that can act to achieve the mission. Such constitutive rhetoric attempts to create a group identity, a cohesive "us" in part by defining us as different from "the other." JanMohamed (1985) argues that the differences within the collective, whether us or other, are erased, and the homogenized us and other are reductively essentialized to their respective collective similarity. The multi-faceted self may thus be interpolated into a particular subject position relative to the organization, the collective, and the other. An organization's rhetorical construction therefore has implications not only for its ability to achieve its mission and for how the audience perceives the organization, but also for perception of self and other.

Data-gathering. Given that the university President (prior to 1934) or Chancellor (after 1945) is the administrator charged with communicating a vision for and of the university, I limited my review of rhetorical artifacts to Presidents' and Chancellors' public addresses to the university and artifacts to which those addresses refer. The earliest documented reference to the university's public service mission to the state is by Edward Kidder Graham, President from 1913 to 1918 (Coates, 1988). While some ensuing Presidents and Chancellors did mention public service and some did not, I chose to limit artifacts for analysis to Chancellors serving since the 1980s, the decade that the faculty participant with the longest length of employment first joined the university, though that decade does reflect and continue to reproduce the rhetorical legacy of service and engagement back to the tenure of President Graham

I focused further on significant addresses that occur repeatedly: Installation to the Office of Chancellor, Convocation, University Day, address to the faculty Senate, State of the University (under Chancellor Moeser), and graduation, resulting in 119 speeches. I included six speeches made to select audiences by Chancellors Hooker and Moeser because the primary subject was public service and engagement and because each was reported in the university newspaper and the faculty/staff newsletter. A limited number of these speeches, when referring to public service, referred to one or both of two other rhetorical artifacts: Graham's comments on service to the state, and Charles Kuralt's keynote address at the University Bicentennial Celebration in 1993. Finally, I included the four mass e-mails sent to all university e-mail addresses from Chancellor Moeser between 2006 and 2008 that referred to service or engagement because interview and focus group participants referred to this form of communication explicitly.

Data analysis. To identify re-articulation of university administration rhetoric by students and faculty, it was necessary first to be fluent in the relevant rhetoric. To develop that fluency, I employed Burke's (1969) approach of identifying synchronic and diachronic elements of the rhetoric that referred to service or engagement. First I identified the diachronic elements—those that remained consistent over a period of time, a number of texts, and in some cases for multiple rhetors. Then I identified the synchronic elements—those that were unique, or changed quickly, or were specific to a particular rhetor during a short period of time.

This study is concerned not with the actual original texts, but rather with what specific elements of those texts are consumed by and salient enough to students and faculty members that they incorporate them into their perceptions of and experiences with public service and engaged scholarship. Following the background rhetorical analysis, I returned to the coded interviews and focus groups. I triangulated the rhetorical and ethnographic inquiries of this study by identifying fragments of administrative rhetoric as reproduced by faculty and students—what they picked up and re-articulated, what stuck with them, and what meaning they interpreted from it—to determine what rhetorical fragments were salient and memorable (Sloop, 1996).

Thus, the rhetorical analysis is presented through identification of what nodal points of university rhetoric are re-articulated by students and faculty—the "text" of service and engagement as constructed by students and faculty, given their interpretations as it relates to their own perceptions and experiences. And it is in the relationship between these perceptions and experiences of service and engagement that we find the challenges, tensions, barriers, and opportunities faced by the university and the CCPS

relative to public service and engagement, as well as determining the implications for university members and UNC-Chapel Hill as a community.

Limitations of the Study

It is important to note that study participants had enough interest in public service and/or engaged scholarship to agree to participate; I make no generalizations about the greater student population or faculty population based on the perceptions and experiences of the study participants. When I use the phrase terms "students" or "faculty members," I am referring only to participants in this study.

Though I previously described the recruiting methods used for this study, I want to acknowledge the difficulty of recruiting faculty and student participants. I thought it important to gather all data within the same academic and fiscal year. It became more important with Chancellor Moeser's announcement of his retirement that I complete data collection prior to a new chancellor's appointment, which could have potentially influenced responses. This meant that I had to make a compromise on how representative the study population was relative to the faculty and student populations, resulting in under-representations and over-representations indicated in the participant sections above.

Regarding faculty, in response to directly addressed personal e-mails (the third round of faculty recruitment) I did receive response e-mails from 19 additional faculty members whom I did not interview. Of those, 13 female faculty members sent their regrets about not being able to participate due to being overcommitted and/or having no time in their schedule before the end of the academic year. Of the remaining six, two males made interview appointments and later canceled and could not reschedule; one

male and four females were unable to work me into their calendars despite repeated attempts. Of those who did participate, three responded because they recognized my name from my career prior to graduate school; one did so because of a previous acquaintance with my mother.

Interviews with administrators were by far the easiest to schedule. All administrators, through their administrative assistants, agreed to participate within three days of my initial e-mail query and scheduled an interview no more than three weeks later.

Amongst the students, only three participated because they saw the recruitment e-mail or one of the 400 flyers posted in public spaces. The remainder participated because of an announcement in a course, because they knew me personally as a former instructor, or because they were friends with a person who wanted to participate and came at that person's invitation.

Just after my eighth student focus group, student body president Eve Carson, embodiment of "The Carolina Way" according to many media representations, was murdered. In the media and campus discussions of the murder, UNC-Chapel Hill was repeatedly referred to as "the people's university" and Eve as the model student. University officials, her friends and family, and other student leaders made calls to action to emulate Eve's service and "give back" like she did, to try to honor her by changing the world and developing the strong personal ties that she had with so many on and off-campus. I had planned to hold two more student focus groups, but determined that the new but temporary rhetorical context may have provided data too incongruent with the focused groups completed prior to that time.

Regarding the student participants, while two considered activism or advocacy to be a form of public service, none considered herself or himself to be involved in activism or advocacy. While students involved in activism or advocacy may or may not have different perceptions and experiences of public service than the study population, I find it important to note that students who identified enough with the subject of public service to participate in the study did not participate in activism or advocacy.

On a final note, de-identification of the complex and highly contextual faculty and administrator responses left some passages empty or incomprehensible, and therefore not appropriate for inclusion in the dissertation. However, in some cases, including information such as rank was of critical importance to analyzing the results. In such cases, I have substituted a generic label such as "Faculty member" for the pseudonym to prevent the reader from being able to cross-reference enough specific information in multiple comments to identify the participant.

In the case of administrators, a significant portion of each interview cannot be quoted at all without compromising their confidentiality due to the specificity of their responses in referring to their administrative positions' responsibilities. It is also a possibility that the familiar speaking styles of the small population of administrators could be a clue to their identities. Therefore, I have chosen to present administrator data at the relevant points within the chapters on student and faculty results instead of in one separate chapter.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS: STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF AND EXPERIENCES
WITH PUBLIC SERVICE

This chapter addresses the student results related to the three research questions:
How do students perceive and experience public service within the social structure of the
university community, including related university rhetoric? How do their perceptions
and experiences relate to their participation in public service? And, given student
perceptions and experiences, what are the implications for their everyday lives and for the
university as a community? Perceptions and experiences related to engaged scholarship
are not included in this chapter, as none of the students had been involved in engaged
scholarship or any kind of research outside of their regular course-work.

Analysis confirmed my initial reaction to the focus groups, which was that
consistency of responses was extremely high, though there were some differences of
opinion or experience. Analysis reached saturation at focus group five, with no new
codes generated by analysis of the final three focus groups. Organization of the results
from the student focus groups is in rather close alignment to the focus group question
guide. Presentation of the results is in the following order: the importance of public
service to the university; the impact of context in university rhetoric; definitions and
conceptions of public service; motivations to serve; tensions and points of disagreement;
socialization and service as a social commodity; and barriers and complications to

participating in service. Please note that when I refer to "all students," "a majority of students," etc., that I am referring to students who participated in the study and not the student body in general.

The Importance of Public Service to the University

When asked if public service was important to the University and if so, what gave them that impression, all students replied in the affirmative. They supported their responses by citing university practices related to public service, as opposed to any university rhetoric. Marco, Puck, and Carly provide three different examples, from club sports, to graduation honors, to scholarship requirements.

> Marco: I guess this is a way that the administrators encourage public service, but club sports get more funding depending on how many hours of community service we record.

> Puck: And they've started stuff like the Public Service Scholars program, like there's a clear need there, I think, that needs to be addressed. And there are a lot of people in that, to get that line on their transcript and the cord at graduation.

> Carly: UNC itself encourages these aspects. It's not just something that we're self-imposing. Like when I won the [academic scholarship], originally, they had a service component required.

Additional examples included a service-themed dormitory, service requirements for scholar-athletes, the new experiential education requirement as of the class of 2012, funding for public service projects, service-learning courses, and awards for service projects. These responses indicate that the impression left by organizational behavior trumped rhetoric in terms of salience and impact. It was the primary means by which students made sense of and articulated what was important to the University. Students did, however, rearticulate fragments of university rhetoric at other points in the discussions.

87

The Impact of Context in University Rhetoric

While the university as context is important to understand student perceptions and experiences relative to public service, the impact on students of context *within* University rhetoric was striking. Students re-articulated specific fragments of university administration rhetoric during the discussions, including "the history of service to the people of the state," "the people's university," "the privilege of being a part of Carolina," "connecting with the people of the state," and "duty to the people of the state," all fragments identified in the rhetorical analysis. Place, the privilege of this particular place, and historical precedent were recalled and discussed as the context for service, and were the only fragments of University rhetoric rearticulated within the discussion.

For example, Kate's comment was typical of those referring to the history of the University's service to the people of the state: "I think Carolina was built on service to the people of the state. It's very… It prides itself on being diverse and helpful, having well-rounded students." Her comments underscored service as not only a historical, fundamental, and foundational aspect of the university, but also one with implications for current and future students.

Regarding the history of service, consider the following exchange, which typified how 38 students recalled or participated in discussion about aspects of history in the University administration's rhetoric, and its motivation:

> Vanessa: Yeah because it is like a very old, very old… You can tell it's like in the tradition of Carolina, it's part of the history, but I think with the Chancellor, it's been stronger
>
> Nicole: [interrupts] Or been rejuvenated…
>
> Vanessa: Yeah, like I think he's really trying to bring that back.

As Bodnar, (1992) suggests, recollection of the past is being used to influence behavior in the present, and results in future. The students recognize the rhetoric and how it is being used, but within the greater discussion at the time about the privilege of being at Carolina, they expressed it positively, with pride, and without considering it manipulative. Suzanna's comment indicates how deeply the value of service is internalized and acted on by students:

> So I was taken aback by not only being around so many service organizations, but also how prevalent student leadership was in the organizations. I mean, I went to [another UNC system school] before I transferred here. A lot of time you go to an event, and there's the faculty advisor or the staff advisor and like two people. And at Carolina events, the faculty advisor is in his office. [everybody laughs]

In addition to history as context, students also rearticulated rhetoric that specifically positions the University in relationship to the people of the state and frames those within the University as being in a privileged position to those who are not. Nicole, a senior from North Carolina, said, "Our slogan's 'University of the People,' so, a lot of times we focus on giving back to North Carolina and our surrounding community." This rhetorical fragment, originally uttered by Charles Kuralt at the University's bicentennial and then incorporated into administration rhetoric, had not been used by the administration in approximately two years. Nicole's reference was not singular; it was repeated by four to seven different students in each focus group. The administration's official rhetorical slogan at the time was "Living up to the Promise of the Nation's First Public University," sometimes followed by "to the state and beyond." However, the phrase "University of the People" had been rearticulated beyond the administration so extensively that it had become a rhetorical nodal point of ongoing persuasion.

Regarding the phrase "to the state and beyond," every administrator indicated the phrase was meant to reflect the university's growing emphasis on global initiatives while acknowledging commitment to the state. Public service by participating students, however, was conducted primarily in the university's own back yard—Orange and neighboring Durham counties—or in the students' home towns. Only one student mentioned university-related service conducted in another state (Hurricane Katrina recovery in Louisiana), and only one mentioned doing public service in another country. However, three administrators lamented about how students were more interested in international service than service within the state. Chris's comments were typical:

> Chris: You know, we've got students coming out of our ears that want to go to Africa, and… do something. I'm not sure they know what it is.
>
> Leah: But they have a million dollars to do it right now. [Referring to the Millennial Village project]
>
> Chris: Right, and we can't get them to go to Bertie county to do the same thing even though we need it there. So that's a factor that we really have not accounted for, in my view, in terms of our strategy.

The irony here is that the administration's rhetoric was emphasizing places beyond the state, but the administrators wanted more students to choose to do service inside the state. The students in my focus groups were not rearticulating the global rhetoric at all, and all of them had done or were doing service in Orange and/or Durham counties. That service was not recognized at any point in the interviews with two of these three administrators.

After the interview with Chris, I began to consider whether any university program, college, or administrative unit other than the CCPS promoted service by students within the state but beyond the university's local area. I scoured bulletin boards, the university newspaper, six months' worth of informational e-mails, university calendars, the public advertising billboards known as "the cubes" outside the student

90

union, and university and student life calendars. Not only did I not find anything relative to promoting service or service opportunities in North Carolina beyond the local area, but also I did not find reference to or representation of the remainder of the state. Lectures, service trips for Hurricane Katrina recovery, research presentations, fundraisers, student organization recruiting, night-club and concert advertising, spring break travel flyers, and summer employment advertising abounded, but not one mention of the state beyond the university's borders as a service opportunity, or even as specific locations or specific communities. The remainder of the state has so little representation on campus that I could not locate it, and I was specifically looking as opposed to going about my everyday business at the university. The business school's portico, adorned with flags from around the world, does not even include a flag from North Carolina. The fact that the university had replaced its previous logo of the state's initials with a graphic depicting the Old Well, a university landmark, became relevant though paradoxical, given the comments by administrators.

In another perspective on service to the people of the state, Skippy's comments summarized the issue of privilege, the relationship of the privileged to the marginalized other, and the tension regarding whether being admitted to Carolina is a privilege bestowed or a privilege earned:

> Skippy: I think that since we're an educated body, service to the people is important, because we're fortunate to have a lot of things that others don't. Like to be at UNC. Yeah, so we're privileged, so I think we should be able to give back if we've had that privilege given to us. I mean, it's not like we didn't work for it, but you know… [shrugs] It's not why I do it, personally, but yeah, I get it.

Skippy's comments reflect those expressed by all but three of the white student participants wherein the privilege is acknowledged, but the rhetoric of privilege does not

function to motivate the students to serve. Rather, it functions to divide them from the people of the state and place them in a superior, privileged position. And while they consider it partly to be a privilege bestowed, they also consider it to be a privilege that they personally earned through their own work prior to college. This internal locus of control, sense of privilege, and division from the less privileged are reflected in Landon's comments about why he engages in public service:

> I mean… other people aren't here and maybe the state needs us to help… but… I don't feel like compelled to serve people because I'm here. I think it's more I'm compelled… I mean, I do feel privileged to be here, but it's not that. I feel more compelled by like my experiences in life and growing up and seeing the need at home to help other people. Then coming here I still need to help people because… I don't know. I definitely feel privileged, and I definitely feel the need to help people, but I don't feel like compelled just because I'm at this school that I need to give back to the state. It's more compelled because maybe that's how I'm made or something.

The remaining three white students, including Nicole, discussed the privilege of being a Carolina student as a debt—something they had been given that obligates them to serve as a repayment. Nicole said,

> Being here is a privilege, yeah. It makes me feel like I don't do enough, so, whenever I hear the chancellor talk, I'm just like, "Oh, I should volunteer more," because the University has given me a lot and I feel like I really should give more back to North Carolina.

All three students were women, native North Carolinians, and leaders in student service organizations. Each re-articulated the "University of the people" rhetoric, though they were in separate focus groups. Each expressed guilt over feeling like they do not do enough public service, though they were some of the most involved of the research participants. Each referred to hearing the chancellor talk or to the chancellor's e-mails, but not specifically to anything the chancellor said or wrote.

92

Comments from students of color indicate a very different perspective on the people of the state and the privilege of being at Carolina. They spoke of their privilege as a motivation and an opportunity to serve specific others, not as an obligation to serve the lesser privileged, generalized "people of the state." Remarks by Sarah and Sean reflect similar comments made by all but one non-Caucasian participant, an international student.

> Sarah: At Carolina, there's a lot of privilege of being able to go to college. I mean like, even me, I'm on scholarship, so I can afford to do this. I have to work and go to college at the same time, but it's still that I can do that, it's still a privilege. Or that I got in here is still a privilege. And even right here and in Durham there's a lot of people who can't afford that privilege, people I see every day. And I think that just as privileged students that public service is important, in the same way that gratitude, giving back, helping others is important.

> Sean: For the last two summers I worked at this moving company, and, I mean, it's pretty rough work, but for me, it's just good summer money for a college kid. But for everyone else there, this is what those guys do year-round, and they really don't bring home enough, and it's kind of like, these guys look at me like, oh here's this privileged kid, he goes to Carolina, and they love that too, though. [a few chuckles] I can just imagine their faces lighting up, they're always like… one of my good friends that still works there, he's always talking about how he hasn't had too many opportunities, and it really puts things in perspective. I mean, it's like I'm here for more than myself, because there are a lot of people who couldn't have been here for whatever reasons, they didn't get to make it. And there are pretty much a lot of people who died for me to have the chance to even go here. So it's like, I owe it to at least them at least to reach back, and to be all that I can be, and to remember the people who helped to get me to where I'm at now. So I'm like… I mean, I feel like a lot of students don't… everyone doesn't see it that way, so it's almost like you have to take it upon yourself to look at it that way. But I feel like just looking at things that way makes me feel better about what I'm doing.

The issue of privilege relative to the marginalized other made itself even more apparent in students' definitions and conceptions of public service, which follow.

Definitions and Conceptions of Public Service

The focus on serving the people, and the less privileged, is the primary

characteristic within student definitions of public service and what kind of activities

count as public service. At the beginning of the focus group discussions, students were in

consensus; their comments indicated that public service involves direct service to those

less privileged, and with immediate and visible outcomes. Students' initial comments

defining public service included a number of examples of activities they believed to

"count" as public service and organizations that provide a public service, as did their

discussion of the kinds of service in which they had participated. Michael's, Sarah

Jane's, and Jackie's responses incorporated various aspects of the amalgamated definition

that students negotiated out and agreed on over the course of each of the focus groups:

> Michael: When I think of public service, it's free, voluntary, um… giving your
> personal time for a need or a problem that needs some more help in addressing.
> Um, and you use your own resources to help others, and it's kind of like an
> organized, on schedule thing. When I think of public service, like the first thing
> that comes to my mind is Habitat for Humanity, kind of.

> Sarah Jane: I just wrote kind of a definition. Performing an action that is
> beneficial to the greater community and helping those who need help, which is
> mainly those who are less fortunate than you.

> Jackie: Helping people because you want to, and because it's something you feel
> like the people want, like it will just make their day better or something.

While each focus group teased out the definition in different ways or a different

order, the consistency of what was agreed to, across eight focus groups, was arresting.

There were some nuances that differed slightly, depending on the depth of discussion on

any particular characteristic of service. For example, the characteristic of "immediate

outcome" was stated both in terms of outcomes for the beneficiaries of service and in

terms outcomes for the one performing the service. Jessika and Anna captured each side of the outcomes:

> Jessika: [Public service project] lets you do something that makes concrete changes around you. And I think that people like that feeling, that they can actually see the results of their work right in front of them.

> Anna: I'm beginning to wonder about the impact of the organization as a whole, like, whether or not that is organization-worthy to have my time, not that my time is more special than anyone else's [all laugh], but I could be using my time in a more effective way.

Note that Jessika and Anna are both talking about service from an organizational perspective. Students in four focus groups brought up the question of whether helping an appropriate other independently was public service, and each time they concluded that unorganized service was not public service, but private charity. Alice's comments about organized service as "official" represent the perceptions of those discussions:

> Something that was on my mind… about how it's sometimes hard to say what is public service and what isn't, and where do you draw the line? And especially like, if you're tutoring people on your own, like you could be helping people in your dorm or something and is that considered public service? Because it's not constructive necessarily, it's different from volunteering over at the math help center where it is you're officially a tutor and they officially need tutoring. The private individual stuff, I don't think that counts.

The discussions revealed that none of students included public policy work, protest, social justice work, or politically oriented activities as "legitimate" forms of service, even when directly probed on these modes of engagement. Only two considered advocacy a form of public service, and both had been through the Public Service Scholars orientation program through the Center for Public Service; the examples each student gave related to the non-controversial issues of homelessness and education. Regarding such activities, Sarah's comments provided an illustration of the agreed-upon distinction:

I'm pretty heavily involved in political and in other groups that do public service. Like I'm an organizer of the Middle-Eastern student forum, which is a student forum where we have discussions and events and stuff. It's to bring awareness to people about political controversies they should be aware of. But then also for example I'm in another organization that's a religious organization. And we did this thing where we got people to pledge to fast for one day and then we had business sponsors who would donate money for everyone who fasted to the food bank of North Carolina, so we had like 400 meals donated. I think, like, like feeding people yes, that's public service. But the educational stuff, no, no. That's not public service, that's personal, it's political. [shaking her head and pushing her hand to the side, as though pushing away the idea]

A Muslim student who dresses modestly and wears a headscarf in accordance with her religious traditions commented on the line between the personal and the political when discussing why she participates in public service:

I do it because it's the right thing to do, because people need help and I can help them so I should do that. I mean, I do think it's important for people to see people dressed like me out there doing good things. I mean, that's not why I do it. That's more of a personal thing. There's still so much hostility, all these years later [after 9/11], and I went to the memorial service this year, and this girl was staring at me, so ugly, like, "What are YOU doing here?" Like just because I'm Muslim? Really? And I've got an aunt who works at the Pentagon and a family history of being in the military. I mean, it's a problem sometimes, like I organized a Halloween canned food drive, you know, trick-or-treating for the shelter, but I didn't go because I didn't want people thinking I was wearing a costume. So sometimes it causes problems, but I just deal, you know, because the important thing is helping people.

In addition, a comment from Skippy gave some insight on undergraduate student culture at Carolina, at least in his experience: "Talking about politics is not something we do much around here." For many students, that may be the case, particularly partisan politics. But public education and advocacy regarding anything controversial were deemed personal causes, or political, and those deemed political were sometimes characterized as dirty or suspect. Consider Jeff's comment:

I mean sometimes I get the feeling that once you mix politics and activism in, it becomes this abominable thing with the media effects and stuff. I think people should act altruistically, and they poke around and find dirt and stuff and it taints

96

the image of public service. I'm not so sure about mixing public service and activism.

Carina's comments regarding service and politics flipped the concern around and considered the University's perspective, bringing both institutional neutrality as communicated, again, by the University's actions, and not its rhetoric:

> Um, I almost feel like they think, like the university thinks, service can be tainted by politics and religion and these other kind of things, like it's supposed to be more like people just volunteering to meet other people's basic needs. Food, shelter, clothing, basic education. Stuff like the APPLES program.

> In two focus groups, sense-making and nuance evolved into creation of a

hierarchy of public service activities, through the back-and-forth questioning and discussion. The discussion in one group began when Jessika, one of two students to consider advocacy a form of service, made the following comment:

> Yeah, I was kind of thinking about all those nonprofit organizations, putting them along a line like with advocacy at one end and service organizations that help people out at the other. But either way, it's about making a difference and trying to help out someone who may be less fortunate than you.

Eventually, they had placed "just giving money" at one end of a continuum and direct service as defined above at the other end. They placed fundraising just above giving money, then administrative or "back of the office" work, then service that didn't involve direct contact with those who benefited but did have an immediate and direct positive effect, service organization leadership, then direct service. Of the two students who believed advocacy to be a form of service, one qualified it as service not involving direct contact, and Jessika placed it above direct service:

> I think that probably the best form of service is one where you can't necessarily call it service. Like for example those people who are advocating against the death penalty or something. I don't know that they'd say they're volunteering or doing service. But I think it's true service when you can't necessarily even use that word, because otherwise it's like you're doing it to fulfill some sort of

requirement. That seems to make more sense, that if I'm genuinely passionate about it then it becomes much more like a passion and less like service. It becomes more a part of your personality.

When motivated by passion to act on a particular subject or in a particular way, then, that passion becomes an aspect of one's identity—it becomes personal, and therefore is either the highest form of service, or not service at all.

Motivations to Serve

Initially, students indicated a limited number of motivations to serve that fell into three basic categories: personal, such as a religious duty, a sense of altruism, a sense of satisfaction or enjoyment, or an obligation of the privileged; communitarian, such as a need to contribute to or give back to the common good; and pragmatic, such as socializing, or having to do service to maintain membership in a student organization that the student enjoyed. A moral imperative, fun, and making a difference were the most widely discussed, as illustrated by the following comments:

> Cole: I have a really strong faith, and there's a part in the Bible that says um, when you feed and clothe, or when you serve others, you do so unto Him. So that's another important thing to me…

> Kate: I think that people who volunteer chose to do it because they love and care about others, it's not that anyone else is telling them to do it. I volunteer. I work at a [crisis] hotline and I do it because I want to. It's not because I have to or because I'm getting work experience or anything. It's because I love it. I'm helping them, listening to them, and that's what they need.

> Liz: I don't want to sound cliché, but when you are, like, helping someone one on one, it makes a difference in how they react to you, just how they like become happy as opposed to maybe a different situation. It makes you feel better about yourself that you were able to help someone.

Impact and outcomes were a defining characteristic of public service in every group, and they were most often expressed in terms of "helping someone who needs it" in some way, or "making a difference for someone." All but one of the students expressed a

desire to perform service that would make a *difference* at a personal scale, but never to create *change* at a personal scale, or to create difference or change at a larger community or societal scale, or over the long term. In fact, two-thirds expressed frustration over a perceived inability to effect change at a larger scale. Sean, an African-American male senior, captured the frustration, along with the inter-relationship of privilege and making a difference:

> Sean: I mean, yeah, there's always a need out there… there's always problems to be solved, but what can I do to change something like how so many blacks get the short end of the stick when it comes to jobs or something? It's been a problem forever, and I can't change that, but um… but I can make a difference. I'm in a position to do that. I can reach back and help other people.

Tensions and Points of Disagreement

As the discussions progressed to what activities counted as public service and what motivated people to participate, the definition of public service took on more nuance and areas of contention began to emerge. Students agreed that motivation to serve was an important aspect of the definition, but disagreed over what motivations were acceptable or not. They agreed that outcomes were important, but disagreed over whether personal benefits and rewards to them as outcomes were acceptable. Those who agreed that personal benefits and rewards were acceptable disagreed over which benefits and rewards were acceptable.

Natasha captured one of the primary tensions over appropriate motivations, discussed to some degree in every focus group, while discussing her own motivation:

> I've been told to appreciate what you have and… try to give to others so they can feel some love or something. [laughs] I guess it's only that the obligation comes in when I think about the bigger picture, because I don't think a lot of people see it that way, don't see it as an obligation. They see it more as a responsibility, more like something they have to do for school.

Regarding the role of motivation, and the tension between motivation and outcomes, comments from Carly and Sarah in two different focus groups represent the extremes.

> Carly: It might as well just be like an ends justifies the means thing. Like whether or not you want to do it, you're still doing an act of public service. In the end, you're still helping someone, so… That's still service. I mean, they don't know what your motivations are. If you're the one receiving the service, the one benefitting from it, I don't think it would make a difference to them if you did it because you had to for some clubs or if you did it because you were genuinely passionate about it.

> Sarah: I don't think it matters if you're not doing it for the right reasons, good and noble reasons… You should be doing it because it's the right thing to do, to help other people, you know, not because it makes you feel all warm and fuzzy or you can put it on your job applications.

In one focus group, the students discussed the motivation-related tension between personal benefits such as satisfaction or feeling good about themselves, versus the more noble motivation of doing good for others. They resorted to an ethical authority as the time to end the focus group loomed.

> Marco: Well, but you could always look at it as the reason why we feel good about it is because we're helping them and not because we're all pleased with ourselves for doing the right thing and being such good people.

> Anna: This is like a philosophy class… [all laugh]

> Melissa: But it's for kicks, and we have brownies. [all laugh]

> Anna: It just reminds me of The Philosophy of Ethics, the philosophy class I took.

> Marco: Oh, that class…

> Anna: Yeah, and it's… it's intense. However, Socrates came to the final conclusion that people can do things that make them feel good.

> Leah: You can do good and feel well at the same time?

Anna: Well, you can't do it for that reason. I mean, people can do things to be doing good and it's OK to feel good about it, I think is what it was. [laughs, apparently at her thin memory of it, as do others, but in a supportive way]

The collective nature of the sense-making process and the nuance of what "qualified" as service are both reflected in this exchange, as is the tension between sacrifice and benefit, and between different kinds of benefits:

Leah: Does the behind-the-scenes stuff count?

Puck: Oh, yeah, definitely!

Liz: I think it counts for a lot more.

Cookie: Yeah, they tell you… they label it "leadership." And that counts for more than just regular service.

Puck: Yeah, and it doesn't really matter what you're doing.

Liz: It's like making a sacrifice to keep the organization going and create opportunities for others. It's more time you have to put in, and not everybody thinks that kind of stuff is fun.

A comment from Michael indicated a tension between motivations and benefits when discussing his membership in a service-based student organization relative to why he participates in public service. He said, "I mean, it's a service organization. You don't join it if you don't enjoy doing service. [laughter] And it's rewarding to me, and yeah, it's gonna look good on your résumé like anything else you do in service. But I do it because I *like* it."

The debates over the nuances of what counts as public service, the differences of opinion over appropriate motivations and benefits, and concerns about outcomes add significant insights to our understanding of how ambiguous the concept of public service can be. While a core of consensus existed around the basic definition, the rich variety of subtleties emerged through the lack of consensus. However, when the discussion of

101

benefits and rewards took a turn toward the role of service in personal success, consensus returned with remarkably similar experiences of socialization and personal accomplishment.

Socialization and Service as a Social Commodity

During the discussion of personal benefits and rewards, students did not mention the inclusion of public service activities in their college application process or their future job searches. However, during the first focus group in the discussion on whether public service was important to the university, a student remarked that she heard a lot more from the university career services office about the importance of participating in public service to be a well-rounded future job applicant than she heard about the importance of service in and of itself, just like in high school regarding future college applications.

Probing in the first and subsequent focus groups revealed that students were pre-socialized by the college application process to understand service work as a social commodity to be exchanged later, via résumé, for better opportunities as they leave college. Considering service as a system of social exchange became inculcated when, as high school students, their parents, siblings, peers, teachers, school policies, and guidance counselors emphasized the necessity of a well-rounded application that included service and leadership. This socialization continued in college, as the University emphasized the necessity of being a well-rounded student to be a competitive job applicant. According to Heather, the socialization in high school was highly systemized:

> Yeah, and like in our honor club, they would specifically tell us what activities we needed to do to get into college, and they would like, have to approve everything that you wanted to do before you did it, and they were like, "OK this is good enough to do, but this is not a good enough project to do, and this is a good organization to get involved with to help you get into college," type thing. So it was always kind of hammered into our heads.

102

And the Carolina application process, as opposed to Carolina's rhetoric about what constituted a successful candidate, continued that socialization. The following exchange was typical of the application discussion, which came up in six of the eight focus groups:

> Sarah Jane: That form, there were a lot of lines, but they were really clear with us that it wasn't about the number of things, but how well you did them, to pick a few things and do them really well and get really involved…
>
> Nicole: It's not really about the number of lines, but they are there, you know? You do think about it. Because even then, even when you get really involved, being really involved in more stuff is better…
>
> Bunnae: Yeah, but they told us don't just join, try and do something, be an officer, be involved. It was about the leadership thing.
>
> Leah: OK, so you have to show your leadership abilities, show your commitment. [lots of "yeahs"]
>
> Nicole: Yeah, but there are 10 lines, *10* lines! And the application form seems to suggest that you *ought* to be able to fill them all up!
>
> Leah: So the *application itself* seems to suggest it?
>
> Megan: Yeah, it's really tricky. [all laugh]

In interviews with university administrators, two of them discussed the undergraduate application and selection process, and I broached the subject of the application itself with each. One administrator responded, "That's what it takes to get into a top university." Another administrator responded as follows:

> Leah: In the student focus groups, one of the consistent comments across groups, they talk about the college application process and when they're preparing to apply to college for the four to five years before, one of the things on their mind is, "What will demonstrate that I'm a well-rounded student, and an involved student?" And a lot of them, the vast majority really, choose to be involved in many different things in part because on the state application there are 10 lines for extra-curriculars, and they talk about the pressure of filling up those
>
> Terry: [interrupts] That dissipates the chance to have an impact. You get people who are sort of frenetic in their activity but not really committed to anything in a

103

sustained way. There are a few of them who are, and there's a pool for that sustained commitment over time. I believe that they won't know this and they can't be comforted too much because they won't believe you if you tell them, but if you have five good ones, it's better than 10 to which you just signed your name and showed up one day.

Terry focused responsibility on the students in this response as opposed to addressing the function of the application form, despite also stating students would not believe anyone who told them something different from what the form suggests. Terry's assumption was that filling in all those lines meant frenetic, uncommitted service with little or no impact. However, students who discussed their high school public service all spoke of being actively involved and often being involved enough to gain a leadership position, but never of just joining an organization and not being involved. They also spoke of the outcomes of their service work in terms of making an immediate and visible difference, which to them meant having an impact even though it may not be long-term.

All of the students agreed that socialization regarding expected service-related activity continued with little interruption upon their matriculation at the University. The following exchange was typical of discussions in each focus group:

Marco: Yeah, like it's never enough, whatever you do is never enough, you have to keep going and you can't take a break. I was in shock. We're under all this pressure to get all this stuff on our college résumés, then the minute we get here, we've got all this pressure to get all this stuff on our job résumés.

Melissa: Exactly. [all laugh]

Liz: Yeah, and it's not the education that's going to get you a job, that's not enough anymore

Marco: [interjects] Exactly, yeah…

Liz: …Now you've got to do all this other stuff, you've got to be the well-rounded job applicant now.

While we did not explore "what it means to be well-rounded," it related obviously to peer comparisons, given that it was discussed relative to job applications. Students expressed that while in college, they rely heavily on their interpretations of peer behavior to determine what they should or shouldn't be doing, and perceive peer behavior in extremist terms that position the student as under-achieving, motivating them to do more. The following exchange, though long, reflects not only the power of peer behavior, but also the cathartic nature of its revelation and the realization that it's a collective instead of individual experience.

Elle: I worked hard to get in, and now I can relax, that's how I felt freshman year.

Anya: Yeah man, "I made it into college, I'm done with all that work it took to get in here." [all laugh. They keep talking over and adding onto each other, and there's a sense of relief, but also of common chagrin: "Oh, how silly we were! And at least it wasn't just me that was so mistaken!"]

Todd: Like, "I can just have fun now!" [all laugh] But no!

Anya: Yeah, and then I realized everybody around me was still going at it!

Elle: Yeah!

Anya: They're doing *all* this stuff, and I'm like…

Elle: Like, "Why? Why are you working so hard?"

Anya: "Doing so much?" Yeah. And it's about the next step, they're like, résumés and jobs, it looks good for that. And I was like, "Dangit!"

Carina: Oh yeah, because friends were like, "I've got this going on, and this going on, and I'm doing this and that," and I was like… OK. I've got work and school… [laughs] And I need to be doing more, getting more involved. It's like, you *have* to be busy. Because everybody is busy.

The composition of the student body—"Everybody"—is the product of University behavior in the form of the admissions process. Again, the influence of organizational behavior as a salient form of communicating priorities is made apparent, fostering and

105

normalizing University culture and experience for students. Vanessa's comments

captured the implications and reflect again the extremist perspective through her claim

that, "Everybody is like that":

> Yeah, that's just how it is here, and it's because of who they let in. Everybody is like that. It's always "Oh, I gotta go study, I gotta go work out, I've got a meeting, I've got this thing I have to go do," even when it's like, going out at seven in the morning to go pick up trash off the highway. Those are the kinds of students who get in.

Vanessa's perspective was shared by students in three other focus groups, and it

was confirmed by Taylor, one of two administrators who discussed the application and

selection process:

> In the first place in selecting students, we have a bias toward students who have a propensity toward engagement and public service, and that's one of the things we look for in our undergraduates, and who are also leaders. So we set out to have an active student population by the students we choose, who we select to be members of this community.

An additional aspect of student socialization during college is that many of the

students and the majority of the seniors participated not only in service they could list on

their future résumé, but in service that would provide significant experience in their

chosen career. Maggie's comments were the most specific:

> So then when I decided I wanted to be a nurse, it was suggested that I volunteer at Hospice. Because of all the things you have to do as a nurse, when somebody dies that would be the hardest, so I needed to be in that situation. So I go every weekend and work and try to get used to that aspect of health care.

Vanessa's comments indicate just how strategic some students are relative to how

they utilize their service experience in service of their future career:

> Like when I apply to internships, I only put relevant things down that would show that I am trying to get into that profession. I mean, I put everything down, but I'll put those first. Because I've just been told that they don't want to see that you've built a house if it's not what you're going to be doing. I mean, it sounds messed

up, but you know, they really don't want to see it, but I've done it, so I'm going to show you.

Socialization, University behavior, peer influence, and consideration of future careers are significant factors that motivate student behavior and choices regarding public service. However, barriers and other complications influence student behavior and choices as well.

Barriers and Complications to Participating in Service

The discussion of why students participate in service was followed by a discussion of why they choose the service opportunities they do, why they choose not to participate in others, or what inhibits or prevents them for participating. Students indicated that they have difficulty identifying and connecting with service opportunities that they are able to do, that are related to subjects of interest, and that they feel to be effective in terms of outcomes.

The vast majority of student participants relied on opportunism (personal e-mail, a friend's invitation), resulting in unsatisfying and scatter-shot, short-term service. But if an organization is perceived as being overzealous in its e-mail contact, the students indicated that they backed away from those opportunities due to a concern that the organization was too needy and may overwhelm them. Regarding service learning courses, they indicated that they desired service learning opportunities that challenge them but found many to be "busy work" or unfulfilling. Service learning courses that don't challenge students are seen as "a waste of time," and are usually the last service learning course a student takes.

One tension regarding barriers to participation is reflected in comments in different focus groups by Elle and Cookie: the difficulty of getting involved later in one's college career, versus the potential of getting overwhelmed in one's first year.

> Elle: I feel like there's kind of a downside to it if you don't get involved freshman year. All of a sudden, you're really out of the loop. And I tried to get involved, and sitting in those meetings, it just seemed like everyone knew each other already, or everyone was like, "Oh I'll talk to the head of the Y," or something, and as someone trying to get into it, I felt like I just didn't contribute anything at all. So, it was kind of like, it was sort of a little bit tough to find a niche for myself, where there wasn't like already way too many people filling some need, so…

> Cookie: I wish I had at least waited. I just dove into everything. Because when you get here, everybody's like, "Here, here, here… Here!" You know, flyers, handouts, and you're like, "Yeah!" [lots of laughter] And then you know there's 6:30. Like *everybody* wants to have a meeting at 6:30. [lots of laughter] You know? So you go to that, then you leave and go to another one, the 7:00 meeting, and you just lose school. You just *lose* school. And I mean, I didn't get like a 1.5 or anything, but I just… [more laughter] I just dove in so deep, and I wish I hadn't.

> Leah: The infamous 1.5 of academic probation… [lots of laughter]

Much of the discussion of barriers and complications related not to why students did not participate in some public service opportunities, but rather why they did not participate in *more* public service. Available time was the primary reason, but Melissa's comments indicate how significantly overloaded some students felt before they would decline additional service opportunities:

> And that's one of my biggest problems, like I set myself up and do too much and *can't* stop to take care of myself and my parents are like, "You've been doing this since high school, why don't you take a break? We know how much work you do, and it's alright to take care of yourself." So… that's what I'm doing right now, worrying about my personal well-being. You know? I just can't help people 24/7. It was just too much.

Another factor in participation and non-participation was opportunity. Only two students indicated that they had actively sought out particular service opportunities; the

rest became involved after being solicited through advertisements of various kinds, but

mainly through friends' invitations or happening upon an acceptable opportunity. Anna's

comments reflect both the complication of prioritizing activities and the role of

opportunity:

> Anna: This year I'm in a residence hall honors society thing, but we do a lot of service projects. And so I've been active with them, but I've kind of teetered off this year, with finishing up school and with law school applications.
>
> Leah: Law school applications. So this year you're less involved because you've got something else that's a life priority that you have to deal with?
>
> Anna: Yeah, yeah. And partly because I haven't had the opportunities present themselves as easily as they had been in other years. Like, I just ran for [residence area] governor and got it so then I was heavily involved in that. And that was just easy, it just showed up, kind of fell in my lap.

While easy opportunities were a primary quality of students' service efforts,

organizations that repeatedly contacted students via e-mail with opportunities resulted in

actually turning those students away from the opportunity. Comments similar to

Landon's were made in every focus group and affirmed by students.

> Landon: Well but the problem for me was like I went to Fall Fest and learned about a lot of things that sounded cool and ended up on their e-mail lists. But they e-mail you so often that you would just, or at least this was how I was, I would just want to delete them because it was like one e-mail after another, and it was just *crazy*.
>
> Leah: Almost like they're harassing you? [laughter and nods all around]
>
> Landon: Yeah! I feel like… had it been like a once a month reminder about "Oh, we're doing this on this night," or "Come join us for this," I may have been better off, but I was just *overwhelmed* and all these e-mails were flooding my in-box. So, I think that's what my problem was.

The first time this came up, I commented that it sounded like the equivalent of

"Desperate Date Syndrome," and how the more desperate or needy or clingy a potential

date is, the less likely you are to go out with them. The students concurred and added it was particularly true if you had more than one opportunity at your disposal.

Even when the right opportunities present themselves at the right time, it does not ensure a positive experience for students, which results in their not continuing that particular public service opportunity. Cookie, an African American woman in what is a primarily white university, said, "I don't get involved with some stuff because of the demographic. If I go and don't see anyone who's like me or that I think can relate to me, that's it."

Safety was another complication. Sarah discussed at length both her safety concerns about some the neighborhoods, work-sites, or time of day of some opportunities and her guilt about those safety concerns. She summarized by saying, "If I feel like I'm at risk, I just can't be comfortable doing it. I felt bad, but I found something else." Being comfortable in a different context and with different people brings us full circle to the impact of context and the relationship to the other, and the implications for students and the university as a community.

Summary

This chapter has provided the study results related to student perceptions of and experiences with public service at UNC-Chapel Hill. While all students agreed that public service was important to the university, they discussed administrative behaviors as evidence, and not university rhetoric. The salience and impact of the organization's behavior trumped its rhetoric. The rhetorical fragments that students rearticulated during discussion of other questions emphasized context, particularly the history of service, the university of the people, the privilege of being a part of the university, and the

110

relationship to the people of the state. These particular nodal points function to shape students' perception of public service as a fundamental characteristic of the university and themselves as privileged. The strength of the phrase "university of the people," not used by the administration in more than two years, was much greater than that of the current slogan used by the administration, which students did not re-articulate at all.

The concept of privilege functioned differently for students of different races. All but three white students did not feel motivated by the privilege of being at Carolina. Rather, it functioned to divide them from the people of the state and place them in a superior, privileged position. The three white students who were motivated to do public service because of the privilege of being at Carolina spoke of it as a debt to be repaid. They also spoke of it as a source of guilt that they were not doing enough service. All but one of the students of color spoke of their privilege as a motivation and an opportunity to serve specific others instead of the generalized lesser privileged people of the state.

The rhetorical nodal points regarding privilege relative to the marginalized other are reified in how students defined public service and the kinds of activities that count as public service. They indicated that public service is *direct but organized service to benefit "appropriate" others in need with an immediate and visible outcome, done on a volunteer basis (as opposed to mandated), and involving a personal sacrifice*. None of the students included public policy work, protest, social justice work, or politically oriented activities as "legitimate" forms of service because of their relationship to politics or conflict, even when directly probed on these modes of engagement. Only two considered advocacy a form of public service. Students discussed political and controversial issues as being personal, and therefore not considered public service.

111

Initially, students indicated a limited number of motivations to serve that fell into three basic categories: personal, communitarian, and pragmatic. Almost all of the students expressed a desire to perform service that would make a *difference* on a personal scale, but never to create *change* on a personal scale, or to create difference or change on a larger community or societal scale, or over the long term; two-thirds expressed frustration over a perceived inability to effect change on a larger scale.

As the discussions progressed to what activities counted as public service and what motivated people to participate, the definition of public service took on more nuance and areas of contention began to emerge. Students agreed that motivation to serve was an important aspect of the definition, but disagreed over what motivations were acceptable or not. They agreed that outcomes were important, but disagreed over whether personal benefits and rewards to them as outcomes were acceptable. Those who agreed that personal benefits and rewards were acceptable disagreed over which benefits and rewards were acceptable.

Probing in the first and subsequent focus groups revealed that students were pre-socialized by the college application process to understand service work as a social commodity to be exchanged later, via résumé, for better opportunities as they leave college. The Carolina application process, as opposed to Carolina's rhetoric about what constituted a successful candidate, continued that socialization with the form's 10 lines for extracurricular activities. All of the students agreed that socialization regarding expected service-related activity continued with little interruption upon their matriculation at the University, from the university's focus on becoming a well-rounded

job application, but primarily from peer modeling. Future career plans even influenced the types of service students performed.

Students indicated that specific barriers and complications affect why they choose the service opportunities they do, why they choose not to participate in others, or what inhibits or prevents them for participating. They indicated that they have difficulty identifying and connecting with service opportunities that they are able to do, that are related to subjects of interest, and that they feel to be effective in terms of outcomes. They rely primarily on opportunism in identifying service work, with invitations from friends and personal e-mail being most significant. Available time, being able to identify with others in the organization or project, and feeling safe were all complications or barriers to service.

A notable point with implications for the later discussion of this analysis is that students did not use the terms "outreach," "engagement," or "engaged scholarship" during any of the focus groups. While students did mention service learning and APPLES service learning courses, they described the related projects as public service and offered no mention of research, applied research, or engaged research projects. Even in one reference to an APPLES course project that included an organizational analysis, the project was referred to in terms of the deliverable report to the nonprofit organization, and not in terms of the applied research process necessary to produce the report itself. These results vary significantly from those related to faculty, which comprise the following two chapters.

CHAPTER 5

RESULTS: FACULTY PERCEPTIONS OF
PUBLIC SERVICE AND ENGAGED SCHOLARSHIP

The results from faculty interviews reflect a great variety of perceptions and

experiences, as the conversations were more loosely structured and far-ranging than

student focus groups, and faculty members had a longer tenure in university affairs in

general. Given the degree of variety and complexity of the faculty results, I have divided

them into two chapters. Chapter five deals primarily with RQ 1 relative to faculty: How

do they perceive and experience public service and engaged scholarship within the social

structure of the university community, including university rhetoric? This chapter

focuses on faculty members' opinions on the importance of public service and engaged

scholarship to the university and their definitions of the terms. Chapter six deals

primarily with results related to RQ2 on participation and RQ3 on implications for their

daily lives.

To protect the confidentiality of the participants, I have aggregated their relevant

individual information instead of providing individual descriptions. Participants included

seven full professors (29%, and including three endowed), eight associate professors

(33%), six assistant professors (25%), and three fixed-term (13%). Five (21%) were

women and 20 (79%) were men; one was African-American and 23 were white. Four

direct or co-direct a university academic center, institute, or program. Two were

department administrators, and four were past department administrators. The minimum

length of employment at Carolina was four years, the maximum was more than two

decades, and the average was 16 years. Disciplines and program areas represented

include American studies, biology, business, chemistry, communication studies,

comparative literature, computer science, economics, education, English, folk lore,

foreign languages, geography, geology, history, human sexuality studies, Jewish studies,

journalism/mass communication, mathematics, philosophy, physics, political science,

religious studies, social work, and sociology.

Faculty members tended toward long and often complex responses that did not

lend themselves well to paraphrasing or extraction of summative statements without

compromising the voice of the faculty member. De-identification of personal

information also made it necessary to use generic substitutes for some words and phrases,

some of which are long to prevent loss of the quotation's meaning and comprehensibility.

These two issues have resulted in a number of lengthy quotations. The breadth of the

conversations is reflected in the organization of this chapter, which includes the

following: importance of public service and engaged scholarship to the university,

university rhetoric, university motivation, defining public service, and defining engaged

scholarship. As with the entire study, when I refer to "all faculty members," "a majority

of faculty members," etc., I am referring to participants in this study and not the entire

academic affairs faculty population.

Importance of Public Service and Engaged Scholarship to the University

When asked if they thought public service and engaged scholarship were important to the university, faculty members either responded in the affirmative, indicated they received mixed signals on the subject, or asked me to define one or both of the terms. Those who responded in the affirmative represented a cross-section of disciplines. Those who received mixed signals were from the humanities. Those who asked me to define one or both of the terms were from the physical and natural sciences, core curriculum disciplines, the humanities, or the social sciences. Of the 13 faculty members who responded in the affirmative, there were two categories: those who spoke in terms of the university's future and external audiences, and those who spoke in terms of importance within the university itself. Four spoke to the importance of public service and engaged scholarship for the university relative to its future well-being and its audiences, some of which were specifically named and some of which were more general. For example, Bill, an associate professor in the social sciences, responded relative to the university's future by saying:

> Oh, absolutely. There's no question about it. Absolutely no question about it. This university cannot go forward in this state without it. There's absolutely no chance. So I look at what the chancellor's done in this respect, and I think he's politically a very savvy operator.

Doris, an associate professor in the physical and natural sciences, responded relative to the university's audiences, as did Jay, a professor in the physical and natural sciences. While Doris spoke to the expectations of those audiences, Jay spoke to the need to communicate what the university does and why it is important:

> Doris: Yes... [long pause] I think probably the citizens of North Carolina and our legislature have a pretty high expectation that we're going to give something back for what the state provides to the university. I don't know what people really expect, if they have specific expectations, or if they just expect that faculty and

universities and other state agencies will give something back. But I don't know what those expectations are. Everybody wants something right? [both laugh]

Jay: Absolutely. I don't think we should exist if we can't explain to people why what we're doing is important. Yeah. I don't believe in the ivory tower model. We need to be able to tell people why we're doing what we're doing and why it's important. And that goes down to the intro class I teach.

Daniel, a professor in the social sciences and program director, took a slightly different tack to the question. He discussed the importance of the university system's General Administration's efforts to increase service and engagement, and that the university's actions—not rhetoric—communicate that it finds service and engagement important:

I think there's clear signals coming from the GA that indicate a desire to have more engaged scholarship, to do things that show relevance to the state. I think that the university is certainly sending signals with the offices and organizational structure that have been set up, that's true.

Of those who spoke of service and engagement as important within the university, only one re-articulated any university administration rhetoric in response to that specific question, but all referred to administration behavior and activity within the university. Edward, a full professor in the social sciences who holds an administrative position in a program, did refer to some contemporary examples of behaviors and activities that he felt indicated public service and engaged scholarship were valued at the university. However, he was the only faculty member to refer to the university's historical context, as students had done.

I do. I think that's sort of a mantra here. The university from the very beginning has tried to reach out to the state of North Carolina and to the region, and the history of [program] here really begins with Howard Odum and the whole vision of it is to go into the field and work with [specific populations] that live in totally different worlds. So the study of the South, which began here under Odom really was anchored in that, and it's extended in health care, and legal aid, and all sorts of areas, that whatever the school within the university, it seems to be a significant part of the history of what they've done.

While Edward referred to a generic mantra as opposed to articulating what the specific

mantra is, he was specific about activities initiated within and across the university and

contextualized them historically. However, five of the six administrators referred

specifically to the university's history when asked about the importance of service and

engagement, such as when Stacey said, "It's very different here. It's clearly more in the

fabric of the institution, its history, and I think it harkens back really to the founding of

the institution."

In addition to Edward, eight faculty members responded directly to the question

of importance to the university by discussing contemporary administrative actions,

including leadership commitment and budget allocations. Odin is an associate professor

in the humanities who has been involved in service learning courses and engaged

scholarship. Odin's comments typify those responses:

> Odin: I *think* so. You know, there's pretty good evidence of that. What I started
> to say initially was that people in the university are using all the right words to
> suggest that they value it. Now I think there have been some structural and
> budget commitments as well, and you may be more familiar with those than I am
> since you're working more closely with folks in that area, but APPLES, for
> example, has been tightly connected to the vice provost's office. And I'm having
> a hard time remembering the title, but there's another title of someone who's kind
> of responsible for also overseeing engaged scholarship.
>
> Leah: The vice chancellor for service and engagement?
>
> Odin: Thank you. So it really looks like the university is making a unique
> commitment as well, the vice chancellor position. I only live on this campus, but
> from talking with people on other campuses, I don't see that same kind of rhetoric
> that we get here.

Like Edward, Odin referred to the generic "all the right words to suggest that they value

it" instead of the actual words used, but whatever those words are, they only "suggest"

that service and engagement are valued. The "commitments" to service and engagement

are reflected through the actions, and through the proximity of structures or programs to the executives in the administration. Comments from Bob, a professor in the social sciences, drew a tight relationship between the perception of importance to the university, programs, leadership, and budget allocations:

> They've got these great programs going on, somebody at some high level has some motivation. The CCPS, they're dropping a dime there, and these Kauffman fellowships, that's a lot. You can learn something about people's motivation by how they spend their money, and a lot of it is through gifts, but they're obviously focusing on it.

While Odin said he *thinks* service and engagement are important to the university because of administrative actions and behaviors, Bob said those actions and behaviors indicate they are "obviously focusing" on service and engagement. Geoff, an associate professor in the social sciences who conducts engaged scholarship in an inherently engaged discipline, emphasized the relationship between leadership, resource allocation, and university priorities in a slightly different way:

> Certainly it's valued in [my academic unit]. Further up the university, it really depends on who's sitting in the chairs, I think. Meaning that certain provosts will know more about what we do than others depending on what discipline they came from, so there might be some, you know, different emphasis on resource allocation or what-not. And we do generate [a significant amount of grant income], so I don't think we're ignored in what we do.

While Geoff indicated that what is important to the university depends on leadership that changes over time, he also perceived resource allocation to be an indicator of what is important to those leaders, but that an academic unit or researcher's ability to generate external revenue is a determinant of importance to the administration.

While some administration behaviors may indicate that service and engagement are important to the university, other behaviors indicated the opposite to two faculty and created mixed signals due to the conflicting messages of the rhetoric and the actions.

119

Two faculty members indicated that funding decisions caused them to doubt the

university's rhetoric:

> Lecturer: They say it's important, you know, to help the community, but, well… I had applied once for a grant with [faculty in another discipline] to work with [public education professionals in the community] to look at, figure out how to [address a challenge in public schools]. To me, that's probably the biggest thing going. We worked very hard on this grant, a university grant, and we didn't get it. We were both disappointed, and then I found out there were two people I know, they got the grant, and it was theoretical, not applied, to do [a project without a direct impact, not involving a community]. And my thinking is, where can we have a greater impact than in the public schools? I mean, there's a value to [the other project], but there's no direct impact.

> Assistant professor: Yes, from what they say, but I think it's really only in a very specific way. Like when I heard that talk about service and engaged scholarship, that there was support that was available through the Dean's office, it was about helping kids, helping women, not helping businesses. But at this level, the ones who are getting those fellowships or graduate scholarships are the ones choosing projects that make you cry, or move you, or are oh so nice. It's not the projects like helping a business bring in more dollars thanks to some new idea you come up with.

Again, no specific rhetoric was re-articulated in these perceptions, but rather the generic

"they say." Regardless of what it is specifically that has been said, the behavior proves to

have more significant persuasive power in the perception and experience of these faculty.

It also makes the case that, in terms of research, some approaches are more valued than

others, and some beneficiaries are appropriate while others are not. The rhetoric that was

specifically re-articulated in faculty interviews primarily positioned the university and its

faculty and students relative to the people of the state as the appropriate other.

The Privileged Benefitting the People of the State: University Rhetoric

How faculty members perceive the university is important to understanding their

perceptions of the context of public service and engaged scholarship, as well as the

context of their everyday professional lives. Half of the faculty members interviewed re-

articulated specific fragments of university rhetoric at some point during their interviews, all of which related to positioning the "university of the people" and those "privileged" who are a part of it relative to the "people of the state." Specific mentions of service and engagement associated with university rhetoric emphasized "benefit to the people" of North Carolina or "benefit to the state," or emphasized that service is "part of the culture" or referenced it in historical terms. Just as with students, the rhetorical nodal points relate primarily to context and the relationship between the privileged and the other. Six faculty members, all tenured and from a cross-section of disciplines, specifically mentioned association with UNC-Chapel Hill or having higher education as conferring privilege. Edward's comments are typical of the six, as he discussed an engaged scholarship project with students:

> I tell students that [subject] helps you learn to walk in the shoes of another person, to imagine yourself in a totally different world from the one you were born into. We're all very privileged here at the university, and most of the people we work with are not privileged, have no formal education.

While Edward focused specifically on the relationship between privileged members of the university and the unprivileged others who benefitted from that research project, four faculty members also discussed expectations of the privileged. For example, Eleanor, a lecturer and program director, said, "Being here is actually a privilege—this is an elite institution. More is expected of us because of that."

In addition to the privilege related to being part of the university, other rhetorical nodes emphasize both the university as context and the relationship to the other. Thor's comments on culture and "the people's university" exemplify that re-articulation by half the faculty members, who represent a cross-section of disciplines and tenure status, but

121

all of whom had been at the university for more than 10 years. In discussing why he

joined the faculty, Thor said:

> I think one of the most attractive things to me about the University of North
> Carolina at Chapel Hill is that there still is a culture of the people's university, and
> I think it's very tangible here in ways that if you teach anywhere else, you'd
> recognize. It's part of the culture here.

An associate professor who conducts engaged scholarship in the social sciences referred

specifically to service and engagement with the same contextualizing rhetoric:

> I think… Chancellor Moeser has brought an engagement focus that might have
> been heightened a bit from what was here beforehand, in terms of it being a part
> of the culture, of being the whole university of the people of North Carolina.

Again, the university administration had not used the phrase "university of the people" or

"people's university" for approximately two years prior to the start of these interviews.

The phrase had been replaced with "fulfilling the promise of the nation's first public

university," sometimes followed by "to the state and beyond," but neither of those

phrases was ever mentioned by faculty. In addition, faculty never discussed service or

engaged scholarship in international terms, though every administrator did. Taylor's

comments were typical:

> At the same time this [emphasis on public service and engaged scholarship] has
> been ramping up, we've been increasing our focus on the global initiatives, being
> local and global at the same time, and I don't see any conflict there. This is a
> university with a great wing-span. We can do both. We're good enough and
> great enough and comprehensive enough that we can talk about Siler City and
> Singapore in the same sentence.

> While faculty did not re-articulate any international rhetoric, some of what they

did re-articulate included unintended interpretations. Apollo, a professor in the social

sciences and head of an academic unit, specifically referred to "the long-standing rhetoric

of service to the citizens of the state of North Carolina," but he disagreed with

122

contemporary rhetoric that he interpreted as discounting current service and engagement

work:

> The way in which it has unfolded, the way in which the rhetoric has taken
> particular form here is the long-standing rhetoric of service to the citizens of the
> state of North Carolina. In fact part of the reason that I like being at this
> university is that sense of a social contract with the people of North Carolina, but
> not in its parochial form. I mean, I think there are direct things that I do, most of
> my faculty do. I just don't, I don't entirely buy into the idea that engagement is
> the exception rather than the rule here, that we're not doing enough to serve the
> people. I see it as much more common than people are giving it credit for. I think
> that there's a rhetoric that has grown up here that's sort of bashing the university
> and claiming that we're not still living in that heritage, when in a very large
> portion of this university, we really are. So the question then is, are we just
> beating up the humanities if they're not doing it, or asking something more of the
> natural sciences, which I haven't really heard as part of the rhetoric.

What Apollo hasn't "really heard as part of the rhetoric" indicates ambiguities and

questions left unanswered regarding who is not engaged enough. Jamie's comments also

indicate a lack of clarity about "what the administration means by service" in discussing

research:

> Most of my work, my areas, specialties like [international subject], there is no
> connection to anything in North Carolina, like, again… It's something that our
> local [particular population] community wants to hear about, but I don't see
> any… [long pause] I don't see how anything I research would feed into this kind
> of question about whether it would be of benefit to the people of North Carolina.
> Not in any obvious way, unless what the administration means by service is
> really, really different from anything I understand by it, then I don't feel like my
> work fits into that.

Though Jamie's research is international in scope, the phrase "people of North Carolina"

is again the message with staying power, as opposed to the more global rhetorical phrase

"people of the state and beyond." Jamie indicates a resulting sense of

incommensurability between "what the administration means by service" and "anything I

would research." Jamie's awareness of the increased emphasis on service and

123

engagement by the university indicated that at least some but not all of the university administration's rhetoric was filtering through.

Unfortunately, that wasn't the case with all faculty members. Four faculty members used the phrase "academic silos" in reference to the divisions between academic units during the interviews, but in some cases, those silos appear to have functioned more like bunkers with no external access. At the outset of one interview, the head of an academic unit asked me to define public service and engaged scholarship because the academic unit head had "no idea what all this is about." The motivation for agreement to be interviewed was assisting a doctoral candidate's research. After defining the terms using the CCPS's definitions, I probed the participant's level of awareness of service and engagement-related activities on campus.

> Leah: Are you familiar with the UNC Tomorrow initiative that's come down from the General Administration?
>
> Academic unit head: No, I'm not. I probably should be, but I'm not.
>
> Leah: [Describes UNC Tomorrow and how the university is responding.] So a lot of [academic unit heads] are scrambling right now because the Provost has been in touch and said, "We need you to figure out X and tell us these specific things." So I guess you haven't heard from the Provost.
>
> Academic unit head: No, if they'd asked me something like that, I'd remember it. [both laugh]
>
> Leah: Yeah, I'd think so.
>
> Academic unit head: Unless somehow the e-mail didn't arrive. I mean, I get bombarded with e-mails, and the university is the worst offender.

Despite numerous stories in the student, faculty, and local newspapers; three public speeches by the chancellor that discussed service and engagement and/or the UNC Tomorrow initiative; and the creation of a new vice chancellor for public service and

engagement, this academic unit head had not gotten the message that the university

system and administration were emphasizing service and engagement.

The academic unit head was not alone, including the complaint about the over-use

of e-mail as a means of communication by the university. Doris, Eleanor, and Zeus made

similar comments. Zeus was a first-year assistant professor who had previously taught

and done research at the university on a time-limited contract basis, and who began the

interview by asking me to define public service and engaged scholarship. I stated that I

was seeking participant's perspectives, not the university's. Zeus's comments were

interesting in part due to the fact that the faculty member had never heard the term

"engaged scholarship," but was conducting engaged scholarship as defined by the

university. Zeus didn't define it that way due to the structure of the university's annual

report form. After discussing current activities, teaching, and research, I asked Zeus,

"What counts as service to you?" Zeus replied as follows:

> Zeus: I think research doesn't count as service.

> Leah: OK. Could you elaborate on that?

> Zeus: So when you talk about the research I do that benefits the community and
> the university, I don't believe any of that counts as service. Because when we do
> our annual reports, research is separate. Research does not count for service. I
> think service is more, more volunteer work, that kind of thing. Participation in
> committees. I don't even know how to define it, really. But research has nothing
> to do with it. And the research I'm doing and the research I might want to do,
> with this [problem affecting a particular population] stuff, um, that would be my
> interest, but again, that would not be considered service because it's research. At
> least that's my understanding of it.

> Leah: OK. The kind of research you're talking about, the administration has
> begun advancing this idea of engaged scholarship

> Zeus: [interrupts] Which I have never even heard of, and I don't have a concept
> of what that is or what they mean by that. I've never heard of it. Even if I've
> heard of it, I don't know what the definition is. I don't think that's been

125

communicated to us as faculty. It's the first I've heard of it, and I guess I think of research as not being service, at least based on my perception of what service is.

Leah: So they're not reaching all the way to your academic unit?

Zeus: It could be, you know, but you just get all these informational things and newsletters and stuff in e-mails, and there's only so many things you can process in a day.

Despite the speeches, extensive media coverage, and university e-mails, Zeus states, "I don't think that's been communicated to us as faculty," indicating that whatever the university's rhetoric is regarding service and engaged scholarship, the message has not been getting to Zeus. The university's actions in the form of the annual report of activity separating service and research, however, made a significant impression.

While I will not speculate about why the university messages have not been getting to Zeus, another faculty member made it quite clear why his academic unit had not been getting messages about the importance of service and engagement to the university. After this professor stated that her/his academic unit and its administrative head were only concerned about cutting-edge research and "they don't give a damn about service and engagement," I asked the professor, "What about the general tenor among faculty in [your academic unit], as far as the university's concerned?" The professor replied:

I think faculty in [my academic unit] largely ignore the university. I don't think they think beyond the walls of the building for the most part. Some do, a few, a handful. Um, but what they want is right here or in the Smith Center. I think they largely just ignore the rest of the university, including the administration.

Some faculty may choose to "ignore the rest of the university, including the administration," but even though who choose to pay attention may not be in a position to act on what they hear. The head of one academic unit indicated that the university

administration is not the only contributor to the diffuse text of the rhetoric of service and

engagement:

> Of course we hear the Chancellor when he says service and outreach are important. But we also had a dean that had a view of service that was really just teaching undergrads. I forget which one, but they said, "Our service is education." Based on that definition, we do a lot of service.

A former academic unit head made a similar statement:

> In some ways, this university doesn't have quite the mandate that NC State has. Because [NC State]'s a land-grant. The academic side of this campus has never had anywhere near the outreach mission that, for example, NC State has. And I never felt that the Dean has asked us to do that. In fact, I've felt that the Dean has pushed back, emphasizing that we were to focus on undergraduate education and research when we were being asked by others here to increase our engagement.

The academic unit heads' and the professors' statements bring the issue of departmental

and school or college leadership into faculty perceptions and experiences, along with the

issue of competing or conflicting messages. Regardless of *what* the university

administration was saying about service and engagement, there was significant faculty

interest in *why* the administration was saying it.

University Motivation Regarding Service and Engagement

The question of whether service and engagement were important to the university

brought up comments and thoughts on why it was important to the university, from the

faculty members' perspectives. In comparison, students never questioned the university

administration's motivation. Of the fifteen faculty members who stated that service and

engagement were important to the university or that they had received mixed signals on

its importance, nine commented on the administration's motivation. All the comments

referred to motivations related to audiences or individuals beyond the walls of the

campus, though none referred directly to a motivation to benefit those people or

communities in need of the university's public service or outreach. The motivation was never referred to as a form of altruism or social intervention, but rather as instrumental—a mode of managing the university's public appearance and revenue.

Regarding audiences beyond the walls of the campus, Bob referred to the rhetorical node of "the people of the state," but did so in terms of their attitude toward the university when he said:

> They [the administration] seem to be stepping up to service and engagement, and part of it may be that they're paying attention to which way the wind is blowing with the people of the state, and that's part of my argument. People know what the folks at NC State are doing for them, and here they know how the med school helps them, but I don't think they're so clear on how North Campus helps them. And that's a good strategic argument for me, and with this whole engaged scholarship thing, that's got to be doing a lot to carry our name out there.

Bob's comments were similar to those of four administrators, each of whom discussed the university's motivation to improve or increase public perception. For example, Stacey said:

> Part of the feedback from UNC Tomorrow is telling us that we need to increase our outreach across the state, be present in all 100 counties in a way that we like to think we are, but we maybe are not telling our story as well as we can be, how we do touch the lives of all of the people in all the counties and the state.

Thor's comments similarly referred to the perceptions of audiences beyond the borders of the university, but were much more explicit about the current perception and that it needed to be countered:

> Thor: My impression is that… they've just released that new document…

> Leah: UNC Tomorrow?

> Thor: Yeah, and they obviously want to promote that. My reading of that, and we recently discussed this in a faculty meeting, and my reading of that is that Erskine Bowles and others, they're doing it to counter the idea that UNC-Chapel Hill and the system as a whole are just eggheads in ivory towers who are overpaid and underworked and little invested in the state.

Of additional note is how Thor described "eggheads in ivory towers," i.e., the faculty, as comprising the whole university, and therefore at the crux of negative perception of the whole university. Apollo, on the other hand, believes that past responses to negative perceptions of the university are part of what has created the whole problem of a current negative perception, though like Thor, he discusses the faculty as the crux of the negative perception:

> In a way, it's become a… You know, a solution to a problem that I'm not sure exists, that there's become a… I mean, it's been popular ever since Jesse Helms made a name for himself by slamming the university… to have this love-hate thing about the university and to claim that we're just off in our own world… Um, I'm not sure I see a lot of evidence on that. I mean, individual by individual, you could certainly come up with examples of faculty members who are just doing their own research. And you know, [former Chancellor] Michael Hooker in a way catered to that a little bit. On the one hand he was a very intellectual chancellor, and you could really engage Michael. But at the same time, he did sort of play into that in a way when talking with public audiences, in a way sort of building up and trying to reinforce their sense that he was listening to them, paying attention to the people. So in a way as a part of that process, and perhaps even unintentionally, kind of reinforcing the idea that something needed to be done that wasn't being done here, rather than really explaining to them, "like are you aware of what the School of Public Health is doing, or what x y and z are doing?"

The act of being attentive to public audiences, meant to rectify perceptions of an insular university with dis-interested faculty, may have actually reinforced the public perception that the university was not being responsive and attentive enough, in Thor's opinion.

Other faculty members also spoke to the university's motivation to create or maintain a positive public perception of the university. According to Edward, "The Chancellor has been very, very supportive of public activities, anything that draws positive looks at the university, he is in favor of, and most postsecondary institutions are

the same way." He characterized this behavior as positive and typical of universities.

Doris, however, perceived the same motivation as negative when she stated:

> I guess the cynical side of me thinks those things that land us on the front page of the paper, that give us good PR, those are probably well recognized and rewarded or at least supported, and those are probably the things that count.

Activities that result in "positive looks at the university" or "good PR," are supported.

Activities that might cause "the public" to cast negative looks at the university, however,

have received very different treatment. A faculty member made the point explicitly in

discussing an engaged scholarship project in the planning stage:

> The problem I have right now is that there are folks in the administration debating whether [this project] would be politically damaging or viewed as liberally biased by the public, so would it help or hurt the image is the question. The question is the appearance of impropriety as it were, instead of whether it would help us achieve our research and service missions.

The common stance amongst public universities is that the institution is neutral, though

the faculty members have academic freedom to pursue their own interests and research.

One administrator, Taylor, specifically reiterated this stance:

> It's a complicated issue. I think institutionally we should be and are neutral, but I think we should be a forum where all hell can break loose with controversy. We have had faculty, when you think about tobacco or the hog industry and environmental pollution, and we have faculty working on those issues. We've had pressure for people to stop working on those issues from certain economic interests in the state, and we've had to say that we're neutral but we defend the right of faculty to go wherever the truth leads them. That's the nature of a university.

> However, institutional neutrality comes into conflict with academic freedom at

the level of institutionalizing organized, sustainable research activity. Another

administrator, Riley, discussed the implications:

> There are so many people out there watching, and the sensitivities to what is acceptable are much higher than they were even back then by a pretty significant margin. When you get right down to it, the Board of Governors has a fear that if

enough faculty are making recommendations that seem biased or too controversial and they piss off enough people, it may cause the legislature not to support us in the way we want to be supported. It's just too risky. It's just this whole notion that everyone has a fear that you say something that gets the wrong kind of attention, but I think that's just one of the down-sides of being a public university, in a way. There's less insulation from that kind of outside pressure and criticism.

Jamie, a program director and scholar in the humanities who focuses on a subject that some may deem controversial, has also experienced less than supportive responses from the administration at multiple levels:

> From administration, the [potentially controversial subject] studies program has tended to get more, I'd say stonewalling than, you know… Nobody's openly hostile, but there's a fair amount of, "Well, we think this is a fine idea. We're not going to give you any money or support, and we don't want you to talk about it because it will upset our donors." Maybe I should just be braver about it, do the public lectures. And we certainly have administrators saying, "No, don't do that." Again, it's that they're saying, "We want you to reach out, but no, please don't talk about *that*." But *that's* what I do, so how am I supposed to frame that so the people can hear it?

In this situation, institutional neutrality and academic freedom came into direct conflict, and Jamie's academic freedom to disseminate research was restricted. Jamie's experience indicated it was acceptable to teach the subject and acceptable to research the subject, but it was not acceptable to the university to be perceived as supporting the teaching or research of the potentially controversial subject, and it was not acceptable for Jamie to engage with those outside the university regarding the potentially controversial subject. "The public" that may react negatively, according to the administration, is comprised of university donors. Jamie's individual perception was re-iterated as a universal truth by another faculty member, a professor in the social sciences:

> I can tell you that when I came to North Carolina, one person told me, "This is a public university, and you probably want to know what the public is." And I waited for an answer. And the answer was, "The public is people who give money to the university."

131

According to these faculty members, donors as "the public" reflect a revenue stream, wherein the university's motivation is to portray itself in a positive and non-controversial way to protect that revenue. Another faculty member also mentioned revenue as a motivation, in the form of grants. A faculty member in the humanities who has conducted engaged scholarship projects and taught service learning courses said:

> My jaundiced or cynical opinion about what many of our university administrators mean with that, the importance of the service component, is that it should be that you should get a huge grant to do something called service and the university should make money off it.

Though the faculty member characterizes this opinion about the university administrator's motivation as "jaundiced or cynical," it is still the professor's perception. The perception and perceived act may or may not be a reflection of the growing marketization and privatization trend in public higher education. Regardless, all of these perceptions of the university's motivation to emphasize public service and engaged scholarship lead us to explore how faculty members define those terms.

Defining Public Service

Given that I argue that public service and engaged scholarship are contested ground within the university, it was important not to make assumptions about how faculty define the terms themselves. Faculty members mainly fell into three groups regarding how they defined public service and engaged scholarship: those who could not or would not define it (which includes those who asked me for a definition instead of offering one); those who defined it in terms of work done to maintain regular functioning of the university and academy; and those who defined it in terms of service to those who are not part of the university or academy. At some point during 18 of the interviews, faculty

132

members asked me how, specifically, the university defined public service and engagement. I did answer them eventually, but asked first how they defined the terms.

Liz, Bryan, Jamie, Zeus, Lucas, and the head of an academic unit did not offer definitions of public service and engaged scholarship. Liz stated outright during introductions that she agreed to participate out of curiosity and wanting to help a graduate student; she stated she had no idea what public service and engaged scholarship really are other than "things the university wants us to be doing," so I skipped the "How would you define…" questions. Bryan, Jamie, and Zeus did not offer definitions when asked, and each stated they were not clear on the concepts, and each related that specifically to not knowing the university's definitions. Following my introduction of the project and before I could ask any questions, Bryan asked questions of his own:

Bryan: Can I start by asking two questions?

Leah: Sure.

Bryan: What is public service? How is it defined?

Leah: That would be up to you, literally. How would you define it?

Bryan: And about engaged scholarship, you would say the same thing?

Leah: Same thing. That's part of the study, your perceptions and experiences. So how would you define public service?

Bryan: Well, I can imagine it would involve any number of things. And so I don't really… I'm just unclear about the concept itself. It could involve volunteering… I really… I mean, it could involve working at a public institution. [chuckles, gestures around his office] Relative to what the university thinks, I just don't know.

Bryan was not the only faculty member to offer that working at the university is in and of itself a public service, which is covered in more depth later in this chapter. Bryan's response to my question was similar to Lucas' and Jamie's, though Lucas did not

offer any examples. Lucas said, "I don't know. However the university defines it, I would think." Jamie did not offer possible examples or definitions of the terms when I asked either, as indicated in the following exchange:

> Leah: There's no right or wrong answers, just your understanding of it.

> Jamie: It depends on what the university thinks it is.

> Leah: What do you think from the university's perspective, what is public service?

> Jamie: I guess I don't really know. [long pause—eight seconds]

> Leah: You haven't gotten a clear idea?

> Jamie: No, I haven't.

> Leah: Would you say the same about engaged scholarship? Or community engagement?

> Jamie: Yeah. I mean, I'd say engaged scholarship is one of those terms that gets thrown around a lot, and I have colleagues doing things that clearly to me would fall under that rubric. You know, that's cool, I see how that fits. But I don't know what the university's working definition of it would be.

Jamie's comments indicate something akin to the cliché about art: "I can't define it, but I know it when I see it." Jamie is aware enough of the term, to the point of stating it "gets thrown around a lot," but not to the point of having a definition for it, or knowing the university's definition. Jamie's experience is not singular; I encountered something similar after asking an experienced administrator of an academic unit, also a full professor, while discussing undergraduate teaching in general:

> Leah: OK. In terms of teaching and service learning within courses, is that something that happens in this [academic unit]?

> Head of academic unit: I hear that all the time. What is service learning?

134

I find this relevant given the relationship between public service and service learning,

though I was not asking for a definition of that term in particular as a part of the study.

Zeus is another faculty member who did not offer a definition of public service

and had never heard the term engaged scholarship prior to my recruiting e-mail, but did

offer examples of potential public service:

Leah: So how would you define public service?

Zeus: I don't know. I think it depends on what the university considers service, and I think the university considers service to be things like serving on boards of organizations, getting involved in organizations outside the university, maybe getting involved in more committee work. Things like that. I don't know, but that's what I believe they want us to do. What's interesting is that the personal volunteer work I do, [a project related to my discipline], that helps society and doesn't even count, so I can't even include that kind of stuff.

Leah: Because?

Zeus: I think it's because it's not through the university, and I think they want us to work more through professional organizations that maybe tie in more directly with our discipline, put that kind of stuff on our annual reports.

Zeus' concern regarding the definition is not just how the university defines it, but what

counts to be included on faculty member annual reports. While the examples include

service to the university, service to the discipline, and involvement with outside

organizations, the defining characteristic is whether or not it counts. A focus on

evaluation and labeling occurred throughout the interviews, though for some, it was about

how those *beyond* the university define public service and engagement. In discussing the

system General Administration's UNC Tomorrow initiative and implications for funding,

Elliot said:

Elliot: It's not like we need to do more to satisfy this engagement, the big word of late, but the fact that we are educating the next generation of North Carolina citizens, we're curing or figuring out how to cure North Carolina's sick people,

135

we're doing good stuff, and this is service. I don't know whether that's recognized as service.

The implication is that how we define service is not as important as what others recognize as service, as what others value in the behavior of the university and individual faculty members. Elliot is defining service as teaching, research, and caring for people in need, but believes that service may not count to those who control part of the university's funding.

Service to What Public?

Among faculty who offered definitions or examples of what they considered to be public service, there were significant differences of perspective. Primarily, they fell into three groups based on the public being served: those who defined it as the university's low-cost undergraduate education or as working for the university; those who defined it primarily in terms of work within the academy beyond research and teaching or as service to their discipline; and those who defined it much like students—a direct and appropriate act to benefit an appropriate other outside the university and involving some kind of personal sacrifice.

Lucas, Elliot, and Bryan all described teaching as a public service but discussed different nuances. Lucas focused on education in general as a direct form of public service when he said:

> I want to make a point first of all that just education is public service. It couldn't be any more direct. You know, we're training students to go out and do things, and that's public service in its most basic form.

Elliot focused on the university's undergraduate teaching and its comparatively low cost when he stated, "We bring in 2,000 first-years every year, and educate them for $6,000 a head, and if that's not a public service, I don't know what is."

Bryan focused on the high percentage of in-state undergraduates and on the

comparison of salaries at public versus private universities, after I brought up a comment

he had made previously about the state mandate for low tuition:

> Bryan: The idea that 80% of the students that you teach should be from the state of North Carolina, that's an incredible public service right there. I mean, I really think it is, if you compare that to a school like Duke, or like [the private university where he worked previously].
>
> Leah: And that we're mandated to keep tuition low?
>
> Bryan: Exactly. And which reflects in my salary, too, compared to what I would be earning in a private university. Everything I do in some way is contributing, like the classes I have.

Undergraduate education at low tuition, in this situation, is a direct benefit to the state

and an appropriate audience that involves a sacrifice on the part of those providing it.

One administrator also referred to undergraduate education at low tuition as a public

service and as a personal sacrifice in terms of effort and salary:

> Chris: The public university model doesn't make any rational sense. The only reason we can do it is people that are so devoted to the institution that they make sacrifices for themselves, and they exert superhuman efforts that allow us to cross the chasm between $6,000 and $50,000 a year for 30,000 people. It's amazing.
>
> Leah: OK. Earlier, you talked about it in terms of commitment to the institution
>
> Chris: [interrupts] Yeah, right, so that's another big piece of the public service, right? I mean, laying down your life day after day for the University of North Carolina, even if it's in some of the most core academic functions, that's an extraordinary public service. I mean, our staff and faculty and administrators do public service every day they come here and work for less than they could at a private university.
>
> Lucas, who teaches in a core discipline, discussed undergraduate teaching not as a

public service but as a service to the university that requires a sacrifice on the part of

those teaching:

> We have service courses, but that's a different meaning. These are [subject]
> courses are designed not for [our] majors but for those who need to satisfy [core
> course] requirements for [other majors or the general college]. It definitely is a
> service to the university but it's not directly service to the public I think, and I
> think every core curriculum department has service courses of this nature, but
> they place a huge strain on our resources, in terms of faculty and grad student
> teaching loads.

In terms of undergraduate education, Lucas differentiates service to the university by

individual teachers from public service, though his previous comment was that education

itself was a public service. What it takes to achieve that goal of "education itself" is not a

part of what counts as public service to Lucas.

Public Service as Keeping the Academy Running. Bryan, however, takes the

opposite perspective from Lucas and perceives academia as being based on every-day

volunteerism. When I asked Bryan whether he thought public service was important to

the university, he replied:

> I just think that begs the question, so what is service? Academic cultures are
> notoriously volunteer-based. I mean, they tell you when you come into an
> institution like this that you are _required_ to teach two courses per semester, and
> you are _expected_ to write one book in seven years, and other than that, everything
> else you're supposed to do goes rather _undefined_. But most people that I know
> here, and this is true at [the other university where I worked], they work 60, 70-
> hour weeks, and part of that is going into teaching and part is going into the
> mandated part of research, and it's only part of it.
>
> The other amount, you really could say no to, that you don't have to serve on a
> dissertation committee, you don't have to direct these, you don't have to have
> office hours outside of the mandatory one or two hours a week, you don't have to
> serve on graduate admissions committees, you don't have to do searches for
> faculty, you don't have to have administrative responsibilities in related programs.
> There are lots of things that you could _theoretically not_ do, that it's not in your
> job description so you can say no to it. And there's all the professional service:
> meetings you have to go to, professional obligations, organizations you have to
> work with so that conferences actually happen, editorial boards of journals that
> you have to serve on. It's endless.
>
> So in some ways it's a volunteer culture, it really is. And I really say that the _vast_
> majority of people I know are running on empty, that they're pretty maxed out

with what they're *expected* to do. And we haven't even gotten to the public yet. We're still inside the walls at this point.

For Bryan, that which is not a defined aspect of the job for which he contracted and is paid is a volunteer service, and one that comes at a sacrifice of time and energy, though those are the things necessary to keep a department or university or discipline functioning. He states that this volunteer service is what is expected of faculty members, even though it is not explicitly defined in a faculty job. While Bryan considers part of the expected work to be volunteerism, Zeus defines the entire job as volunteer work and a public service:

> Well, the university pays almost nothing for salaries. Salaries are *horrible*. Most of us consider our university jobs as being public service. Because it's like doing volunteer work, the salaries are *so* bad in North Carolina. To me, it's volunteer work. We are making a sacrifice just being here—I took a *huge* salary cut. Also, not only that, but I work twice as many hours. So if I work til midnight, and work all weekend, I'm also a single [parent] and I'm ignoring my [child], and the house maybe gets cleaned once every six years, or whatever. I mean the demands are incredible in terms of the expectations of the hours necessary just to do the *bare minimum*, and you never feel like you can ever be caught up or close to it. And then they pay *lousy*. So the job itself is public service. And that's why when they put service on top of what we're already doing, it's like, you've *got* to be kidding! [laughs]

Zeus specifically cites the sacrifices of salary, time, personal relationships, and personal responsibilities, all relative to achieving the "bare minimum" of what's expected of a faculty member. Unlike Bryan, Zeus does not perceive that there's a choice between doing what is defined as a part of the job and what is expected of the person doing it.

In discussing service, nine other faculty members offered examples of service to their department, the university, or their discipline—Thor, Odin, Eleanor, Liz, Jamie, Doris, Bob, Jay, and Ken. These examples included administrative positions in academic units and related programs; recruiting future undergraduates; serving on administrative

139

committees inside and outside the department; leading discussion and working groups; serving on faculty council or program advisory boards; serving on editorial boards and national association committees and boards; organizing discipline-related convenings; and reviewing tenure applications. Ken, an associate professor who works directly with the public in long-term applied research projects, agreed that these activities are considered service by the university, but he personally disagreed with this conceptualization of service:

> [My academic unit] is… I learned very quickly what it was going to be like. While admittedly there are some wonderful silos that understand engagement and *reward* that around the university, for the most part, service is the way it is here in [my academic unit]. The word *itself* has been distorted. Service now, as it is in tenure and annual review, is taken to mean either internal service like being [head of an academic unit] or serving on a committee, or it's meant to be or taken to be service within the academic discipline more broadly like if I'm on a journal board or conference committee, that's viewed as service as well. The things that I do, here, the things that I do are called outreach. And it's sort of, we need a new term, because what I think used to be service, and what I think people like Edward Kidder Graham and everybody else up through Bill Friday and so forth would consider service has become more narrowly defined internally and with respect to the academy.

Ken's comment indicates that what he believes counts to the university as service has changed over time with different leadership; that what counts now is service to the department, university and discipline, which is what can be documented on promotion and tenure paperwork and can be rewarded; and that what counts differs between academic units. "Service has become more narrowly defined" from work outside the academy to work that keeps the academy functioning. What Ken's academic unit defines as outreach, the university defines as engaged scholarship, but Ken defines as service.

Service to Non-University Publics. Ken was not the only faculty member to state that service is work that benefits those outside of the academy; Thor, Jay, Eleanor,

Daniel, Doris, George, Lucas, Odin, Bob, Bryan, Edward, Jamie, and Geoff (all from different disciplines) each provided a similar definition or related examples, though the characterizations of the type of work differed.

Daniel and Doris' definitions were the most broad, and both included motivation as a defining characteristic in addition to who is being served. Daniel paused for approximately nine seconds after I asked how he defined public service, then said, "I'd say that's a tough one. I guess it's an activity where one of the primary motivations is to assist some group other than your… I guess than the immediate organization or institution that you're in." Doris' response to the same question reflected that service should benefit publics outside the university, but also that it should not be instrumental in nature to benefit the university:

> That's a really good question. I guess I think of it as contributing to society in some way that… [long pause] that benefits society and doesn't necessarily reflect some priority of the university. It's giving back and engaging with people away from the university system. I think it's a pretty broad thing, you know. I'm not sure… I guess I don't have a narrow definition of what public service is, beyond engaging with and helping communities.

Of the 14 faculty members who discussed public service to publics outside the academy, all mentioned public lectures or invited talks to public groups. Other examples included working in an advisory or applied research capacity with government, nonprofit, or community organizations; translating knowledge for the public through documentaries or workshops; involvement in community groups; tutoring in core discipline areas; or providing development workshops for working professionals or k-12 teachers in their discipline. Thor's comments were typical:

> I've participated in service and engagement in a modest way. I have consulted with a couple of [public institutions] about how they're going to organize their [information presented to the public], and how they're going to engage certain

issues. I've consulted with… with a big [presentation of a topic of public interest] that [public organization] is putting on, things like that. I've given talks to clearly public audiences which are not intended for academics. I've done documentaries and participated in documentaries. I think, for example, how in [my academic unit], faculty are engaged in ways that would be hard for me to put my finger on a specific example but they're engaged in ways in the community and the state, engaged in ways that were not true at [my last appointment]. To give you a small example, there are faculty here who are active in all manner of community organizations as well as speaking to public groups.

More specific characterizations of public service by some faculty members

included discussion of benefits, need, altruism, costs, and immediacy of impact. For

example, Odin commented specifically on altruistic efforts that do not benefit those doing

the service.

> I think public service is service to a community that benefits primarily that community, regardless of who does it. Whether I do that, you know as an individual making sandwiches and handing them out on a day that the shelter kitchen is closed, or whether I do that in my capacity as a university professor, I think that's what defines public service. The benefit is intended to be primarily one way, altruistic effort.

His comments about feeding the homeless also indicate a marginalized, appropriate other

who benefits. Bob's comments referred directly to "people in need" and his engaged

scholarship work involves a marginalized population. He also referred to public service

as something above and beyond what "you naturally do" as a faculty member, that it

should have a cost, and it should have an immediate impact:

> It seems to me you somehow need to separate the things you naturally do out. I think lots of people over in public health think of what they're doing as public service, but that was just sort of your job. That was just what you did. I think there should be an element outside—in a sense it needs to cost you something if it's going to be service the way I think about. Any of my colleagues could prove they're making the world better. That doesn't feel like public service to me. I mean if you advance knowledge, you've made the world a bit better, but for me it's seeing how we can benefit people who need it immediately or in the near future in a direct way.

Daniel also discussed people in need in discussing his perceptions of public service and research:

> There's sort of a soft line between research and service, but the clearest definition I see for us to the broader community is the [particular population] program. It's not a research project per se, I mean, it's application, and when it first started up we thought, well, we could get a stronger research component, but their needs seem so strong that there was no way we would divert resources to that.

Bob and Daniel both characterized their applied research as public service and then differentiated it from discovery research in their comments. Three other faculty members also used examples such as applied research projects that advise community organizations or assess public programs similarly as public service work. Odin, however, perceived service, research, and teaching from a more integrated perspective:

> And I think one of the things that really resonated with that first service learning class I taught was that our service is our teaching. Our service becomes our research. And I think that's a good way of thinking about it. Engaged scholarship, I think, too, gives us the opportunity to further integrate our professional lives in ways that are going to enrich the community. Again, you know, I can think of elements of my writing and research as a kind of service, as a kind of outreach. I can think of my teaching as a kind of outreach into the community that allows me to do things that provide a benefit to the community.

Odin describes service, research, and teaching as mutually reinforcing and enriching, but his description also brings to the fore the difficulty of clarifying these concepts within a highly diverse academic community. To Odin, service is teaching, and research is a service, service becomes research, writing and research are service and outreach, and teaching service learning courses is outreach. They are a way of increasing the quality and potentially the impact of each other.

Defining Engaged Scholarship

As stated previously, six faculty members could not or would not define engaged scholarship when asked. Of those six, three were conducting engaged scholarship

according to the university definition but did not realize it. Of those three, one had not encountered the term prior to recruitment for this study. Among those who did offer definitions and examples, they characterized engaged scholarship as research that involves public issues; that may involve students; and that benefits a particular less-privileged community, North Carolina, or the greater good. Areas of disagreement included what publics were appropriate beneficiaries, relevance and immediacy of impact, what kind of research counts, proximity to the problem, and what subject areas are conducive to such research.

Administrators' comments were similar. Though none offered a definition, each discussed examples of engaged scholarship. When I first used the term while interviewing Terry, Terry said, "I think one of the questions that I have is, I don't know what people mean by engaged scholarship. So I'm going to speak in terms of applied research." Of the six administrators, three used examples only of applied research that had a direct and immediate impact on people or communities in need such as TEACCH, which assists people with autism. Three used examples of applied and discovery research that was no more than one step removed from the people or communities in need that it benefits, such as economic development and medical research.

Of faculty, those who were knowingly conducting engaged scholarship offered the most nuanced definitions. Geoff and Odin, both engaged scholars in problem-oriented disciplines, emphasized research in collaboration with a community to benefit the community and the research itself. According to Geoff:

> It's being out in the community and trying to bring academic rigor in terms of measuring important community issues, understanding dynamics involved, and then from [my discipline's] perspective, with program development, you know seeing what might fit or developing a new one, then assessing those for the

144

community. That's really, to me, engaged scholarship. And the scholarship is sort of the rigor, the methodological heart, and the engagement is having the community partnership that infuses the process.

In Geoff's case, he later discussed that the research results in program case studies and assessments lead to peer-reviewed publications, indicating acceptance of this research by his discipline. In Odin's case, applied research in a community itself leads to knowledge development:

> I think engaged scholarship is research, writing, that… that takes a faculty member into the community in a way that is more intimate than typical research. That rather than sort of going in as an invader and getting what they need and leaving, engaged scholarship becomes a way in which a researcher can use their work, can use their expertise, to go into a community, for the mutual benefit of both the work—the new contribution to knowledge—and the community.

Daniel discussed engaged scholarship as applied research, but he emphasized that the primary motivation should be to have practical outcomes in the short term:

> I guess I would define engaged scholarship as a form of research or teaching where one of the primary motives was to reach an audience where the outcomes, there could be some practical outcome in a short period of time. So the stuff I do with [public agency], I would see that as engaged scholarship. It's clear that they've paid a lot of big bucks to get [a product from other researchers], and they're junk. So giving the report of why that is and suggesting an alternative to it, um… so yeah I would see that as, uh, engaged in the sense that the primary motive of that is to make some difference in the way things are being done, not in the long term but in the short term.

Daniel's comment indicates engagement to him is to engage a particular problem and "make a difference" in the short-term, rather than engaging with a particular institution or public even though they benefit from it. Jamie also spoke of engagement from a problem perspective and emphasized relevance "to people in North Carolina" as a defining factor:

> Well, the things that seem most obvious to me… are the kinds of things where somebody is working on something that has to do with current environmental or political or social or economic concerns in the state, or a sort of history or cultural history that speaks to that in some way. And… my research doesn't. I think that, you know, to some extent, your kinds of involvement are going to depend on your

discipline, especially if you do non-Southern stuff or pre-20th century stuff, it's not particularly obvious how you translate that into something immediately relevant to people in North Carolina.

Jamie was one of 10 faculty members who discussed how their discipline and research area of expertise or that of colleagues did not align with or apply to contemporary concerns and issues. The implication is that scholarship does not count as engaged unless it does so. Just as with public service, what counts to the university was an issue. According to a professor and former academic unit head:

> Former academic unit head: I'm not in a position of authority anymore, but somebody ought to have a talk with [university administrators] relative to this [academic unit] and say, what do you see as engagement for us? In other words, are we adequately engaged, because we're helping cure cancer and helping people in need and helping business people? Is that enough, or do you want us [providing services to] charitable organizations, or what? What is appropriate engagement for us?

> Leah: Clarifying what counts?

> Former academic unit head: Yeah, what counts right now? What do they mean? Are we supposed to go out to rural counties and teach [our subject]? We just don't know what counts, what they mean by engagement.

Though there are several different modes of engagement offered as examples, what modes are "appropriate" are the ones that count to the university, at the level of effort determined appropriate by the university, and "what counts right now" is unclear. Apollo, also a professor who has held administrative positions in his academic unit and a university program, discussed several different modes of engagement but challenged the idea that "engaged scholarship" is different from the kind of work faculty have already been doing—research that is beneficial and produces knowledge:

> It gets complicated very quickly. Without taking too extreme a position here, I think it's important to see that engagement starts with a lot of people who are not necessarily going out every night to talk to a school audience in North Carolina. There are different kinds of engagement and I think most of us are trying to

146

navigate our way among these different communities of which we are a part. We are in fact involved with communities, and constituencies, and people within the state of North Carolina. But I don't want to see the word get captured by anybody assuming that engagement means just something narrower than it is. There's a more general question about what research means and how we do it. And so I... I've been a little bit, more than a little bit skeptical and waiting to hear more from people about whether it's the Carnegie folks or other studies we talk about, or the voices here who are trying to define engaged research as a new kind of research. Because I'm open to somebody convincing me, but I haven't had someone convince me yet that we're talking about a different kind of research. We're talking about research, and research that will hopefully be beneficial and will produce useful knowledge. I'm a little bit skeptical about trying to feature this as some whole new thing. I think engagement should grow out of and be deeply, deeply interconnected with our teaching and our research.

Apollo focuses on engagement with people and not problems, but like Odin, sees it as interconnected with teaching and research and as an organic result of teaching and research. Like's Ken's views on service, Apollo is concerned that narrowing the definition of the term discounts or excludes some modes of engagement and research. Lucas' perceptions of what is "recognized" as research that addresses society's also indicates that some research is excluded:

Pure [discipline] also tends to have applications to solving society's problems in general, but it may take a long time. There are a lot of [subject] phenomena and other phenomena that can be explained through theory, where you develop the model, test it, refine it. But [discipline] contributes to the process by supplying stronger tools, so maybe that's probably the biggest contribution, is that pure [discipline] does provide powerful tools, and people who are really interested in applications will find ways to use them. That's our contribution to research that engages practical problems, but it's not recognized, I don't think.

In Lucas' comments, the issue is the degree of distance from the direct resolution of the problem. The prior chain of research enabling direct resolution is not included in what is recognized as engaged scholarship and becomes invisible because its impact is indirect and longer-term. Even in direct application of research to a social problem,

147

indirect impact and longer-term results disqualify some modes of engagement. Consider George's perceptions:

> It's hard to get across that working on policy issues in North Carolina is a form of engagement with the state—working with a community is an easy thing to understand, that kind of direct, relatively immediate provision of service. But policy is more indirect, longer term. There's a "reformist" nature to public policy, as opposed to the "assistance" or "improvement" nature of direct work.

George's work addresses public policy issues from within his own discipline, but finds it "hard to get across" to others that his work is engaged because it is not direct nor is the impact immediate. The public with which he engages, public policy makers, is not generally considered a marginalized population, either. Proximity to the problem and the population being engaged are part of the issue, just as in student and faculty member perceptions of public service.

Geoff's comments about a previous engaged scholarship project in which he participated illustrate the relevance of proximity and population. Geoff said, "But it was quite engaged scholarship because the programs were in the most disadvantaged neighborhoods, and we were trying to see if there were beneficial effects and, you know, why the programs worked." Geoff equates a "quite engaged" research project with working *in* a neighborhood of those who are "most disadvantaged." The implication is that the more direct the researcher's proximity to the population involved, and the more marginalized the population is, the more engaged the research is, indicating a hierarchy or continuum of modes of engagement.

While these faculty members parsed the nuances of what kinds of scholarship qualified as engaged to them or to the university, Bryan's take on the concept was quite different. Bryan said, "I should say that I think the term 'engaged scholarship' is

148

redundant. All scholarship is engaged scholarship." Bryan's perceptions, along with those of his faculty colleagues, lead us to a discussion of other factors that influence faculty choices regarding participation in public service and engaged scholarship in the following chapter.

Summary

Results in this chapter focus on faculty members' opinions on the importance of public service and engaged scholarship to the university and their definitions of the terms as context for understanding their perceptions and experiences of the phenomena within this particular community. Of the 24 faculty members interviewed, 13 who represented a cross-section of disciplines said they thought public service and engaged scholarship were important to the university. Of those, four said it was important to the university's future well-being and its audiences, and nine said it was important within the university. Two from the humanities said they received mixed signals because administrative actions contradicted what "they say" about it being important. Nine others did not speak to its importance in response to the specific question of whether they thought it was important to the university; they asked me to define one or both of the terms. Of significant interest is that none of the responses included any re-articulation of university rhetoric regarding public service and engaged scholarship relative to determination of its importance to the administration but rather to administration behaviors and actions.

When discussing the university as the context of public service and engaged scholarship and of their careers, half of faculty members re-articulated specific fragments of university rhetoric, all of which related to positioning the "university of the people" and those "privileged" who are a part of it relative to the "people of the state." Specific

149

mentions of service and engagement associated with university rhetoric emphasized "benefit to the people" of North Carolina or "benefit to the state," or emphasized that service is "part of the culture" or referenced it in historical terms. Just as with students, the rhetorical nodes relate primarily to historical and cultural context and to the relationship between the privileged and the non-privileged other. One faculty member interpreted the rhetoric as discounting current service and engagement because it implies that faculty are not doing enough already. Another felt that because of the rhetoric work that did not benefit the people of the state was specifically excluded. Though the administration had not used the phrase "university of the people" in approximately two years, no faculty members re-articulated the more recent rhetorical phrases used regarding "fulfilling the promise of the nation's first public university to the people of the state and beyond." Two faculty stated they had no idea what public service and/or engaged scholarship were, attributing the problem to administrative communication not reaching through to their academic silo, while another attributed the lack of interest in service and engagement shown by faculty in his academic unit to a lack of interest in university life outside the unit, period. Two others referred to the direct conflict of messages because in response to university administration rhetoric about increasing service and engagement, the deans of their academic units had stated that education was their service, pointing to another challenge of negotiating a diffuse text.

Of the 15 faculty members who stated that service and engagement were important to the university or that they had received mixed signals on its importance, nine commented on the administration's motivation. All the comments referred to audiences or individuals beyond the walls of the campus, though none referred directly to a

150

motivation to benefit those people or communities in need of the university's public

service or outreach. The motivation was never referred to as a form of altruism or social

intervention, but rather as instrumental—a mode of managing the university's public

appearance and revenue. Of the seven who discussed public appearance, three positioned

it in a positive or neutral light while four positioned it negatively as opportunistic or as

limiting academic freedom to preserve the appearance of institutional neutrality. The

potential public relations problem of "the public" reacting negatively to activities within

the university was mentioned as a revenue issue by two faculty members, in that serving

donors' interests and protecting donor funding streams was an administrative motivation

that shaped or impeded service and engagement activities. Another faculty member

mentioned revenue as an administrative motivation, referring to the administration's

emphasis on "the importance of the service component" as a means of catalyzing grant-

winning projects.

Faculty members mainly fell into three groups regarding how they defined public

service: those who could not or would not define it; those who defined it in terms of

work done to maintain regular functioning of the university and academy; and those who

defined it in terms of service to those who are not part of the university or academy.

Each group included a cross-section of disciplines and tenures. The six faculty members

who could not or would not offer a definition each said how it was defined would depend

on the university's definition or what counted to the university or what was recognized as

service by those who control university funding. The remaining 18 faculty members

defined service relative to the public being served, and some offered multiple publics:

three referred to teaching undergraduates, and 11 referred to service to their academic

unit, the university, or their discipline, though one contested that this popular notion was a distorted understanding of the term. For 14 faculty members, then, public service is the work that has to be done just to keep the university and the academy functioning, based on the low-cost nature of the service provided, the non-mandatory, volunteer basis of the work, and/or the salary and time sacrifices involved. Eleven of those faculty members, along with three others, also characterized public service much like students—a direct and appropriate act to benefit an appropriate other outside the university and involving some kind of personal sacrifice, and that should be motivated out of altruism and have an immediate or near-term impact, with the exception of George, who included longer-term impact in his definition and acknowledged it was not the norm.

Faculty's definitions and examples of engaged scholarship presented an even less cohesive set of perceptions than those on public service. Six faculty members could not or would not define engaged scholarship when asked. Of those six, three were conducting engaged scholarship according to the university definition but did not realize it. Of those three, one had not encountered the term prior to recruitment for this study. Among those who did offer definitions and examples, they characterized engaged scholarship as research that involves public issues; that may involve students; and that benefits a particular community, North Carolina, or the greater good. Areas of disagreement included what publics were appropriate beneficiaries, relevance and immediacy of impact, what kind of research counts, proximity to the problem, and what subject areas are conducive to such research. Appropriate beneficiaries were described as marginalized, less-privileged populations, though two faculty members lamented that only marginalized populations were appropriate according to the administration. The

152

remaining disagreements come at the intersection of time, area of scholarship, and impact, with the prevailing view being research that has the most immediate impact conducted in direct contact with a marginalized population counts the most. Faculty indicated that research that contributes to future applications for marginalized populations, that indirectly benefits marginalized populations, that benefits non-marginalized populations, or that only produces benefits in the longer term did not count as engaged, or did not count as much. Only three faculty members spoke of engaged scholarship as discovery research instead of applied research; all three conduct engaged scholarship in disciplines where it is valued, and where it is inherent to the discipline or the discipline is problem-oriented in nature.

This chapter's focus on faculty members' opinions on the importance of public service and engaged scholarship to the university and their definitions of the terms provides context to better understand their perceptions and experiences of the phenomena within this particular community. It lays a foundation for identifying factors affecting their choices regarding participation, as well as how it affects their daily lives, as discussed in Chapter 6.

CHAPTER 6

RESULTS: FACULTY EXPERIENCES AND PARTICIPATION CHOICES

This chapter focuses on how faculty's perceptions and experiences affect their choices relative to participation in service and engagement (RQ2) and the implications in their everyday lives (RQ3). Faculty members' perceptions and definitions of public service and engaged scholarship within the greater social structure of the university (RQ1), the focus of the previous chapter, play a role in their related experiences and participation choices. In the preceding chapter, faculty who offered definitions or examples of public service outside the university and academy defined it much the same as students—an appropriate action directly benefitting an appropriate, less-privileged other with immediate and visible impact involving a sacrifice that outweighs the benefit—but also included service to their department, the university, and their discipline, along with teaching and working at a public university. They re-articulated the same rhetorical nodal points as students, focusing on the privilege of being part of UNC-Chapel Hill, UNC-Chapel Hill as the university of the people, serving the people of the state, and history as context. There was no such cohesive perception of engaged scholarship, though those who did offer definitions or examples maintained a similar perception to that of public service—an appropriate applied or discovery research project directly benefitting an appropriate, less privileged other with immediate and visible

154

impact. Like students, university behavior was far more influential in their perception than university rhetoric.

As indicated by the previous chapter, the great variety of faculty members' perceptions and experiences, the far-ranging nature of the conversations, the long and often complex comments, and the de-identification of personal information have resulted in a number of lengthy quotations. The breadth of the conversations is reflected in the organization of this chapter, which includes the following categories that emerged from interviews related to their personal experiences and participation choices regarding public service and engaged scholarship: personal motivation, professional motivation, socialization, measurements and incentives, opportunity, and professional and personal risk.

The hesitancy faculty exhibited in defining public service and engaged scholarship did not extend into their discussions of their related choices and experiences. The vast majority were very candid about their professional lives; the intersections with their personal lives; why they do the kinds of research, teaching, and service that they do; why they don't do other things; and the implications for their everyday lives. Their comments indicate that multiple factors and experiences influence their choices to participate in public service and engaged scholarship, but the most abundant by far relate to the social structures of the university, the academic units and disciplines, and the academy itself. A less common but still important factor for some was a personal motivation to participate. As with the entire study, when I refer to "all faculty members," "a majority of faculty members," etc., I am referring to participants in this study and not the entire academic affairs faculty population.

Personal Motivation

Of the 24 faculty members interviewed, nine discussed a personal motivation for participating in public service and/or engaged scholarship. Like students, some faculty were motivated by personal rewards: receiving positive feedback from those who benefitted from their participation, meeting new people, and having fun. Also like students, faculty members were also motivated by making an impact on those being served. In addition, some were motivated by altruism, either a sense of doing good in general, meeting an unmet need, or a more specific desire to right a wrong. Personal interest in or experience with a particular subject or issue was another motivating factor. Unlike students, only one faculty member mentioned religious faith.

Geoff, Odin, Jamie, and Jay all discussed positive personal rewards as motivation. The rewards they discuss are all immediate in nature. Geoff and Odin, who both conducted engaged scholarship, also mentioned feeling good or excited, feeling as though their work had been successful, and getting positive feedback from beneficiaries as motivation.

> Geoff: With [one of the last programs I did], they were all very nice, and they were all quite grateful that and expressed that to me, that they felt that the program helped them, and that was very… It made me feel good. And I felt like I was contributing an important aspect. So, you know, I think there's that existential feeling of, you know, of successful contribution. And that's been nice. It's all part of why I do it.

Explicit in Geoff's remarks is that the work had an immediate, identifiable impact, and immediate, positive feedback. Odin's comment about a project "going well" has a more implicit reference to impact, but he discusses immediate positive feedback as a good change from the norm in academia:

Leah: You also mentioned getting jazzed, helping the people.

Odin: It is one of those things that there are so many aspects to being a professor and the kind of work that we do, that so much of the positive feedback you get is somewhat delayed. The rewards are often more delayed.

Leah: The negative feedback certainly comes expeditiously. [both laugh]

Odin: Yeah, absolutely. But doing a workshop that goes well and that the participants appreciate, that's pretty immediate, really immediate.

While Geoff and Odin enjoy the feedback and making a difference, Jamie, Jay and Elliot all talked about the social rewards of meeting people through public service.

Jamie and Jay also mentioned that it is fun. Jamie and Elliot were both discussing public lecture series sponsored by their different programs:

Jamie: I guess one of the things I really like about [this program] is the community involvement. It has this big external advisory board of alums and other people they've brought on. It's fun to meet the board members, who are fantastically interesting people with dynamic careers. They're also proud of Carolina, you know? They love this place so much, so that's just really fun.

Elliot: I do it partly because I enjoy the people that I get to meet. If I didn't do it, I would just know the people in this department. And I think about some of the extraordinary people I've met outside the department and the value of those friendships, and being able to do some good just beyond the department, for the university, for the students, for other faculty.

Elliot speaks of general altruism as a motivation, "being able to do some good" as another motivating factor in addition to the social rewards. An associate professor also mentioned the social rewards when he said:

I do it because it's fun and I love it, and because somebody needs to do it. And yeah, I really enjoy it and enjoy meeting the kids. It goes back to one of the first things we talked about, which is that I think we need to get people involved in science and to teach them what this is all about. People have to understand how their world works so they can help save it. So, I can help do that with a science fair, so that's great.

The associate professor also refers to meeting an unmet need in society through his public service work, as well a personal interest in the issue at hand.

Like the associate professor, Bill speaks about his large public service project with a marginalized population as a personal interest and "something that has to be done," but from the slightly different perspective of preventing "terrible consequences." Bill invests a significant amount of time and personal resources in this project, and provided a number of reasons why he does so:

> Well, they're somebody's *kids*, right? I knew because I had seen up close what's involved, and I knew that this kid, my [relative], that if he had a tough go of it, these others are going to have a *much* harder go. And it was sort of like, this *matters*. You know, if you don't want to step forward, OK, but if you can and you choose not to, *shame* on you. If you don't step forward and act in a supportive manner, there will be *terrible* consequences. I'm so mindful of what they've been through. It's like, those are somebody's kids. They're not *mine* necessarily, but this is just something that *has* to be done, and if I don't do it, who the hell *will*? Sort of like, do you want to meet your maker and explain why you could have helped and chose *not* too? Not really. [laughs] That's not a conversation *I* want to have.

Bill's passion regarding the challenges facing this population is obvious in the way he speaks about it, though he never comes out and says that explicitly. He was extremely animated vocally and physically during this statement. He is sympathetic as a parent that someone else's kids are facing a challenge; he has a relative who was in a similar situation and, as a result, he believes the issue is important; he believes it would be shameful not to help; and his deity obligates him to do so. His personal experience with the subject, his sense of moral responsibility to meet this need, and his faith are his primary motivations.

While Bill and the associate professor speak of personal interests and experiences that motivate their public service work, four faculty members discussed how personal experiences motivate their engaged scholarship: Eleanor, Edward, Ken, and Odin. For

Eleanor, research is a way to address the kinds of social injustices she has experienced personally and a means to create opportunities for activism against that injustice:

> Given the life I've lived, the injustices I've had to deal with… I think academics has overlooked [topic] too long, and has kind of let it get out hand, so I think it's the fertile ground for examining [topic] in relationship to [discipline], but also in relationship to society. So that's the kind of things when I see things that I think are unjust. I do two things. One, I want to see what's the underlying assumption, the [disciplinary] analysis of it, and then two, what do you do to get people to be active.

Like Eleanor, Edward is motivated by personal experience related to injustice. He sees his research itself as an "act of protest" against injustices that he grew up with and had no ability to address until a young scholar:

> No, it was part of my coming of age and connecting with worlds that I was denied as a [person of a particular race]. These were people I would never have shared dinners with or stayed in their homes, but I wanted to do that, and [the research project] was an act of protest. It's always interesting, and sadly, the problems are still with us, the issues of race and violence and education and poverty—all the things I felt strongly about then, I still feel strongly about, and sadly, if anything they're worse.

His research in these areas has continued throughout his career in an inherently engaged discipline. Ken and Odin's experience was somewhat different, in that their research prior to receiving tenure had been more theoretical in nature. Their motivations to change were similar as well and involved growing up in the midst of the issues they now research. When discussing why he had undertaken engaged scholarship that intervenes in a particular social problem, Odin replied:

> These kinds of issues were just percolating around my house all the time growing up. It felt like the air that I was breathing. It just seemed to be a natural part of who I was. Then I looked back on some of the work I did, in my PhD program, and my masters program, and I realized that some of the work that I was doing was really a kind of slight attempt to get at some of the issues I'm dealing with right now. So in many ways, I guess I've come kind of full circle with my research on [topic] and the like.

159

For Odin, as for Edward and Eleanor, the topic being researched is an outgrowth of personal experiences related to social problems, and engaged scholarship is the mode of research that allows them to explore and intervene in those problems. Given that engaged scholarship is the most effective mode of research and intervention for them, then these faculty members also have a professional motivation for the choice to participate.

Professional Motivation

Of the 24 faculty members, 10 spoke of professional motivations for public service and engaged scholarship work other than promotion and tenure, which are discussed later in this chapter. For some, it is inherent to and valued by their discipline or department. Other motivations included enrichment and improvement of their work, interest in a particular research question, desire for a particular career impact through their work, or simply because they were asked to do it by someone in authority.

Edward, Geoff, and Zeus each characterized their discipline as being inherently engaged, that "This is just the way my discipline works, it's how we do things," as Edward said. Odin and Elliot both discussed how their department or disciplines are problem-oriented in nature, so service and engaged scholarship that address problems is valued. For example, according to Elliot:

> You know, in some [academic units in my discipline], the research consists of creating something very esoteric and proving theorems about it. We don't do that. We look for real problems. I mean, this has been the hallmark of the department forever. We look for places where we can make a contribution.

For Odin, Edward, and Geoff, each of whom is an engaged scholar, service and engaged scholarship have enriched or improved their research and/or teaching. Odin spoke about

how working directly with a marginalized population enriched his understanding of the

subject and improved his writing:

> I think that in many ways, the work that we've done with community partners has fed my own research, learning a little bit about how [my target population] deals with this problem in their everyday lives obviously informs the kind of work that I did initially, kind of just having an appreciation of that kind of dynamic in reality. I'm not sure that I can point to a specific research question that my work in the community has prompted, but it certainly has added depth to the things that I have written since.

Geoff spoke about a different kind of enrichment of his research, the literal financial

kind:

> Well certainly it's helped my career in terms of being a practice-oriented scientist, because each of the programs I've written about and published on, so that benefits my career. And um… And I've gotten [extremely large amounts] in funding, which benefits my career. So I'm grateful for what it has brought, the benefits for me as well as the community.

Odin and Edward both talked about how engaging students in public service and

community-based research enriched their teaching experience and the learning

experience for their students. Edward's comments are representative:

> I tell students that this kind of work helps you learn to walk in the shoes of another person, to imagine yourself in a totally different world from the one you were born into. We're all very privileged here at the university, and most of the people we work with are not privileged, have no formal education. So that in itself is a very important education for the students, to understand what that means. Experience is the only way they can truly understand.

Odin also commented specifically on how teaching a service learning course improved

his research experience:

> Well the [topic] APPLES course really represented the first, I suppose, the first thing that I did with regard to this greater project. That class, as I began preparing it and thinking it through, really was part of the strategy for how I was going to teach myself this literature.

161

Odin's strategic use of a service learning course preparation and as research preparation allowed him to maximize use of his time while entering a new field of interest.

In discussing research and why they pursue work that is engaged or of public benefit, five faculty members said they were motivated by the specific topic of research. As discussed in the previous section, three faculty members—Eleanor, Edward, and Odin—were motivated by personal experience to conduct engaged scholarship on topics of personal interest, but their interests are specifically about contributing to the public good through addressing social injustices. Two other faculty members discussed that the research topic was what motivated them, and not the related benefits to the public. Lucas works in a core discipline and considers research that improves education in his subject area to be a public service. According to Lucas:

> To be honest, most of us do [discipline] research because it's exciting and interesting. And I think over the long-term, it does benefit education because you get better insight into what [subjects] are really important and even better ways to teach it. So I think there's a long-term benefit to education and that's a public service, but I would say people don't deliberately go for that. It's an accidental by-product.

Though the public benefit is an "accidental by-product," Lucas still considers it a public service. Jay, who had been conducting engaged scholarship without realizing that was what it was, had a similar perspective about being motivated by his research topics and not by any public benefit:

> The work that we did on [subject], I was asking a specifically scientific question, and my perspective as a scientist was a really cool application in a unique situation, and yes there's a public service aspect to it, and I'm happy to let them have that part of it, but my goal that got me out of bed in the morning was the science application to it, and the same with the [other project]. That I was helping out [the site] didn't really enter into the equation. [laughs] And I wouldn't have pursued it if there wasn't a science question involved.

The research topic was what "got [him] out of bed in the morning." Any public benefit was not important.

For another faculty member who conducts engaged research that directly benefits a marginalized population, the public benefit was a major motivator and the reason for a complete change in research area. This professor said:

> I was nearing 50 and reflecting on my career, and I realized everything I had created was being used to entertain or kill people. I wanted to be able to say, "No, today people are using this, it's helping them, and it's not something they'll not be able to use until 15 years from now."

This professor wanted the cumulative results of a career to add up to more than it had at that point. He also wanted his career to have helped people, and for his research to have immediate instead of delayed impact. Career was also a motivator for an assistant professor, but in a very different way. This assistant professor was on the tenure clock and dealing with the negative career effects of having children and she was deeply concerned that she would be denied tenure. She pursued a particular project that would benefit a marginalized study population because it would increase her skills set and her marketability outside of academia:

> So I knew in the beginning that I would be doing it much more for the experience, and to know surveys and how this type of research works and doesn't work given how you ask questions and the issues of timing. I also did it for another line on the CV, in case I don't make tenure, something that is outside what I usually do and makes me more marketable in quote, unquote real life.

A third faculty member, Bill, also had his career in mind but in a very different way when he decided to take on a responsibility that would be a service to the university with implications that would benefit the public. Even though his department does not value service to the university or public service, Bill said yes when asked by a university executive administrator to join a university-wide committee.

163

Bill: You know, I'm sitting here, and I'm on [a university-wide committee], and I'm wondering, "Why the hell am I doing this?" It's totally a waste of time from this [academic unit's] perspective.

Leah: But it's an important thing to do?

Bill: Well, you know, what are you supposed to do when the [university executive administrator] calls you?

Leah: You're supposed to say yes. [both laugh]

Bill: That's exactly what you're supposed to do. People have asked why I'm doing it, and I say, "What do you say when [university executive administrator] calls and asks you to do something? Do you tell them no? Stick it?" "Oh, well they've never called." "Well, OK then. You think about this for when they do call. Stuff happens."

An administrator of high rank called Bill and asked him to do it, and he participated because he felt like he had no choice in the matter.

While Bill had a professional motivation to participate, four faculty members discussed professional reasons not to participate other than those related to tenure, which are discussed later in this chapter. Jamie, Lucas, Daniel, and Bryan each discussed how their chosen discipline and/or area of scholarship were not conducive to public service and/or engaged scholarship. Eight other faculty members discussed not being able to visualize how some disciplines or areas of research could conduct engaged scholarship or contribute to public service. Apollo's comments are representative:

I think there are areas of research where the problem isn't engagement or a lack of engagement, it's a deeper problem about finding things where one can make an original and new contribution to knowledge in, as opposed to areas that we need taught. I mean, we clearly need lots of people that teach students how to learn a foreign language. To understand something about foreign cultures. We certainly need people who can teach the major authors. But how much new is there one can say about Shakespeare? Or does that drive you into people developing new arcane rhetorics? Yes, so I think there's some areas where this is a problem even just figuring out what is a piece of research, a new and original contribution to knowledge, much less how that can be done in an engaged way, or to be of any immediate help to the public.

Thus, the professional motivation to "make an original and new contribution to knowledge" may come into conflict with even the possibility of being able to conduct engaged scholarship or public service. Bryan, who considered service to the discipline as a part of public service, also discussed how professional motivations may lead faculty to focus exclusively on other areas of professional effort:

> Leah: OK. What would be the implications for your standing in your intellectual community, if you were to say no to service in your discipline?
>
> Bryan: There can be two answers to that. If you say no to writing tenure letters and promotion reviews, that's going to impact on one front your reputation and standing, but if you use that time to write and get published, it will be to your advantage in another. The same thing with teaching and research. Some people fulfill those obligations in different ways.
>
> Leah: So there are different pay-offs by moving in different directions.
>
> Bryan: Absolutely.

Desired professional outcomes and pay-offs is a motivational factor in the choices faculty make, according to Bryan. Determining what professional avenues will produce those outcomes and what the pay-offs will be, however, is a product of faculty socialization.

Socialization

Socialization shapes how we perceive and make choices within any social structure, and that socialization is ongoing. All faculty members stated that they would advise junior faculty members not to get involved in engaged scholarship until after receiving tenure, with the exception of two who are in inherently engaged disciplines. I never heard this opinion expressed publicly in faculty forums on engaged scholarship. Three faculty members discussed how socialization during graduate school and early career did not include service or engagement, and how it had shaped their expectations

about and experiences as faculty. Three junior faculty members talked about how specific incidents in their early training signaled that service and engagement were not valued and were potentially career suicide. Six faculty members from a cross-section of disciplines and a range of tenure discussed academic norms, related expectations of and for faculty, and how those norms are reinforced when violated.

Bob, a professor who began conducting engaged scholarship late in his career, is a representative example of those who said they would advise junior faculty not to do engaged scholarship. Each faculty member referred to how it makes it more difficult to be granted tenure. Their reasons included the time involved in such research, publishing difficulties, funding difficulties, "applied" research not being respected in their discipline, or a combination thereof. Bob said:

> The thing is, the publishing venues and funding opportunities for this kind of work are slim, and I've told other young scholars to get tenure before starting this kind of work because otherwise, it's too hard a road. There are people who can make that happen, but it's not the typical route. I mean you don't get tenure for teaching awards here either, you know?

Junior faculty confirmed that they had been told not to pursue engaged research projects. One junior faculty member was discussing a current research project that is not typical in the discipline because it benefits the population under study. According to this person:

> Assistant professor: My [spouse] told me, when I was feeling really down, because you know, you're sure you're never going to get tenure, you're not publishing enough, you know, and [my spouse] said "Why don't you just do something you like doing? Why don't you find a question you're interested in, something that may not be publishable but that's worthy and interesting to you? [laughs softly] So I'm at that stage. Actually, I haven't given up on the tenure thing, but I am just trying to enjoy my research. Which [a senior colleague] of mine told me is the wrong way to go. [both laugh]
>
> Leah: The *wrong* way to go?

Assistant professor: Yeah. We were having lunch, and I told him my resolution, my decision…

Leah: Like, "Here's the new plan…"?

Assistant professor: [laughs] Exactly! And he was like, "WHaaaaat? No! You should publish! Who *cares* if we're helping the poor, or the rich, or whatever! No!" [laughing in disbelief] And I was like, I don't know if it's just my point of view, but I don't know if… I don't know. I don't know. But basically, if, yeah, the message that's now popping up is helping yourself first. If there's any other impact, great, but it should be "Me first."

This clash between tenure requirements, publishing probability, and expectations for what a faculty member should be doing create a situation where the junior faculty member's desire to serve the public is perceived as inappropriate; the appropriate desire should be selfish, not selfless. This message directly contradicts any university messages about doing public service or engaged scholarship, which would require a faculty member to be at least selfless enough to identify a need or problem to be addressed.

Regarding pre-tenure expectations, Liz is an assistant professor whose current research could have a huge public benefit if translated for lay applications or public policy. When I asked her what she saw as the outcomes of the project, she said:

The outcomes of the project… Generally when you're pre-tenure I think your only response to that can be publication; it's what we're told to do. I don't think you ever think of the benefits it could have to anybody.

Liz has been socialized to understand that anything other than academic publication is not an acceptable goal or use of time. Three junior faculty members said they had been told not to get involved with public service, either; two of the three had proposed service to the university or their discipline in the annual plan of work and were told to remove it or limit it. Liz also received the message regarding appropriate publishing and engagement through observing how colleagues on the job market were treated:

I know a friend of mine who has been very lucky when he was actually doing his dissertation to be noticed by outside sources like, general public publications, like *The New York Times*, national magazines and such, that did actually quote his research. He didn't get a job, even though he was noticed by people working in this field who might be using his results, to apply it actually. He was not perceived as that professional, because they thought he was selling out. You're not supposed to be making money. It really sounded, in his case, it really sounded like you know, "You are targeting people who are much more practical than people who are much more into general knowledge of [our discipline], and this is not what we value. It's nice that you helped them to do whatever, but that's not what we're going for." And I was very surprised—he didn't get a job when he went on the job market.

The definition of what is appropriate behavior for a "professional" in this case is underscored by the risks of being perceived as unprofessional.

Understanding what is "appropriate behavior" begins prior to the job market, though. Three faculty members, all tenured, discussed graduate school as shaping their expectations of what faculty work and life would be like, and what it would not be like. Lucas, for example, was not socialized to think of service and engagement as a part of faculty life:

Within the profession, service and outreach, it was not emphasized all that much, and I think the people who did it probably learned it through their church or something like that. So in my generation it wasn't emphasized all that much. In my case, I just moved up the ladder in [discipline], getting more and more training and finally getting a job.

Lucas also discussed how service and engagement are not a point of discussion in his academic unit, and he knows of none of his colleagues who participate in service or engagement outside the university. His socialized expectations match his later experience.

In some cases of graduate school socialization, however, the resulting expectations turned out to be wrong, or to have prepared the future faculty member

168

inadequately for the reality of faculty life. Thor, who had talked previously about the

volunteer nature of faculty work beyond teaching and research, said:

> Coming out of graduate school, I had only thought of myself as a [scholar in my discipline]. I had no idea what to expect, had paid no attention to and was completely uninterested in the dynamics of how a university works.

While Thor had "no idea what to expect," Odin had the wrong idea of what to expect.

Odin said:

> I thought I could do public service type work when I got here. In grad school, I said, "I'm going to be really involved in [nonprofit organization] when I get out of here. I'm going to have time as a professor to do that." And, oops! [both laugh] You know, and then it sort of became, that when I get tenure, then I'll get involved.

Odin was not socialized to have an accurate perception of what life as a junior faculty

member would be like relative to available time and how it could be spent, so he did not

realize that he would not be able to participate in public service early in his career. Thor

also discussed another challenge to participation, of not having been trained with the

necessary skills. With regard to outreach and public audiences, Thor said:

> As I worked my way up through the profession, most of what the profession, when you're being professionalized, as a graduate student and then young faculty member, all of the signposts are teaching you the skills, the survival tactics necessary for your discipline and profession, and there's very little that actively teaches you to engage a broader audience, or even signals to you that you must. I think most people I know would love to reach larger audiences. But it's the combination of we're within, certainly in my discipline, we're not taught how to do that, and then many of us work in areas where we don't know how to do it, because we don't have a topic that's easily translated into building an audience.

The desire to participate in outreach exists, then, but the required skill set is not

developed through the existing socialization and training process. Depending on the type

of service and engagement, participation may be complicated by the political context of

the public university. Consider these comments from Liz: "Given that it's in [this

particular field], it is going to have results that, I guess, can support public policy, that could really help deal with [public supports program], but I don't know how to do that."

Sometimes, the existing socialization and training process omits even basic information that affects participation in service and engagement. Liz mentioned junior faculty orientation specifically:

> Liz: I'm not even aware of what all the possibilities are of what public service could be. It's also perhaps because when you join the university you have all those orientation sessions for junior faculty, and they do not mention public service. You have no one talking to you about the possibilities, talking to you about the convenience or a dual-research approach that could be helpful to you.
>
> Leah: Do they mention service learning courses for undergraduates?
>
> Liz: They do. They do. [laughs and shrugs, as if to say "How does that help me?"]

Liz works in an academic unit that does not incorporate service learning into its curriculum; at orientation, she got information she cannot use in her department relative to service learning. However, she did not get information that could have made a significant difference in her research mode and outcomes, and in her service to the public. That these topics were not addressed in Liz's faculty orientation communicates that public service and engaged scholarship are not a priority, and possibly not expected of faculty.

Academic norms, related expectations of and for faculty, and how those norms are reinforced when violated are all a part of faculty's ongoing socialization as it relates to public service and engagement. Lucas spoke of traditional academic norms of teaching and research, and how the promotion and tenure process and reward system reinforce expected behaviors:

170

Traditionally, people have been assigned courses to teach, and then the rest of it is more or less free-form, you know? You do your thing, you do your research, you do a good job, you get more money for your raise. And if you don't do a good job you get less. People typically don't get fired if they show up and teach their courses, but this is more of a business model, I think. I don't know how they… I don't know what they have in mind here, but if they're going to start requiring people to do those engaged projects, that's a departure from the traditional academic norms.

While Lucas talked of requiring "engaged projects" as a departure from the traditional model of how a university works, Zeus spoke from a more personal perspective about public service as a new and different expectation:

Leah: When we were talking earlier about public service, and you said, "I can't even think about it," you sounded very unhappy about that. I don't want to misinterpret

Zeus: [interrupts] I'm so unhappy about the work load. I mean, I'm exhausted. I like my work a lot, I'm just tired. I want to get a full nights' sleep. It's like, OK, yeah, I can have an 80-hour-a-week job, plus I have to do consulting on the side because you don't pay me enough to even pay my bills, not enough to do anything with beyond pay mortgage, bills, and part of groceries. So they pay me that little, but want more out of me, public service. And it's like… [chuckles] It's like, you've got to be nuts. This is not what I thought I was getting into.

While there seems to be a significant mismatch between Zeus' expectations in general about life as a faculty member, having public service as a work obligation was not one her expectations.

The changing parameters of what is expected of and appropriate for faculty was also an issue for Ken, but one that did not surprise him. According to Ken:

The remark that I hear most often, is that in the political environment of the university, like any organization, as it was with me, is that you have to serve within the parameters that you're given, or there are consequences. And those parameters change most every time there's a new department head, or a new dean, or a new chancellor, or a new president. They don't change all that much or that fast in the discipline.

For Ken, changing parameters within the university were an expectation, but so too are

consequences for not adapting to those parameters. Ken had previously discussed the

difficulty of being an engaged scholar in a department where it is not valued regardless of

what the chancellor or university president wanted. Consequently, the conflicting

parameters within which he can meet expectations restrict him increasingly, or he works

outside those parameters and is subjected to consequences. The discipline, however,

offers a more stable structure for determining job parameters.

Even when job parameters are not in conflict, faculty must prioritize and make

choices about what to focus on within the given parameters. Apollo described the tension

in his academic unit regarding the recent emphasis on service and engagement relative to

job expectations and prioritizing competing demands:

> Where I hear the tension among my colleagues is, "isn't my first job that they're
> hiring me to educate their young people, and to produce both knowledge and
> scholars here? And can I consistent with doing that, can I also do these… a lot of
> other things that different ad hoc groups want me to comment on or draft a
> proposal for, or a community school wants me to come and give a lecture?"

In Apollo's academic unit, the status quo does allow discussion of expectations and

change. In at least one department, a junior faculty member was publicly disciplined

when attempting to discuss why service to the university was discouraged because it was

something the faculty member felt should be important:

> So that's the problem with public service… Even if you would want to have a
> public service influence even at the university level, you would be actually afraid
> of making enemies more than friends, because it's very easy. This profession is
> made up of a lot of people with big egos. It's very easy to bruise them. It's
> *amazingly* easy to bruise them. I was told that by my advisor when I was a
> graduate student and I'd never really had the experience of a faculty meeting or
> committee like he'd had. And yeah, now that I've had the experience, I say yeah,
> I did—I stayed in my place and stopped talking. And when I started talking again
> [laughs] everybody went, "Behave yourself!" They weren't happy to hear it, and

I was raising some issues, and as a junior faculty member it was not OK to lay them out on the plate like that.

This junior faculty member's attempt to discuss a problem, and that the problem was related to work that her department defines as inappropriate for their faculty, create a situation where she has violated their norms for a model faculty member. The reprimand "Behave yourself!" indicates rather that such behavior is inappropriate, and not how a colleague should act or think. Silence regarding a differing opinion and accepting the given norms, even when your position mirrors the chancellor's and president's, is the only option to prevent negative consequences.

Negative consequences for not behaving like a model faculty member can, in another faculty member's experience, be much more serious than a public scolding. As serious as they can be, involving rank and pay, this faculty member chose those negative consequences because of personal commitment to a major public service project even though it was not valued in his academic unit:

Leah: What would [your academic unit's] reaction be to [your public service project] if you received a university service award for it?

Faculty member: That I'm not serious about my research.

Leah: So you believe you would actually get penalized

Faculty member: [interrupts] Of course I would. I already have been.

Leah: Oh…

Faculty member: Oh, yeah. I do this… I am not under the illusion that this is anything other than a costly activity from the school's perspective with respect to me. I do this in spite of them, not because of them, and there are some people who say, "Oh, this is wonderful," and all the rest, but they step out of the way when somebody wants to take a swing at me, when they say I must not be serious about my work. I can give you examples if you want.

Leah: It surprises me that [your academic unit] isn't any more PR-savvy than that.

173

Faculty member: Oh they're happy to use it for PR. They're happy to, when it suits their purposes! "We want you to see us this way," that's exactly right. But that's not the way they treat it inside the building. When you ask about promotion, raises, standing, the answer is, "Well, if you're doing that, you're just not serious about your work."

Leah: Well it's not like you're not doing other stuff, not like you're not publishing and teaching and doing research.

Faculty member: That's right, but that's not their model of what a faculty member should do.

This faculty member fulfilled all the required behaviors of a model faculty member in the academic unit—teaching well enough to win awards, an active research agenda, and a publication record in respected journals. The faculty member does the "serious" work. Yet by having gone above and beyond those expectations, having behaved in ways the academic unit does not value—public service—the faculty member has been viewed as not being serious about teaching, research, and publishing work. However, the faculty member has been aware of and has accepted the negative consequences of not behaving like a model faculty member, of public service work devaluing the other work done.

Measurements and Incentives

The measurements and incentives associated with job security and career progress are a major factor in how faculty members choose to spend their time and efforts. In interviews, faculty members discussed performance evaluations and annual reports, publications as the primary measure of performance, measuring output instead of impact, and the lack of financial or career rewards as factors affecting their choices about participation. These same topics generated significant discussion in university-wide

faculty forums on engaged scholarship held by the CCPS, which I attended as a session note-taker.

Performance evaluation occurs through annual reports and through promotion and tenure reviews, and every faculty member said that primary means by which their performance was measured and rewarded was the number of academic publications produced, with teaching competence a distant second. Elliot, a former academic unit head discussed his approach to promotion and tenure reviews:

> The one place where I would talk about service to the administration was in tenure and promotion issues, and I always had a section about service, where I talked about professional service. Program committees, and things like that. But it was not … that was not a big part, and it's clear in department policy and the dean's policy that service like that doesn't compensate for research or teaching. I certainly don't remember ever talking about service outside service to the discipline.

What is worthy of publication, however, is determined at the discipline level in higher education. In disciplines where applied and engaged scholarship are not valued, it is difficult if not impossible to get published and maintain job security and progress in the career. In addition, public service, outreach, and engagement are a minor or nonexistent factor in performance evaluations in academic units and disciplines where they are not valued.

Jamie, Bob, Bryan, Thor, Elliot, Lucas, Liz, and Bill had similar comments regarding the role of publications and performance evaluations in the choices they make about participation; Bill's comments were typical:

> Leah: About research and publishing… A person in [a similar discipline] said that the only thing that's ever going to pass professional peer-level muster is something that is new and different, and pushing the envelope.
>
> Bill: Absolutely.

Leah: And if you take existing knowledge and apply it in new and different ways and come up with new and different things, they don't care and won't publish it.

Bill: Absolutely.

Leah: Is that the same thing in your discipline?

Bill: Absolutely.

Leah: So it's the "Ivory Tower to the max" model, generate new knowledge.

Bill: Yep, uh huh. Now if you asked them in the [administrative unit head's] office about work that's not cutting edge, they'd say, "Oh yeah, we'd like to have that kind of stuff," because that feeds the PR machine. But at the end of the year when we do personnel evaluations, you get a few "Atta boys," but there's never a raise, it never matters for promotion, and it never matters for tenure. Given the incentives in this place, anybody who does applied research with social applications or public service or teaches service learning classes is just asking for trouble.

For these faculty members, none of whom is in an inherently engaged discipline, time

and effort invested anywhere other than research and competent teaching will have no

professional returns in terms of compensation and advancement. Therefore, the choice to

do service and engagement is the choice not to benefit financially or career-wise. In

some academic units, even service to the unit is not considered worthy of compensation.

According to Thor:

The difficult thing is going to be translating the idea of service into something that faculty are actively rewarded for. In [my department], if you publish a book, you get a merit pay increase for publishing a book. They don't consider, for example, that being director of graduate studies is worthy of merit pay. Now, that's service to the department and it's not comparable to a book, but it takes a huge amount of time. But it's considered something that's not meritable. Which is fine, as long as those are the rules and everyone understands them, I don't particularly find that I should complain about it, but the point is that the merit committee doesn't pay any attention to somebody who… does a lot of work to create for example, I don't know, say a community academic liaison relationship over some particular issue that the community's interested in. That doesn't enter in at all.

The experience is different for Geoff, who was one of only two faculty members in an inherently engaged discipline who had conducted engaged scholarship since graduate school:

> Well certainly it's helped my career in terms of being a practice-oriented scientist, because each of the programs I've written about and published on, so that benefits my career. And um… And I got tenure through that process, I got [extremely large amounts] in funding, which benefits my career. So I'm grateful for what it has brought, the benefits for me as well as the community.

For Geoff, his work has an impact on the public good that can be measured in part through his output of new knowledge through scholarly publications. For faculty not in inherently engaged or problem-oriented disciplines that value service and engaged scholarship, it is a different story. Any impact they have on the public good through service or engagement is not quantified through their scholarship, so it is not rewarded.

Administrators also discussed performance measurement relative to service and engagement at length and that it was a major point of contention in the administration and within the faculty. Two administrators stated specifically that promotion and tenure guidelines should not be changed, though one also said that alternate forms of reward such as merit raises could be a possibility. The other four administrators stated specifically that the promotion and tenure systems had to be changed. According to Stacey:

> I firmly support having this institutionalized to count toward tenure and promotion, but I have heard discussions at the senior level that have been shocking, about why it shouldn't, or that it can't count as much as discipline-based service or discipline-based research and publication, that that really is still the almighty, five papers here and one book there. And I feel like we somehow have to break that role, not just here at Carolina but in higher education in general, that it has to be different.

Chris's comments reflected the other side of the conflict. Chris had stated that production of new knowledge and publication should remain the standard for performance measurement, and later commented that changes to performance and tenure reviews should not even be a part of the discussion regarding service and engagement:

> We're never going to change the fact that the way to get tenure is to get experts from around the world to write and say that you're an expert in your field. So when people talk about the rewards system, when they're having this kind of conversation, that's when it ends. Once you say OK, we have to change the reward system, then the people who are upset because they're not being rewarded get put on one side of the divide, and the people who think that scholarship is the only thing that matters are on the other side of the divide. So the most important thing in this discussion is to leave the rewards out of the conversation.

Chris also discussed how the rewards system is an academic unit level function, not a university administrative function:

> Chris: The rewards systems are in the hands of the [academic unit heads].
>
> Leah: That seems to play out very differently in different places [around campus]. [both laugh]
>
> Chris: You got it! Yeah. Congratulations. You've found the engine room of the ship. [both laugh].
>
> Leah: So it's all about the [academic unit heads].
>
> Chris: [redacted—too specific to de-identify] There's no point in trying to micro-manage them. Because all the things you want to try to control are in their control. They control faculty morale, and who gets hired, and what departments do.

Taylor, another administrator, discussed the challenge more specifically, which is again that different departments and different disciplines value different things, and a cookie-cutter approach to performance measurement of service and engagement will not work:

> The tenure and funding issues are always going to be there, and we just have to recognize that the culture of the chemistry department is always going to be different from the culture of the school of social work. It's as simple as that. But

178

we've got chemists who may be very opposed to the concept of engaged scholarship relative to tenure and promotional awards, but who are already doing it. Every time they create a company, they're doing it. In one sense, we need to figure out how chemistry or classics or whatever the department is, how what they do relates to this larger venture.

Casey is another administrator who stated that the reward and review processes had to be changed, but discussed it from the perspective of accurately reflecting the university's mission while also rewarding a larger scope of work and its impact:

> I have strong feelings that our promotion and tenure policies are too rigid. If we value this kind of work, we need to reward the people who are doing it, so I really think we need to broaden how we evaluate people for promotion and tenure, whether it's public service, and I'd also argue that entrepreneurial activity needs to be included because we have a way of saying, "Yeah, go ahead and do that, but we're not going to promote you for it." But in the end, I'm a traditionalist when it comes to these things, and if we have a three-pronged mission, we should be involved in all parts of those. We've put way too much emphasis on just counting the number of publications and the number of dollars brought in. We need to find a way to look at impact.

Relative to the faculty, Eleanor, Ken, Bob, Bill, Apollo, and Bryan each commented that impact was not even considered regarding scholarship, much less the impact of service and engagement, but that it should be the grounds for reward.

Eleanor's comments were typical:

> So at any rate, I think one of the things that needs to be brought together is that the service needs to count, needs to count as part of promotion and tenure as opposed to just something that you check off but that doesn't add any value. When it comes to reviews for promotion and tenure, it's all about the articles. Teaching is part of it, but the biggest part is research, and a bit for service and something in the profession. But it's about the articles, and passable teaching. It's about your impact within the discipline, as opposed to your impact within the university or with the public. The other impact that people have is not recognized. It's just what's in the journals, how many books do you have published.

Like the others, Bryan believes impact should be considered as opposed to productivity through output. He discussed the measurement of production as a business model:

Well certainly one of the business models is an attempt at quantification of service and quantification of productivity, and I think that's a very misconceived model. I don't see that kind of quantification can work, or how it can accurately capture the work done. [points to an illustration on his wall relative to impact] But this is. There's an argument right there.

Leah: That it's not about impact, it's about numbers.

Bryan: Yes, yeah. But it should be about impact.

Doris, a long-time faculty member, has seen the emphasis on professional output as the measurement of performance increase over time, while the value of service and engagement has declined. Doris said:

You know, I've seen a distinctive change in the culture in the [more than two decades] since I've been here, at least in this [academic unit]. There was a pretty heavy emphasis on community service, [contributing to the professional practice of her science], and community education. When I first came here, that could be and often was the primary basis for promotion of [faculty in my area], and over time, that has really shifted towards more of a demand for peer-reviewed publication and more traditional research and scholarship. So there really aren't any rewards for doing it anymore. You don't get paid for doing it, and you don't really get credit on your promotion dossier for doing it. The fact is, it brings in grants and funding, and that's what they want.

In discussing the problem of measuring impact and the ease of measuring output, Bob brought up the issue of objectivity versus institutional judgment. Bob said, "Part of the problem at universities at our level, not at the *very* top, is that we don't trust *our* judgment—we need *objective external* measures, and those are external funding and publications." For the measures to be valid, they must be objective proof from *outside* the institution itself.

Administrators discussed outside influences relative to performance measurement and public service and engagement. Three administrators spoke of how only specific external forces had any influence, though they spoke about it from different points of

view. According to Riley, great ideas only have influence if they're from an appropriate

source:

> You come here, come back from a conference nationally and say that people are doing this really interesting thing at Portland State, and people look at you like, "Why do we care what's going on out at these third-rate universities? That's not who we are." It happens all the time. Great ideas suddenly seem not so great if they come from somewhere that people think is not as great as we are. It's a crazy thing.

Again, it is not the quality of the information or idea that determines its influence, but

rather the source. Stacey and Taylor both stated that the AAU and its member

universities are the only higher education bodies that have influence at the administrative

level. According to Taylor:

> The only national organization that we pay any attention to is the AAU. That's the elite group. Other organizations can make pronouncements or recommendations, and it has nothing to do with us because that's not our peer set we're concerned about. We're concerned about the top 60. If the AAU makes a pronouncement, we'll listen.

> Stacey concurred, but from the perspective that the AAU ought to be addressing

the issues of service and engagement performance measurement:

> National associations have to step up to the plate and set the tone for everybody. If the 60 AAU schools said, we are all going to agree that we will count service as much as one or two research papers, that would be it. It would change, overnight it would change. Include service to the campus as well as to the outside, and I think that would help have faculty re-engaged with the campus in a way that we need them to be.

> While performance measurement and rewards may incentive more public service

and engaged scholarship, the lack of such measurements and rewards actually dis-

incentivizes participation. Elliot, a former academic unit head, summarized the choice

faculty have to make:

> It's not encouraged, and it's not rewarded. And my number one rule of management and parenting is, you get the behavior that you reward. And faculty

181

not only feel like it doesn't have any reward, but also in terms of the hours it takes away from doing other stuff, it may have a penalty.

For those who choose to do public service and engagement instead of the "other stuff," the publishing that is the basis for financial and career advancement, the penalties are very real. Three tenured faculty members in disciplines that do not value public service and engaged scholarship discussed the negative impact of their choice to participate on their pay level and promotions. One faculty member even objectively quantified the impact:

> Leah: How does the [engaged scholarship project] go over with [your unit administrative head]?
>
> Faculty member: Um…. [long pause] Well, now you're into the rewards system, and the… the priorities. The question is, what do you get rewarded for in terms of tenure and annual reviews, salary and things like that. I'm the lowest paid tenured associate professor in [my academic unit] probably because of the path I've chosen. Because it's public record, you can look it up. My base salary, as a tenured associate professor with [number of] years here is [dollar figure]. I don't think there is another tenured faculty member in [my academic unit] who is under [21 percent higher dollar figure]. I looked it all up a few years ago and found it so depressing that I, you know… [long pause] I can sleep well at night, and there's so much to be done. And I've made my choice because of my passions. This is what I want to be doing.

Motivated by passion to address a particular social problem, this faculty member chose to pursue engaged scholarship despite the penalties of reduced income and rank. In a discipline and academic that do not value service and engaged scholarship, the public impact of this faculty member's work is neither measured nor rewarded, but in fact garners penalties. For those faculty members who desire to participate in service and engagement regardless of measurements, incentives, or dis-incentives, however, the opportunity to do so must be present.

182

Opportunity

To participate in public service and engaged scholarship, opportunity is a key factor. Faculty members discussed opportunity in two forms: serendipity and institutional structures. Regarding serendipitous opportunities, faculty members discussed receiving unsolicited requests to which they responded, or chance connections made to projects or other faculty members. Regarding opportunities created by institutional structures, faculty members discussed the helpful and hindering effects of structures at the academic unit, university, and academy levels.

Thor, Jay, Apollo, and Eleanor each discussed how their participation in a one-time public event such as a lecture came about because a non-university member of the public contacted each with a particular request. Thor's comments were typical when he said, "So I wouldn't say I have gone far beyond what would be fairly conventional for [someone in my discipline]. People come to me with requests, and I'm glad to do it. I welcome the opportunity to do it." No faculty member discussed rejecting such serendipitous responses.

Daniel and Ken each discussed how their participation in a longer-term public service project was the result of being contacted by another member of the university community with a particular request. Their experiences were quite similar, as both were program directors at the time and contacted in that capacity. Daniel's comments are representative:

> Daniel: Basically what happened is that this group talked about it, they needed an administrative home, I was approached, it seemed like an urgent need, and we just did it. I mean, I could tell some other story, but that's how it happened.

> Leah: Those are usually the best ones... the ones where it's because y'all thought it was important.

Daniel: Yeah, we were asked to do it, and at that point we wanted to be part of making that happen.

While participation in these opportunities is reactionary in nature, it did make participation possible. Some engaged scholarship has been made possible or happened just because of serendipitous events on campus. Bob, Ken, and Jay each discussed getting involved with such a project. Bob had a desire to conduct engaged research with a particular marginalized populations but no connections to the population. According to Bob:

> I wanted to [do a particular project for a particular population], but I wasn't having success finding anybody to work with. I was out walking on campus and met [faculty member in another discipline]. I'm a Christian and think of my work being guided by God. [This faculty member]'s in [discipline], I told him I'm in [my discipline], and he says he works in [topic] and is trying to [solve a problem related to that topic, related to the population I was interested in], and I got connected to [that population] that way.

Bob's chance meeting of a particular faculty member was the opportunity needed to turn his desire to work with a certain population into a multi-year engaged research project. That project has also been an opportunity for him to connect with other faculty members and resulted in two interdisciplinary engaged research projects. For Jay, interdisciplinary connections of a colleague in his academic unit resulted in an engaged research project and an ongoing collaboration:

> The [research site] project, yeah, it started with a colleague here who had good connections with the anthropology department, specifically the research labs in archeology, um… and they were approaching the problem with sort of traditional methods, and I'd written a paper with an undergraduate doing a project like that, but that offers a much more sophisticated and reliable approach to it. So this professor was aware of it and brought it to the attention of the archeologist, and said they really should be doing the work through me and this lab. So we did. And now we collaborate all the time.

The informal networks between and among faculty members thus create serendipitous opportunities to connect to other faculty and to participate in service and engagement efforts. More formal structures at the academic unit, university, and academy levels affect participation as well.

At the academic unit level, six faculty members discussed how seniority and leadership structures affected their participation in public service and engagement. As previously discussed in the section on socialization, one junior faculty members was censured by senior faculty members for attempting to discuss service at a faculty member, leaving the junior faculty member to determine service was not an option, given that authority in the unit resided with the senior faculty. Two other junior faculty members were specifically told by their academic unit leaders to reduce or remove service from their annual work plans, and conceded to that authority. Zeus' experience is representative:

> So I've been concerned about [a particular environmental health issue on campus that is a part of my research], and I wanted to get on a committee on campus about that, but I was told to cross that off my goals and expectations report.

Three other faculty members—Eleanor, Jay, and Bill—each commented on how the leadership of their academic unit affected participation negatively in that it was not a subject of interest or discussion for that leader. It was not a priority or even a facet of their administration of the unit. Though the following exchange is long, Jay's comments are typical:

> Leah: OK… What about within your [academic unit], is it the kind of thing that's ever discussed, service or engaged scholarship?
>
> Jay: It was at one time, it was at one time. In fact we had a… We organized some lectures a couple of years ago that were basically designed to, they were open to the public, they were held in the evenings, and we were going to cycle

185

through the faculty and each present 40 minutes of what it is that we do and why it's cool, and I think we had one of two of those and then it was dropped and then we didn't do anymore.

Leah: Do you know why it was dropped?

Jay: We had a change in [academic unit head], so, yeah…

Leah: Alright. And what about, kind of the current culture around service and engagement?

Jay: In this department?

Leah: Mmm hmmm.

Jay: It's not discussed at all.

Leah: It's not?

Jay: Not at all.

Regardless of what is happening at the university or system level, of what has happened in the unit previously, and of whether the new leadership is knowledgeable of those things, service and engagement are not part of the leader's priorities and therefore are no longer even a topic of discussion among that group of faculty. Faculty participated in educational outreach activities when the structured opportunity through the department was there, but did not pursue that work when it was not.

Bill's experience is slightly different from Jay's, in that Bill knows his academic unit head is aware of service and engagement, and of its importance at the university and system levels. The academic unit head, however, eschews any unit responsibility relative to this part of the university mission. In discussing the importance of service and engagement to the university, Bill had responded affirmatively but then commented, "The issue becomes, how do you then… who does that, and what the internal mechanisms are. And [my academic unit head's] view of it is, public service is

186

somebody else's problem, not ours." The mechanisms or structures available at the university level, then, are the important issue to Bill, who conducts public service within an academic unit where leadership gives it no priority.

University-level structures were also a factor in participation for Jamie, George, Bryan, Eleanor, and Edward, all of whom participated in public service, engagement, or engaged scholarship through a university program of some sort that facilitated their participation. While Jamie's account of how this type of structure facilitated participation was typical of others' comments, it also speaks to the difficulty of finding structured opportunities for participation:

> The public service… [shrugs] Part of it feels like it's something we *hear* a lot about. When the structure is there, I am, I am involved in it through [program], because it's made very easy for you. A person keeps a roster of speakers, gets a phone call from someone wanting a speaker, and calls you up and asks if you can talk on this topic. So that's very facilitated, but… I'd also be interested in doing… having a kind of speaker's bureau, but there are a couple of… apparently there is a speaker's bureau for the whole campus that you can register for, but it's really difficult to find information about. I guess that would be one of, sort of, of my complaints. They want us to do all this community service but it's hard to find. It's hard to get hooked up with. I mean, where's the structure? You know, it's such a big university, and it can just be really difficult to find stuff.

Though navigating the size and complexity is an issue for Jamie in finding opportunities to participate, the implied issue is that whatever opportunities out there are not making themselves sufficiently well-known to faculty trying to find them. George also spoke about the problem of the university's size, but in reference to pro-active instead of re-active modes of engagement:

> The need is no different than in Odom's day. We still have controversies to deal with, but the difference is, the university is *big*. So many more academic people doing academic things. The university has become a battleship with lots of little fleet, not a nimble schooner like she used to be. Figuring out how to put together what you need to address a problem, how to find the right people and resources, is no simple thing.

Even with a specific project in mind to address a public problem, George's work is hampered because there is no mechanism that helps him navigate through the large institution to find what he needs.

In addition to the benefit of or lack of primary university structures as factors in participation, other university structures have an impact on whether faculty believe they are allowed to participate. Much in the same way that some faculty perceived that their participation was restricted by authority in their department, Jamie perceived participation to be restricted by other university authorities:

> Jamie: My perception at least is that my work is not conducive to it. It's not something they want out there. Either it's not relevant or it's specifically something the university has told me they don't want me talking about in public. About [#] or [#] years ago, I guess, I was awarded a small grant for research on a book project, and after I'd done it, they asked me to write a thank you letter to the donor, and I asked them a couple of questions about it. Then the office looked at what I did and said, "Oh, don't write the letter. We don't want you contacting that person." So, they did not want the donor to know that their money had gone to sponsor work that was on [potentially controversial subject]. It doesn't exactly encourage you to feel warm and fuzzy about the environment that you're in.

> Leah: You can stay here and do your work but we don't want anybody to know about it?

> Jamie: Just don't tell anybody what you do, basically is the message. So it's not like I can go out there and do workshops or public lectures on it.

Having been censured by a university authority, even one with no input regarding promotion and merit reviews, Jamie was left with the perception that it was not appropriate to pursue any kind of service or engagement related to that particular area of scholarship. According to the university, it was not appropriate for public consumption.

The structure of the university itself creates another challenge for faculty members who are not in inherently engaged or problem-oriented disciplines or

departments where service and engagement are already integrated into their everyday

work, and that challenge is one of time. For nine faculty members—Bryan, Edward,

Elliot, an academic unit head, Lucas, Apollo, Thor, Zeus, and Doris—the significant time

required to do their jobs was a determining factor in the choice not to participate in public

service and engagement. Bryan's comments on the relationship between university

structure, time, and participation were typical:

> And almost everyone in this department runs another program in the university.
> So I'm in [subject], but I'm in [interdisciplinary sub-discipline]. [redacted
> information about other faculty members and their other programs – too specific,
> but demonstrates that the faculty members have responsibilities to multiple
> academic units and programs.] So everyone's wearing at least two and usually
> three hats, so I'm on the administrative board for the [major program on campus],
> and for the [subject studies program] as an [administrator]. And I'm uh, I'm in
> [my department], and I do [major administrative position] here. And three
> searches this year for new faculty, with a couple hundred applicants per search.
> Imagine! The list goes on and on! So people do a lot at the university, a lot.
> Public service outside of that? The problem is that there's always too much to do.
> There's always more to do than anyone can do.

The work involved in keeping the university functioning takes up so much of some

faculty members' time, according to Bryan, that there is none left for participation, all

due to the structure of the university itself. An academic unit head made a similar

comment about that particular position:

> I mean, during the time I've been chair, I feel like I'm using up all my time and
> energy just trying to stay afloat with the job. And I try not to over-schedule and
> overload myself with things, so, you know right now would be the worst time for
> me to take on any public service project.

Elliot and Edward also discussed time, but in terms of how it relates to the basic

job functions of research and teaching. According to Elliot:

> You're not dealing with infinite resources or infinite time. I've had faculty
> members, when I was [head of the academic unit], and this was somewhat
> arrogant, but when I would suggest they would do something, they would say,

"Fine, but, which paper do you want me to not write? Which student do you want me to not advise?" And like I say, that's somewhat arrogant, but not completely.

Edward's comments were similar but reflected his perspective as a researcher. According to Edward, "You just do what you can. You have limits of time. This year, I'm working on a book, and I'm really not doing much beyond that."

Apollo, Liz, Zeus, Odin, Elliot, Eleanor, Doris, and Bryan each spoke about time availability as a particular problem when having to balance their career with their family life, particularly those with school-age children, and even more so for those with a child and no partner. Apollo's comments were typical:

> Apollo: All these things compete for the one resource that is scarcest for us, and that is that we only have 24 hours a day. It's a lot less for those of us with families.
>
> Leah: And I do like to sleep every now and then.
>
> Apollo: Just every now and then? [laughs] Um… We can't put it all off to the next lifetime, but some of us try.

One final issue related to time indicates how some university administrative choices can have a direct affect on not only faculty time availability, but also their level of connection to the university itself. According to Doris:

> Yeah, and there's just only so much a girl can do. [both laugh] It's not that I don't want to be involved or informed, it's just there are a limited number of hours in the day to get it all done, and the reality of the budget and state allocations is that we've had constant reductions of staff support for the last 15 years, so as faculty we're now doing our own clerical work, as well as our scholarship and our teaching and our practice. So I miss a lot of those things, and I think it's a shame, because it makes us feel disconnected from the university, but they've left us no time to be connected.

Doris was involved in and informed about public service and engagement in the past, and wants to be so now. However, the university structure has increased the daily demands on her time to the point where, not only does it prevent her from connecting with the

190

public, it prevents her from being and feeling connected to the university itself. Part of

the irony is that even if there were opportunities in which she might be able to participate,

she is less likely to find out about them.

The last structure that faculty discussed as affecting participation is the structure

of the academy itself. George, Bob, Bill, Liz, Ken, Lucas, Eleanor, Jamie, Thor, and

Elliot represent a cross-section of disciplines, but each commented on the structure of

disciplines within the academy and its effects on participation. George's general

comments regarding career versus impact reflect more specific comments that others

made about their disciplines. George said:

> The discipline is the primary community for faculty—it's a career issue. The
> career is primary, and impact in the current place is secondary. We don't reward
> impact, so faculty in general don't focus on it. A corps of faculty are engaged, up
> to a point, but from what I've seen, it's when their discipline rewards it.

All faculty perceived their discipline as the institution with the most influence over their

career success, because they perceived that the university relied on publication of

research as the primary factor in promotion, tenure, and merit decisions. Of faculty

members in disciplines that did not, in their opinion, value public service and

engagement, seven cited the discipline as the reason they do not participate. Of those

who participate despite their discipline not valuing such work, Bob was most specific

about the challenges the disciplinary structures poses. During our interview, Bob

discussed the difficulties of doing applied research in a discipline that values cutting-edge

knowledge over applied research:

> In my discipline, most write a paper about some innovation and go on to the next
> thing. These hard science researchers want to invent something and throw it over
> the wall and have it change the world, but there's nothing over there, nobody to
> catch. People have to move from research to development. Writing papers and
> throwing them over the wall, there's not much impact, or maybe negative impact,

191

because that person owns that idea, and then you can't really build on it or get it into development.

Again, the issue is disciplinary structures and success as opposed to real-world impact of research. The standard operating procedures and mores concerning intellectual property actually prevent scholars like Bob from testing out real-world applications that could solve social problems through engaged scholarship projects. The impetus for researchers is to do what the discipline rewards, because that is what, by default, the university also rewards. Ken discussed another aspect of disciplinary structure and the negative implications for participation, in that disciplinary loyalty also trumps loyalty to the university. Ken said:

> If you want to maximize your individual well-being and wealth, then you do academic research and academic publications, and you move from university to university, and that's the other dimension of this. The institutional loyalty has evaporated, and instead it is loyalty to the academy or the academic discipline. And in showing loyalty to that, you always look for, "Where can I move to next?" And so this whole foundation of institutional loyalty, which also is helpful with engagement and necessary but not sufficient, but the engagement is gone.

When the academic structure of disciplines is what determines potential individual well-being because it is what determines rewards at the university level, it super-cedes any reason for a faculty member to be committed to a particular institution, or to that institution's mission. Even when the academic unit, university, and academic structures align for a faculty member, however, it does not mean that participation in public service and engagement is simple or easy.

Professional and Personal Risk

Participation in public service and engaged scholarship carries with it both professional and personal risk. Working with the public and/or in the public eye, according to faculty, increases both the complications and the audience size for that

192

work, as well as opening the faculty member up to unintended consequences. Regarding

risk, faculty members discussed misrepresentation, backlash from the university

administration and community, backlash from the public, personal risk, and the risk of

not participating.

Both Jay and Bill discussed how misrepresentation of their work in public led

them to decide not to participate in outreach or expert consulting anymore. Jay had

previously agreed to expert interviews with the media but felt his work had been

misrepresented, leaving the public with the wrong impression of his discipline and his

research. According to Jay:

> You know, when you first approached me, um… I kind of thought "Well, I'm not very engaged in public service, and why aren't I engaged in public service, and why don't I like to go out to the public and you know, I'm swapping e-mails with a high school student now who is sending me the "What does a [scientist in my discipline] do?," and I get phone calls all the time, will you do this, can you look at this, and every time, if I have any hesitation, it's that it's so easy to misperceive us, and to be completely screwed up by the media and the public's impression. I got a phone call a couple months ago to be on a Discovery special and I thought about it for about that long [snaps fingers] before I said no. You know, I just, I don't want to put myself in a situation where what I say gets twisted around and presented in some completely wrong way. Been there, done that.

Bill also felt his work had been misrepresented, and the problem was two-fold. It was

misrepresented by a project partner, and that project partner had direct ties to the state's

governor, and thus, potential influence over university funding. Bill said:

> So we organized a conference on [issue], and somebody had the bright idea to involve the NC [Governor's cabinet level unit]. Essentially, they very successfully outmaneuvered the staff here, and basically turned it into a political circus. And it put us in an impossible position. Basically, the message we were delivering was, [international issue] is not the problem. The problem is [research subject was] not going to succeed anyway, coupled with a recession, so the message wasn't attractive to them. They didn't want to hear it, and it's not how they put it out there in public. That's not something I want to go through again.

In both situations, the scholar lost control of the message when attempting to reach out to or engage with the public regarding a public problem. Neither was willing to take that risk again. In Bill's situation, the partner did not like the information he brought to the project, creating the potential for backlash at the state funding level, and consequently at the university level. Five other faculty members also discussed the risk of backlash either from the university administration or the university community.

Faculty being disciplined by university administration for particular service and engagement or not protected from backlash by administrators was a factor in participation for Apollo, Bill, Eleanor, and two other faculty members. In Apollo's case, it had to do with seeing what happened to other faculty members in the wake of administrative backlash:

> There are other situations, such as one where you might in fact have good research, but is it an area where somebody, some powerful constituency does not welcome. And those are the harder cases. Um, and I can remember for example not all that long ago there was a woman on the Board of Governors, and in fact she [worked with a particular state industry]. And she had exquisitely fine-tuned radar for anybody in the university getting into any kind of research that might be unwelcome to that industry. And there were some people in [another academic unit] doing that kind of thing, and one of them is very much still here, he was a tenured faculty member and is still doing research here. Another was a non-tenured staff member and was publicizing some of these negative findings but didn't really have, in this case, the credentials or solidity, and she's no longer at the university.

In witnessing what happened to other faculty, Apollo got the message that public outreach relative to research results that individual people in power dislike created a potential job risk, regardless of the rigor of the research. Given the university's desire for positive public relations that do not include controversy or the appearance of political or other bias, avoiding risk is a matter of not only ability, but also of the politics involved.

In referring to how today's political context differs from the earlier days of the university, George said:

> We have some tricky political currents. What emerges as doable is what is politically safe, because it's not a one-party system like it was back then. Policy work is putting academic work in a different form, but the faculty have to be able and comfortable with doing it. It's not something many of us are trained to do.

Riley, an administrator, also discussed how most faculty members are not trained to translate their work for public audiences or for use in public policy, which greatly reduces the impact of their research on the public's well-being. It creates a risk for the faculty member and the university, but one that could be avoided:

> The question for me is, is it a risk worth taking, not just is it a risk. Yes. Certain people think Carolina is biased. Do you think we could make it worse? Maybe we could actually make it better. Maybe it's a risk worth taking. That environment is just a really challenging one for faculty to do engaged scholarship. In fact, one of the things I love about engaged scholarship is that faculty really know their subjects. But they have no clue about working in the arena of policy makers. So what we can do is reduce the risk, actually, put supports in place to guide that work.

Bill personally experienced a situation where his research came under negative political scrutiny, though the backlash started with a friend of his academic unit head:

> I thought we had some very interesting stuff, but push came to shove, and basically the [academic unit head's] office hung me out to dry on the politics of it in the state, so it was very clear that if I went forward, they were going to hang me out on this one. The guy who was put out about it was a good friend of the [academic unit head]. So basically, I sort of ended up in a spot where you've got two or three years invested into a project, and you realize this is going to be a disaster if you go ahead with it. Like the longer you stay with it, the worse it's going to get for you. So I basically backed away. So I do essentially only what you call mainstream [specialty] research, because it's not safe to do anything else. Even for tenured faculty.

Bill lost years of research by giving up further work on the project, which was a risk he was not willing to take again. However, if he had proceeded, he risked professional repercussions with his academic unit head. Such repercussions can be extreme.

According to one faculty member who is in an academic unit where public service is not valued:

> There is and has been a tremendous tension between this building and [related program that does research on public issues] because of some of the positions they take, and it's a classic outreach public service operation. And my [administrative unit head] has led an effort to oust [the program's academic leaders], very successfully.

While these are all classic cases of shooting the messenger, which flies in the face of the concept of academic freedom, they are the reality for these faculty members that influence their choices about participation in service and engagement.

Backlash from the university administration, however, is not limited just to research findings or public positions deemed inappropriate. In the case of one faculty member, public service conducted independently of the university proved a risk:

> So my annual review with [university administrator] about the [program] was very brief. He said, "I'm pleased with everything that's going on there. How can I argue with this success? But my one word of advice for you, strong advice, is this. In your role [doing high-profile public service as a private citizen], never do anything that is inconsistent with the interests of the university." Never do *anything* that is inconsistent with the interests of the university.

Later during the course of the faculty member's public service position, the faculty member became aware of a situation that, if made public, could have financial and public relations implications for the university. Though the faculty member dealt with the situation confidentially, the administration ordered the person's resignation from the successful university program shortly thereafter.

Faculty members have also endured backlash from the university community, particularly around service and engagement involving controversial issues. Eleanor and Jamie, both scholars in the humanities, have been subjected to backlash from the campus community. Eleanor discussed the negative reactions when a program she directs

196

sponsored a public lecture given by a scholar who had published on a controversial

subject:

> Eleanor: I got several e-mails from people on campus saying how unethical it was
> for the [program] to have an anti-[subject] on campus. But that's not the point.
> What we did is we invited him to come talk on campus. Now here's the
> difference in what I think about as political as opposed to, in this case, theoretical.
> This was not a political thing at all. It was just what are the arguments one might
> give, and what does [subject] depend on. Until the Q and A, if you read the paper
> or listened to the paper, it was not political, no political action at all.

> Leah: So you've encountered resistance even just around the discussion of
> controversial issues, not even advocating one side or the other.

> Eleanor: We don't advocate any side, but rather think it's important to have a
> discussion of the issues.

> Leah: So you put the issues out on the table, and people protest that they've even
> been put on the table.

> Eleanor: Correct. And the thing is, we get it from both sides. But we do it
> anyway.

While Eleanor was subjected to backlash from the university community because of her

program's public education and outreach service efforts relative to controversial issues,

Jamie, who directed a program focused on a potentially controversial subject, was

subjected to university and public backlash merely because of the program's existence.

The reactions left Jamie believing there were no public education or outreach service

possibilities for the program:

> There are also a lot of people, including me, understandably nervous about
> attracting unfavorable attention to the fact there is a [subject] program here, as a
> subject that some people are *very* hostile toward. And we don't necessarily, we're
> not likely to be going to most North Carolina public high schools to talk about
> [potentially controversial subject]. So I don't know what our opportunities for
> outreach are with [potentially controversial subject].

> Leah: OK. Have you encountered resistance or opposition?

Jamie: Oh yeah, oh yeah… The conservative student newspaper… *Blue and White*, or something? They hate us. They've gone after us. We've had really hostile postings and letters to the newspapers from students about our existence, who have no idea what we do but just assume that it's all about you know, promoting a [potentially controversial] agenda. I mean, we actually work on tons of stuff besides that, but generally the people who go after us don't know that. Several of our individual board members have been targeted by [a private organization's] web site and had their courses *shredded*. Before, there were at least [#] hostile newspaper articles off-campus from [geographic areas], but on campus, most of the *vocal* push-back has come from students.

While Eleanor and Jamie had to endure backlash through mediated channels, Jay's refusal to participate in public forums related to engaged research is due to having witnessed such backlash face-to-face. While at a previous university, Jay and some colleagues had conducted applied research related to a potential local public health risk. He had mentioned that some of his colleagues had participated in town hall meetings related to the project, but that he had opted out. When I asked about that decision, Jay said:

It's because they were eviscerated by the public. The public was not reasonable about the answer. The answer was that it was really not a big problem, but the public didn't want to hear that, and no matter how many times as scientists you explain [the results and that there is no health risk] they didn't want to hear that. Scientists were held up as Satan basically.

Leah: And that's no fun.

Jay: No. Nobody wants to be a part of that. So I sat in the back of one of the town meetings, cringing the whole time for the poor people who were up there, and I knew there was no way I was going to participate in that.

Dealing with a negative public reaction face-to-face literally turned into a personal risk for Jay, causing a negative physical and emotional reaction. Unfortunately, it is not the worst personal risk encountered by faculty members whose research has come to the public's attention. Regarding faculty associated with a potentially controversial subject, the risk is a literal physical threat according to one faculty member:

Most of the folks in [the program] including me have gotten hate mail and/or death threats related to our work. I mean, one faculty member was sent a death threat and was under protection because they took the threat so seriously. There is definitely a perception that we are sitting ducks. And there are people in the state who really hate us, who hate our work or hate what we represent.

This faculty member desired not to draw additional attention to such work due to the attendant increased risk to physical well-being or even just the continued trauma of living with such threats. How the faculty member's work and that of colleagues had been received previously was a factor in the choice regarding work in the public eye.

While some faculty members choose not to participate in public service and engaged scholarship due to various risks, others choose to participate because they believe there could be a risk in not doing so. Lucas, Bill, and Eleanor each discussed the risk of not participating in such work from different perspectives. Lucas, head of an academic unit, discussed the potential ramifications of not being responsive to the administration. Lucas said:

I suspect that what's going to happen is, they'll strongly suggest we do service or public work but not require. The way the administration works is, if you follow their suggestions, then you're more likely to get increased funding for your department than someone who doesn't.

As an administrator, Lucas sees the greater implications for his academic unit relative to budgeting decisions. Bill and Eleanor, however, had less practical and more personal concerns regarding the risks of not participating. Having been penalized for conducting public service, Bill chose to continue the project because the risk of not acting was greater than the professional risks. According to Bill:

My part, I just sort of say, remember what the game is here. You can't do this for free. The real cost is what happens to you in the organization, not whatever else I contribute to this project in terms of time and money. If that's what it is, that's just what it is. I just… Better to absorb a cost for doing the right thing than

absorb a cost for who the hell knows, for not doing anything at all when it's needed.

Eleanor, who participates in public education, outreach, and advocacy related to her research, was also concerned about the implications of not addressing social problems. Eleanor said, "Why not act? Why keep the issues down here, because all they do is fester. Why not bring them up here, so they don't fester?" To Eleanor, the risk of not acting is that the problems will only get worse if not addressed. Bill and Eleanor, who choose to participate in particular kinds of public service and engagement despite the risks, are also two of the faculty members who discussed being motivated by a passion born of personal experiences.

Summary

This chapter focused on how faculty's perceptions and experiences affect their choices relative to participation in service and engagement (RQ2) and the implications in their everyday lives (RQ3). A number of categories emerged from the interviews related to their personal experiences and participation choices regarding public service and engaged scholarship, including: personal motivation, professional motivation, socialization, measurements and incentives, opportunity, and professional and personal risks. Their comments indicate that multiple factors and experiences influence their choices to participate in public service and engaged scholarship, but the most abundant by far relate to the social structures of the university, the departments and disciplines, and the academy itself. A less common but still important factor for some was a personal motivation to participate.

Motivations related to personal experience or beliefs were a factor in participation for nine faculty members. Like students, five faculty members were motivated by

200

personal rewards: receiving positive feedback from those who benefitted from their participation, meeting new people, and having fun. Also like students, two were motivated by their work having an obvious and timely beneficial impact on those being served. In addition, some were motivated by altruism, either a sense of doing good in general, meeting an unmet need, or a more specific desire to right a wrong. Only one faculty member mentioned religious faith as a factor in participation, unlike the significant number of students who discussed it. Personal interest in or experience with a particular subject or issue was another motivating factor cited by five faculty members, one of whom was referring to public service and four of whom were referring to engaged scholarship. The four conducting engaged scholarship all conducted social justice-related research.

Of the 24 faculty members, 10 spoke of professional motivations for public service and engaged scholarship work. For five, it is inherent to and/or valued by their discipline or department. For three faculty members, a motivating factor was how engaged scholarship enriches and improves their research and/or teaching. Five faculty members discussed how their work was motivated by interest in a particular research question or topic of interest, and two of the five discussed any effect on the public good was just a by-product that did not influence their participation. Another two faculty members discussed their desire for a particular career impact through their work, though one meant their career as an academic scholar and the other referred to preparing for a possible career outside of the academy. Finally, one said the professional motivation was because they were asked to do it by someone in authority—saying no was not an option.

Socialization, which shapes how we perceive and make choices within any social structure, was another factor in faculty experiences and choices about participation. All faculty members stated that they would advise junior faculty members not to get involved in engaged scholarship until after receiving tenure, with the exception of two who are in inherently engaged disciplines. Three tenured faculty members discussed how socialization during graduate school and early career did not include service or engagement, and how it had shaped their expectations about and experiences as faculty. Three junior faculty members talked about how specific incidents in their early training signaled that service and engagement were not valued and were potentially career suicide. Six faculty members from a cross-section of disciplines and a range of tenure discussed academic norms, related expectations of and for faculty, and how those norms are reinforced when violated.

The measurements and incentives associated with job security and career progress are a major factor in how faculty members choose to spend their time and efforts. All faculty members discussed promotion and tenure reviews and annual reports as the method by which their performance was measured. All discussed how the primary measure of performance in those reviews and reports was the number of academic publications produced with teaching competence a distant second. Given that the discipline determines what is publishable, the discipline and not the university controls what qualifies as research productivity. For those whose academic units gave any value to service, it was only service to the department or discipline. A complicating factor for six faculty members was that the performance evaluation system measures the output instead of the impact of research, and two attributed this to the rise of the business model

in higher education. One faculty member, however, attributed it to an institutional

insecurity about its own judgment, which makes objective external measures—

publications and funding—necessary. Finally, the lack of financial or career rewards for

service and engagement, according to four faculty members, actually creates a

disincentive to participate, because there are incentives to focus time and effort

elsewhere.

Regardless of a faculty member's motivation or socialization relative to

participation, opportunity plays a role in whether or not they do participate. Faculty

members discussed opportunity in two forms: serendipity and institutional structures.

Regarding serendipitous opportunities, six faculty members discussed how they accepted

unsolicited requests to participate in public events or public service projects. Three

faculty members who conduct engaged scholarship became involved in particular

projects after chance meetings on campus or connections through informal networks.

Regarding opportunity relative to institutional structures, faculty members

discussed the helpful and hindering effects of structures at the academic unit, university,

and academy levels. Three junior faculty members discussed how academic unit

authorities and senior faculty prevented them from doing service, and in one case, from

even discussing it in faculty meetings. Academic unit leadership inhibited opportunity

for three other faculty members by never discussing public service or engaged

scholarship, indicating it was not of any importance or value. For faculty in such

departments, university-level structures related to public service and engagement provide

the opportunity to participate, as six faculty members in such departments discussed. The

structure of faculty jobs, however, creates such a heavy work load beyond research and

203

teaching that nine faculty members said it prevents them from doing service outside of the university or their discipline. Eight faculty members, including four who discussed the problem of their work loads, said that the difficulty of having a family while being a faculty member left them with little opportunity for public service.

The structure of higher education itself is a factor in faculty choices about participation. All faculty members indicated that their disciplines were the primary determinant of their career success, and thus a factor in their professional choices relative to service and engaged scholarship. For the three who are in disciplines that are inherently engaged or value such work, they perceive engaged scholarship as a career opportunity. For seven other faculty members in disciplines where such work is not valued and therefore not publishable, their disciplines are a primary factor in their choice not to participate. Disciplinary norms, then, have greater influence than the university mission or administrative agendas. Those norms create another challenge relative to research, in that the value of research is determined by its scholarly impact within the discipline, as opposed to its impact with the study population, site, or topic. Of the 10 faculty members who discussed this frustration, all stated that impact beyond the discipline should be a measure of equal importance to scholarly impact. Three felt the full value of the impact of their engaged scholarship was not recognized by their discipline, and therefore not accounted for in university promotion and tenure reviews or merit reviews.

Even when the academic unit, university, and academic structures align for a faculty member, however, participation in public service and engagement may carry with it professional and personal risk, according to nine faculty members. Working with the

public and/or in the public eye, according to faculty, increases both the complications and the audience size for that work, as well as opening the faculty member up to unintended consequences. Prior public misrepresentation of research findings caused one faculty member to no longer accept public media appearances and one to no longer conduct research as an expert consultant to public agencies. Another risk for five faculty members was disciplinary activities by university administration for particular service and engagement or a lack of administrator protection from backlash.

Backlash from other members of the university community was an issue for two faculty members when their service or research involved potentially controversial issues, as was backlash from the public for three faculty members. Personal risks ranging from emotional discomfort to death threats targeting colleagues doing similar research caused two faculty members to choose to keep their research out of the public eye. And finally, the risk of not doing public service and/or engaged scholarship was an influence for three faculty members. One discussed the possibility of unfavorable administrative decisions regarding departmental budgets. Two other discussed the greater risk to society of not addressing social problems.

While it is clear that multiple factors and experiences influence faculty members' choices to participate in public service and engaged scholarship, the most abundant by far relate to the social structures of the university, the departments and disciplines, and the academy itself. The professional and personal motivations, rewards, and risks play out differently depending on whether a faculty member's discipline and department value service and engaged scholarship. While some have chosen to pursue whatever scholarly endeavors are rewarded by their discipline or academic unit, others motivated by personal

passion born of personal experience have chosen to pursue public service and/or engaged

scholarship despite the personal and professional risks. The following chapter discusses

the inter-relationships between faculty and student perceptions of public service and

engaged scholarship, participation choices, the university as a social structure created

through its rhetoric and actions, and the implications in the everyday lives of students,

faculty members, and the university as a community.

CHAPTER 7

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This study was prompted by the question, "Why do some people choose to get involved in addressing community and social challenges and others do not, and what is the relationship between those choices and the organizational rhetoric of a dominant institution in their social structure?" Based on a review of the current literature and my experience in community change work, I believed that the modes of civic participation and the motivations for, and barriers to, participation were inadequately or even incorrectly theorized. I wanted in part to address the prevalence of assumptions about the choice to participate, assumptions about commonality and consensus, the normative prescriptions for preferred forms of participation, and the limited research on the relationships between civic participation and dominant social institutions and their rhetoric. I also wanted to explore further the relationships between individuals, dominant social institutions, and their communities.

Given the growing emphasis on public service and engaged scholarship in higher education in general and in the University of North Carolina system, and given my background in engaged scholarship, I chose to use the university community as my research site. My goal in this study is to increase the capacity of the CCPS and the university to improve the well-being of the people of the university community in everyday life, thus strengthening efforts to improve the well-being of the people and

207

communities they serve. In collaboration with my partner organization, The Carolina Center for Public Service, I designed this research project to assist the CCPS in achieving its goals of supporting and facilitating participation in service and engagement while increasing their capacity to do so in ways that are more inclusive of, and give greater voice and agency to, the people of the university community.

Therefore, I sought to answer the following questions: How do university students and faculty perceive and experience public service and engaged scholarship within the social structure of the university community, including related university rhetoric? How do their perceptions and experiences relate to their participation in public service and engaged scholarship? Given student and faculty perceptions and experiences, what are the implications for their everyday lives and for the university as a community?

University students, faculty members, and executive administrators provided me with an extremely rich data set, and CCPS staff provided me with a better understanding of the historical and operational contexts of their work and of service and engagement at the university more broadly. I analyzed the data set using open and axial coding, and I employed a variety of member and perception checks to test, clarify, and add nuance to my analysis. My analysis yielded a number of theoretical and practical insights, deepening and enriching my understanding of why and how these participants make the choices they do, the role of the university and its related rhetoric, and the implications for the people of the university and the university as a community. This chapter is organized into the following sections: perceptions of public service, perceptions of engaged scholarship, findings and implications relative to participation by both students and faculty, findings and implications relative to students, findings and implications relative

208

to faculty, findings and implications relative to the university as a community, theoretical implications, areas of future research, and conclusion. As with the entire study, when I refer to faculty members and students, I am referring to participants in this study and not the entire academic affairs faculty population or student population.

Perceptions of Public Service

Cheney (1991) argues that for an organization to achieve agreement and participation from its audience, institutional rhetoric related to social change must function to elicit the audience's identification with the organization. Therefore, in my research design, I felt it was necessary to determine whether students and faculty perceived public service and engaged scholarship to be important to the university. Then, I could determine the relationship of that perspective to their other perspectives, experiences, and choices regarding service and engagement.

Those students and faculty who replied that they thought service and engagement were important to the university administration did so with examples of university practices, not university administration rhetoric. Students discussed application forms, programs, themed dorms, and the like, while faculty discussed resource allocations, programs, administrative appointments, and performance measurement systems. In terms of de Certeau's (1984) symbolic, material, and imaginary registers and my extension of that theory with a social/systemic register, the evidence of value was found in the material and social/systemic registers that students and faculty have to navigate on a regular basis as they go about their everyday lives within the university.

Only two faculty members indicated they did not know if public service and engaged scholarship were important to the university, and each attributed their confusion

209

to experiences where "they say" it is important, but university behaviors indicated it was not valued, or valued in only very narrow ways. For these faculty members, when registers of experience came into conflict, they privileged the material over the symbolic.

Some faculty members answered this question of importance not in terms of whether service and engagement were valued by the administration, but rather in terms of how service and engagement are necessary to ensure the institution's good reputation with external constituents, its revenue streams, and thus its future well-being. This same concern with the public face of the university and presenting a positive, non-controversial image to funders, legislators, and North Carolinians was also discussed in terms of the university's motivation behind its promotion of public service and engaged scholarship. To add to Finet's (2001) discussion of organizations in complex sociopolitical environments relative specifically to public higher education institutions, the sociopolitical context creates a tension between academic freedom and institutional neutrality, wherein academic freedom is perceived as potentially compromising the organization's well-being because not all faculty research agendas are politically neutral or free of controversy.

While students and faculty did not re-articulate university administration rhetoric relative to determining the value of service and engagement to the administration, administration rhetoric did have a significant influence on how students and faculty defined what counts as public service. Re-articulation of rhetoric is evidence of its impact (Blair & Michel, 2004), and text fragments with a high degree of impact—those which a critical mass of people re-articulate—can be described as nodal points (Zarefsky, 1986). Students and faculty did re-articulate and congregate around very specific

210

rhetorical nodal points: university rhetoric that reveres and romanticizes "the history of service to the people of the state," "the people's university," "the privilege of being a part of Carolina," and "duty to the people of the state." These particular nodal points function to create a rhetorically constructed imaginary that influences university culture and policy, as well as the behaviors and perceptions of faculty and students relative to public service and engaged scholarship. As de Certeau (1984) theorized, the symbolic shapes the imaginary, and the imaginary shapes the material; it also functions to shape the systemic and social.

Students and faculty who gave a definition or examples resulted in a definition of public service as *direct but organized and politically neutral service to benefit appropriate others in need with an immediate and visible outcome, done on a volunteer basis, and involving a personal sacrifice*. The concept of being privileged just through membership in the Carolina community functions both to unite those within Carolina, but also to differentiate members from those perceived to be lesser or non-privileged. As Burke (1969) argues, the process of identification with one thing necessitates division from something else. This maintains the "appropriate other" conceptualization of those served or engaged, which reinforces a direct service mode of service/engagement, as does the belief that public service occurs through organizations.

As a result, the understanding of service and engagement is unnecessarily narrowed, reflecting a "charity" model focused primarily on achieving an immediate, positive impact on the well-being of lesser-privileged people in need through sanctioned activity with appropriate organizations. To be considered service, actions must occur through a formal collective and have a micro focus that benefits a lesser-privileged

211

person in need—making a difference, making someone's day better, but not necessarily changing the world or addressing the root causes that create inequality, injustice, or marginalization.

In addition, students specifically defined public service as politically neutral and dealing with noncontroversial issues. Students ruled out activities such as political advocacy and protest because they had the dual qualities of being political and having no visible and immediate impact. Students were highly engaged in apolitical, relational and social forms of civic life. Their mode of participation in public life (Asen, 2004) was inherently social, as opposed to political. They referred to public service in terms of its nobility and goodness, and to politics in terms of taint, controversy, and being a personal concern. They indicated that direct service provided the opportunity to make an immediate and visible difference, while political involvement did not. Their discussions indicated they are not apathetic, but rather apolitical and conflict-averse, a possible reflection of the institutional neutrality of the university itself and the available rewards and punishments reinforcing their previous socialization.

The rhetorical nodes re-articulated by students and faculty reinforce the concept of neutrality in service by romanticizing the historical and fundamental context of service, as a reified and immutable aspect of the university itself, and one that must be revered. For students, to be a part of Carolina means performing public service, and particular kinds of public service. The imaginaries that are Carolina and the language that continues to recreate and maintain those imaginaries are also reinforced within the social register of peer influence and behavior, where students learn both the necessity of performing service and the appropriate forms of service work. This is evidence of the

complexity of the rhetorical field of action (Leff, 1986) and the multiple persuasive influences that students must navigate. It brings to the fore how the privilege of being a part of the university also requires sacrifice, given that a personal sacrifice of time and resources is part of the definition of public service and that some students also sacrifice their personal well-being to fulfill their perceived obligations as students.

Perception of peer behavior has complex and potentially dangerous effects on students personally. Coupled with pressure to be well-rounded and successful in the future job market as well as the classroom, it results in many students sacrificing physical health and personal well-being. These sacrifices, in turn, are exacerbated by the accompanying sense of guilt about "not doing enough," even in students who are highly involved in service and highly successful in the classroom. They see "not doing more" as selfish or not allowed, and some commit themselves to so much that they sacrifice their well-being. Melissa even talked about caring for herself as worrying about her well-being, and had to be encouraged and given permission to do so by her parents.

Sacrifice was also an aspect of being a part of the University for faculty who defined working in a public university as public service, educating undergraduates, and/or the production of new knowledge. However, service was most often described by faculty in terms of service to the department, the university, and the discipline— departmental committees, graduate student committees, proposals, task forces, program administration, editorial work, and conference planning. The activities required to keep the university and the academy functioning were redefined from being "real work required in my job description" to being service to the department or university, as though it were voluntary or not a huge time commitment. This laborious and possibly

213

less personally rewarding service involves sacrificing time for other kinds of work but has the trade-off of another line on the CV and annual statement of activities. The situation is similar to students' perceptions of "back-office work" in student organizations: it is necessary and not as personally rewarding as direct service, but it has the trade-off of being labeled "leadership" and looking good on a résumé.

Faculty described any activity outside the university that involved use of their professional knowledge (public lectures, speaking to a k-12 class, serving on an organization board, serving on a government task force) as either service, engagement, or outreach: there was little consistency of terminology. Many faculty members were unclear on what qualifies as service, partly due to differences in departmental and disciplinary cultures and jargon. Those differences inhibit translation of university rhetoric or definitions into their own jargon and experience.

A significant number of faculty said that the definition of public service is whatever the university defines it as—though they did not know what that definition was—or that the definition depended on "what counts" to the university. Though administrators consistently said that the university's most important public services were undergraduate education and production of new knowledge, faculty determined "what counts" through the structures of annual review forms and the promotion and tenure review process, both of which focus on publications but do acknowledge teaching and service within the academy and both of which indicate that public service other than to the academy is not important.

The differences between student, administrator, and faculty definitions indicate that the university is not a singular speech community with a shared vocabulary and

grammar, but rather an amalgam of speech communities. Even the same words or phrases do not necessarily have the same definition; sometimes, even a shared definition may have very different connotations. The consistency between and among those speech communities was found in the rhetorical nodal points that maintain an identity of privilege and differentiate the people of Carolina from the appropriate other to be served—the lesser privileged other and the people of the state. As Zarefsky (1986) argues, these textual fragments condensate from otherwise unfixed symbols; the interesting point in this case is that the fragments are salient enough across differing speech communities to become a point of common identification. This consistency was also reflected in faculty and administrator perceptions of engaged scholarship.

Perceptions of Engaged Scholarship

Those faculty members who were familiar with the concept of engaged scholarship determined whether it was important to the university based on administrative actions, policies, and resource allocations—not what the administration said about engaged scholarship. When university rhetoric valued engaged scholarship but university actions and structures did not, the actions and structures had the greater persuasive power. Faculty members and administrators did not focus on engaged scholarship as a mode of research, but rather on individual projects. Faculty members also focused on "what counts" to the university and the administration's motivation for increasing emphasis on engaged scholarship. Faculty discussed university motivation in terms of the value of individual projects as positive public relations opportunities that would not potentially harm future revenue streams and/or ability to generate revenue, as opposed to any motivation to make a difference or address public problems.

215

Only 18 of the 24 faculty members offered definitions or examples of engaged scholarship, and all of the administrators discussed examples of such research. Of these participants, three faculty members and two administrators defined research with any public benefit as engaged; each also defined undergraduate education as a public service. For the remainder of faculty and administrators, the consistent characteristics within the majority of responses define engaged scholarship as *non-controversial, appropriate, applied research related to public issues with a direct or nearly direct and near-term benefit to an appropriate, less-privileged other within the state or to the greater good.*

This definition, as with the definition of public service, reflects the university's historical rhetoric of privilege, the university of the people, and the people of the state. The influence of the historical rhetoric regarding the people of the state outweighs that of the contemporary, international rhetoric, in that faculty limited "what counts" to research that directly involves North Carolina. The historical rhetoric creates a tension between local and international contexts as incommensurable while limiting what counts to faculty. It also limits the possible scope of beneficiaries, ruling out any population, community, or organization not perceived as being lesser privileged. Combined with the perception that such work must be noncontroversial in nature, it also functions to limit "what counts" to research that improves immediate conditions for people or communities in need instead of reforming structural causes of those conditions or addressing potentially controversial problems.

While not a part of the administrative rhetoric, the collective understanding of engaged scholarship as applied research that yields near-term and direct or nearly direct benefits also functions to limit "what counts" to faculty and administrators. The farther

the researcher is from visible or tangible outcomes for the lesser-privileged beneficiary, such as with theoretical research that is later applied by others, the less it counts. The longer the time period to those outcomes, such as with public policy research, the less it counts.

Faculty members who had conducted engaged scholarship or were in inherently engaged disciplines or academic units were the only ones to define engaged scholarship as discovery research that has the potential to generate new knowledge; all administrators and half the faculty characterized it as applied research. Given that some disciplines, academic units, and academics consider applied research to be second-rate scholarship, this understanding results in a misperception of the potential value of engaged scholarship. For faculty members who had conducted engaged scholarship but were in disciplines or academic units where it was not valued, the implication was that they also defined engaged scholarship as a career risk involving sacrifice of income and promotion potential.

How faculty and students perceive and define engaged scholarship and public service affects their understanding of what activities are deemed appropriate within the social structure of the university. Despite the polyglot nature of multiple speech communities, the university's historical rhetoric is influential enough that it overshadows the more contemporary rhetoric of service and engagement. It reifies narrows what counts as public service and engaged scholarship while it also functions to establish a privileged subject position that is contingent upon association with the social structure of the university and that defines service as a literal, fundamental part of the university.

217

Bodnar (1992) discusses how an officially sanctioned public memory functions to normalize a particular understanding of the past and serve political and disciplining functions in the present and future. However, in this case, we see how what was once a rhetorically constructed official public memory can function independently and beyond the control of the organizing entity, resisting and even undercutting that entity's ability to achieve its goals. While Hartelius and Browning (2008) correctly argue that organizational rhetoric is "the creative process by which we enable shared grounds for action" (p. 23), that process is complicated by the existence of collective imaginaries that are the product of the organization's prior rhetorical activity.

The symbolic or language register, as proposed by de Certeau (1984), thus fosters and maintains the imaginary register wherein the concept resides of what Carolina is to each person. The reality of the social structure for students and faculty, however, resides in the social/systemic and material registers of the university's actions, policies, forms, resource allocations, and behaviors. These were the primary indicators of the importance (or lack thereof) of service and engaged scholarship, of the administration's related motivations, and of "what counts" or doesn't count. The social/systemic and material registers thus function along with the language and imaginary registers to normalize appropriate beliefs and behaviors, which has implications for why students and faculty do or do not participate in public service and engaged scholarship.

To Participate or Not to Participate

While there were a significant number of factors that influenced student and faculty participation in public service and engaged scholarship, there were several that applied to both populations in terms of resources, motivation, reward, and risk. This

section discusses the general overlaps, and the sections that follow discuss the more specific factors and implications.

First and foremost, faculty and students do not exist in a vacuum with nothing to do but public service or engaged scholarship. This means that time and other resources, along with acceptable opportunities, are factors even for those who are motivated to participate. Limited time and other resources—effort, energy, finances—create a situation where students and faculty have to make choices about whether and how to invest their time and resources, given the investments they perceive to be required in their roles as students, employees, teachers, researchers, and family members, among others.

Recall the response to Putnam (2002) and Schmeirbach et al. (2005): If neither attitudes about the importance of civic engagement nor short-term increases in participation behavior resulted in long-term increases in participation, then what else is necessary? In the case of those who participate through reactive opportunism, the answer is structured, accessible opportunities that provide direct access to public service work and engaged scholarship. With public service in particular, the vast majority of students and faculty practiced a reactive opportunism, participating in charitable volunteer work when opportunities came along that fit their schedule, abilities, and interests. For those who want to do public service, the primary reason they do not, or do not do more, is that they find it difficult to connect with acceptable opportunities. Given their reactive opportunism, they are not investing time in finding opportunities, but they are not made aware of or presented with enough acceptable opportunities. This opportunism mirrors the original approach of UNC-Chapel Hill president Edward Kidder Graham, often quoted by later administrators: "Write to the university when you need help." With

219

faculty who desired to conduct engaged scholarship or translate their research for the public benefit, the lack of structure to mentor, foster, and support that work prevented them from doing so.

For those who are motivated to participate in public service and/or engaged scholarship, making choices requires prioritizing the acceptable opportunities along with day-to-day obligations and responsibilities. Reward and risk are two of the factors that play into prioritizing choices for both faculty and students. The time and resource costs of any choice to participate in public service or engaged scholarship are weighed against the rewards and risks involved in that participation, but also against the rewards and risks of not participating. The tally for any particular choice is then compared with the tallies for other choices.

There was no common answer, however, for what factor is most important in this cognitive equation of time and resources versus rewards and risk. In general, students avoided immediate risk altogether and balanced time and immediate and future personal rewards against future risks. Given the right rewards, they would sacrifice time to the extent of chronic lack of sleep and poor self-care. For faculty, the risk/reward part of the equation is more complex. When considering the relationships among research, teaching, and service, the positive implications of how they "inform and support" each other are the usual focus. The negative implications of the inter-relationship go un-recognized, usually, such as when a faculty member's public service causes a promotion and tenure committee to characterize him as not being serious about his research, despite his publication record. However, investing effort in one takes away from the others, and taking a risk in one can result in being penalized in another such as when faculty

220

members' research is undervalued because their public service is perceived as an indicator that they're not serious about their research. The choice *not* to participate in service or engaged scholarship may have more rewards, as that time can be invested in activities like research that are recognized and rewarded in promotion and tenure reviews.

The one exception to this case is faculty who had a significant personal motivation to address a particular social injustice through public service or engaged scholarship. Of the five faculty members who discussed personal experience with injustice as a motivating factor in their work, three are in different academic units or disciplines that do not value public service or engaged scholarship. They are involved in long-term public service or research that they created or actively pursued. All three experienced significant professional risks and/or penalties for participation—lack of merit raises and promotions. All three chose to continue their participation because of the non-monetary personal rewards, and because they perceived the risk of negative consequences for society if the social problem goes unaddressed, and the reward for those affected if it is addressed.

For students and some faculty, the choice to participate in public service is based on three factors: available time, the motivation to make a difference, and awareness of a need or problem that can be addressed through an acceptable opportunity. That service is most often limited in scope and range, such as consulting on a public project, an afternoon in the soup kitchen, tutoring an underprivileged child an hour a week for a semester. Awareness of a need or problem, however, is a very different thing from personal understanding of the injustices or systemic issues that created it. For these three faculty members, personal experiences and the understanding that comes with it were

221

strong enough to motivate them to work long and intensively on a particular problem, and to continue to do so while dealing with the resulting professional penalties. Their personal experience also led them to work on socially controversial issues, something that most faculty and all students in the study avoided or did not recognize as public service because they eschew controversy in their definition of service.

Students: Doing Good While Doing Well and the Implications Thereof

Given the extremely high levels of public service participation of students in this study, the question at hand is why they choose to participate and how they decide between and among different opportunities. Their primary motivations were both social and instrumental—a desire to make a difference for others in need, and a desire to be competitive on the job market after college.

Students indicated that they care deeply about the problems they encounter and want to make a difference and do work for the public good; as Asen (2004) contended, we can determine what mode participation actually takes through descriptive research with no a priori judgments, as opposed to assumptions in the participation literature that malign the public as apathetic or lazy. They are not apathetic or lazy, but rather apolitical, or more generally, conflict-averse. In addition, they perceive themselves as having limited ability to create change on a large scale, so they focus on making a difference at a do-able scale. They are products of their socialization, and as active producers instead of passive consumers, they find a way to make do within the structures they must navigate on a daily basis (de Certeau, 1984) by limiting their participation to non-controversial social needs.

The university as a social structure claims to be a neutral institution, and its historical rhetoric, structures, and actions reinforce a specific definition that promotes politically neutral, noncontroversial participation by students. Within this dominant social structure, politics is characterized as a personal issue rife with conflict. Acting on personal issues such as advocating for a community of personal identity is seen as a political act of personal interest, not an act in the public interest. The social structures students must navigate create the inverse effect of the civil and women's rights movements; instead of making the personal political, they make the political personal rather than a collective concern.

The cathartic experience of revealing "personal secrets" during the focus groups, such as feeling selfish or overwhelmed or under-involved, and sudden awareness of those secrets as a common experience hints at the possibility of increased agency. The focus groups functioned as subaltern counter-publics (Fraser, 1992), indicating an opportunity for challenging the status quo through dialogue and collective sense-making about the context and process of public service. Recall Maggie's experience: as she made the connection between the well-rounded student population that is always doing something, and the resulting feelings of stress and peer pressure, the others responded with relieved agreement with and support of her questioning the status quo.

In terms of choices, developing a passion about a particular problem or issue presents an additional hurdle. Once you become passionate about something, that makes it personal—you are highly internally motivated to pursue the personal passion. Once it is personal and you're committed to it, *that* makes it political, and it is no longer a kind of public service, but something different from what all but two students considered service.

223

In addition, commitment to a particular subject means you have taken a stance on an issue—you have acknowledged that something is not right in the social realm and needs to change, not just that there are people out there who need help. You have acknowledged that a conflict exists, that there is a disconnect between what is and what ought to be. You have taken a side, a level of engagement rare for the apolitical or conflict-averse.

Students did not recognize incongruities or conflicts in their discussion of personal and political actions. They eschewed the political, but they did not perceive the act of filling out a college application as a political act, nor that a particular subjectivity is built into application forms (Deetz, 2002). They also did not perceive that résumé building in college is a political act, not that doing service so others see someone of your racial/ethnic/religious type doing good is a political act. To students, "people seeing people like me doing this work" or raising money for cancer research after a loved one's death was perceived as a personal statement and considered public service; the politics involved go unrecognized. Advocating for Muslim rights or protesting for more support for battered women was seen as a political act, and therefore not appropriate to be considered public service.

Students' social motivation to make a difference, but in what they define as an apolitical, non-controversial way, is related to their other major motivation: developing a competitive job résumé that will land them a job successfully after graduation. Students had been socialized by the college application process, peer behavior, and university career services to believe the necessity of being a well-rounded job applicant, which

224

includes participating in public service. That public service has to be acceptable to potential employers, so controversial or political activities could risk future employment.

Public service has become part of a system of social exchange, with service being the commodity exchanged for advancement to the next level of education or career. Students trade (or sacrifice) personal resources and gain college entrance or job opportunities. Given the definition of public service as communicated through the university and other socializing structures, only certain kinds of public service are acceptable as commodities, and some of those commodities are more valuable than others. The most valuable and accepted commodity is service that is politically neutral, shows a return on investment (an impact), preferably is done as a leader, and is applicable to a future career.

What McMillan and Cheney (1996) analyze as a descriptive metaphor that originated in the 1980s—student as consumer—is a reality. Students have been literal consumers since the degree was invented, exchanging time, effort, and tuition to develop knowledge and receive certification of that knowledge. The tension lies in the transition of students into active, goal-driven consumers *exercising* (or attempting to exercise) their agency, along with the trend of higher education institutions increasingly adopting a business model. When students define what counts as public service, they speak in terms of an exchange system. For it to count as public service, you put in time and effort, you make some kind of sacrifice, sometimes you have to put in money in the process or through donation, and you receive benefits—the satisfaction of helping others, feeling good about yourself, more funding for your team, a scholarship or grant, a cord at graduation, and/or a valuable line in your résumé.

de Certeau (1984) brings to light that consumers are not passive users but rather active agents within a dominant system/structure. The institution dangles more and more carrots, creating a commodities-based relationship: Do 300 hours of public service, get a cord and a statement on your transcript; do public service, get more funding for your club team; do research and take these courses, and you get to graduate with honors.   They work within the system to garner the commodity, but many do so in strategic ways that maximize gain while minimizing risk and investment.

Such strategic commodity exchange is not without implications for the students and for the greater good, however. For students, commodification of service means that quantity becomes as important as impact and quality. Instead of pursuing and developing a passion for a particular issue, opportunism means most students become lightly involved with a larger number of service opportunities without a particular focus, unless they become highly involved in administration and leadership of a particular organization. The lack of deep involvement in a particular issue and the limited number of leadership positions relative to any particular issue result in few students becoming deeply involved in a single issue. This potentially limits the possibility that they would get involved in political action that requires passion and endurance, and it also potentially limits the impact of their efforts. In addition, students tend to stick with types of service that relate to their future career goals, limiting their exposure to the myriad of social and civic challenges that might capture their interest at deeper levels. Structural and systemic problems do not get addressed, and modes of civic participation that could be more effective or more timely in dealing with social problems go unexplored or underutilized.

Most students enter UNC-Chapel Hill with a charity-based conception of public service that is reinforced and focused by University rhetoric; they are exposed to few alternatives within public service that challenge this conception, unnecessarily restricting their current and future participation to charity types of service. The implications are problematic:

First, a working understanding of public service and engaged scholarship that eschews controversy, moral debate, and political action limits student understanding of themselves and their possibilities of participation in the present. When anything political or controversial is redefined as private instead of public, it shuts down possibilities for collective debate and discussion about social challenges and issues, which precludes collective voice and agency (Fraser, 1992). We are accustomed to thinking of debate in the public sphere as a way toward action by determining the best course of action. This is an action-oriented group of people, though, who prioritize immediacy, impact, and getting something done. They prioritize action over "sitting around talking," as Liz and other students said about service organizations that they found tedious and with which they ended their involvement

Second, students' identities are being formed around these definitions, as are their senses of agency. As Joseph (2002) contends, their community functions in part to discipline how they see themselves, but it also functions to define their possible roles as a part of that community. They understand themselves as particular kinds of members of the community with narrow and exclusionary modes of participation being most appropriate. This limited sense of identity and agency creates a phenomenally complicated mental tap dance when it comes to dealing with political and controversial

227

issues, whether those issues are public or private, in order to maintain a consistently appropriate identity as a member of the UNC-Chapel Hill community. The most marginalized students—students of color from low-income or non-Judeo-Christian families—had the strictest definitions of appropriate motivations and modes of public service, and they are also the students who believe most strongly that the university has granted them the privilege to be a part of UNC-Chapel Hill. Maintaining their identity as members of the Carolina community requires the most marginalized to erase or privatize their "political" (read: personal identity and well-being) concerns related to the ways in which they are marginalized.

Third, a charitable volunteer model of public service fails to prepare many students for active civic participation for healthy communities and a healthy democracy. The university was founded by charter to produce good citizens. To be involved in the workings of democracy requires political involvement, and healthy democracy requires political debate. However, a charitable volunteer mode of public service that is politically neutral and conflict-averse limits the range of possibilities for students as current and future community members and reinforces an elitist perspective. The Kettering Foundation's critique from 1993 is still applicable: students are not learning the "concepts or language to explore what is political about their lives" (Harwood Group, p. xii), much less what is political in their communities and the greater society.

Part of the motive behind public service as a method of civic education is to educate future voters and civic officials and leaders about the workings of community and democracy (Battistoni, 2006). Students may learn how to recognize social challenges, how to temporarily mitigate the street-level symptoms and effects of those

228

challenges, but not how to act as citizens or public officials to tackle the causes of those challenges and rectify them. The university emphasizes leadership, but students don't necessarily have the opportunities to develop the leadership skills to address social challenges that involve conflict, controversy, or systemic change, or they do not see those opportunities as fulfilling their own goals.

Faculty: Subjects of Multiple Masters and the Implications Thereof

Given the wide range of perceptions of public service and engaged scholarship that faculty hold, it is necessary to have a clear understanding of their perceptions of their multiple social structures to understand participation choices and related implications. Faculty members, unlike students, have to navigate the social structures of their academic units, the university, and their disciplines. These different social structures normalize behaviors according to their own missions and goals, which sometimes come into conflict with each other. When those conflicts occur, faculty members have to make choices about what structure to follow and what structures to circumvent or resist.

Regardless of the importance of public service and engagement to the university, it is first and foremost a research-intensive institution, and faculty members are the researchers. Every faculty member said research publications were the primary determinant of their career success within the university social structure because publications are the primary performance measure. However, the discipline has control over what gets published, so impact within the discipline is the determinant of value, as opposed to any impact on the public good. This creates a conflict of loyalty between university administrators and faculty members—unlike faculty, administrators are deeply committed to the university and its mission, not to a single discipline or department. In

229

addition, not all disciplines lend themselves to an engaged scholarship approach, nor would it be appropriate for many to do so. Not all that could lend themselves to an engaged research approach value such work.

With the exception of faculty who are time-limited or have personal motivations that outweigh career success, faculty indicated that their disciplines were the primary determinant of their research activities. However, administrators spoke of faculty primarily in terms of being part of the university or their academic unit, and rarely in terms of their obligations to, or loyalty to, their discipline. But disciplinary standards are what get you tenure, merit raises, and promotions. For faculty who pursue engaged research agendas in disciplines that are inherently engaged or that value engaged scholarship, this presents no conflict with the university social structure. They produce publications. For faculty who pursue research agendas that are not engaged but are still valued by their discipline, it presents no conflict with the university social structure, because they produce publications.

The conflict between social structures comes into play for those doing or wanting to do engaged research and/or public service in disciplines or academic units that do not value it and/or do not reward it. The university structural system of performance measurement and career options creates only one path to traditional tenured career success for most faculty: conduct and publish rigorous and respected research that has an impact in the discipline, teach adequately, and perform enough service within the academy to indicate involvement. The tension here is that the university's stated mission of serving the public good combined with the myth of academic freedom come into conflict with the power of the academic unit and performance measurement structures.

230

Faculty who desire to do research or service not valued by their discipline or academic unit—even if it aligns with the university's stated mission—are forced to choose between giving up their desires to achieve career success, or giving up career success to pursue their personal desires and possibly even be punished for it (e.g., no promotions, no merit raises, being forced to resign from program leadership positions). In de Certeau's (1984) terms, in their efforts to make do within the dominant structure, they are forced to compromise their desires because the structures allow only limited agency

The structure of the university itself limits agency through the singular path to career success, and this limitation is reinforced through faculty socialization within their academic units. Academic units function in part to discipline faculty members into the normalized conception of what a "model faculty member" should be, in part because the quality and value of the unit as perceived by administrators depends on faculty career success. Again, for faculty in disciplines and departments that value engaged scholarship and public service, this presents no conflict for faculty in making choices about their activities. But for faculty who desire to participate in engaged scholarship and public service but are in departments that do not value it, faculty are forced to conform to the model faculty member role and give up those desires, or suffer the personal and professional consequences of censure and/or career failure or stagnation, or go elsewhere. Those without authority are even censured for voicing desires that counter those of a model faculty member.

Another limitation on choices and agency comes into play when considering that, within the university social structure, model faculty members engage in noncontroversial and politically neutral service and/or engaged research that poses no risk to the

university's reputation or revenue streams, or must keep their work from the public eye. These appropriate forms of service and research are communicated in part through the rhetoric of privilege and serving the people, but also through university actions and behaviors. Faculty members who adhere to this model may be spotlighted in the university's public relations work, but if their discipline and department do not value it, they are not rewarded professionally for it. Impact on the public good and value as good press are not factors in the promotion and tenure system. In addition, faculty members who do not adhere to the model and engage in research or service that is perceived as potentially controversial or political in nature risk censure and/or career failure or stagnation at this university.

The alignments and conflicts between and among academic unit, university, and discipline social structures thus create a complex field for faculty to navigate as they make decisions about what professional activities to pursue. The reality of the situation is that complete academic freedom is a myth. The only faculty members free to pursue their desired research and service agendas without penalty are those whose agendas conform to the model of a faculty member performing acceptable research or service as established by the social structures of their disciplines, academic units, and the university. Academic freedom implies equitable valuation of rigorous and productive research agendas, but that is not the reality. Faculty work, even of excellent rigor, that creates or even has the potential to create conflict between the university and its publics or funders may be evaluated negatively, quashed, or withheld from public consumption according to faculty members interviewed. Faculty members involved may face censure, reprimand, career or salary penalties, ostracism within their academic unit, and/or job loss.

Faculty member choices about participation in engaged research and service within these structural systems are complicated by five additional factors. First, these structural systems create an evaluative categorization of work, a hierarchy based on appropriateness and output wherein applied and engaged scholarship typically rank second-class to theoretical and discovery research in departments where it is not valued. The categorization of research approaches also creates misperceptions of applied and engaged research as being less rigorous and as no more than testing of theoretical and discovery research, or worse, no more than technical assistance for people and communities in need. However, applied and engaged research can be conducted at standards of rigor equal to more valued forms of research and often generate new contributions to knowledge that may even feed back into new theoretical and discovery research. (See, for example, Holland et al., 2007; Johnson, et al, 2007; Madison, 2005; and Waltman & Hass, 2007.)

Second, the promotion and tenure system is based on measures of research output in the form of publications, not research or service impact. Even when faculty members' engaged research or service agenda aligns with the dominant structural systems, they face career risks because promotion and tenure systems do not adequately accommodate the length of time required for many such research programs to produce adequate data for publication. In addition, engaged research often produces deliverables with high impact on the public good, but with zero value according to the promotion and tenure system because it is not a peer-reviewed research publication. The promotion and tenure system does not reflect administrative rhetoric about the value or importance of engaged scholarship and public service.

Third, misperceptions regarding the risks of *not* participating in public service and engaged research complicate the process of making participation choices for some faculty members. University rhetoric that promotes public service and engaged scholarship is interpreted by some as a mandate to *all* faculty. Such a mandate is antithetical to the idea of academic freedom and the traditional laissez-faire approach wherein faculty members pursue their own interests. Faculty not conducting engaged scholarship and departments in disciplines not conducive to such scholarship perceive the increasing emphasis on engaged scholarship as a potential career threat or an unreasonable expectation regarding their research with potential funding, status, and promotion implications. While Hauser and Grim (2004) focus on the role of rhetoric in motivating civic participation, this finding makes explicit that organizational rhetoric and behaviors can function also to inhibit or prevent participation, and can even produce anxiety and resentment toward the organization.

A variety of faculty, particularly those who view working at a public university as a public service to begin with, perceived the increased emphasis on service as an instrumental tactic to increase their non-research work output—effort that would not translate into reward within a promotion and tenure system that values only research output. This perception is reinforced by the hierarchies of service that faculty members create as they weigh the opportunities for participation, making those that align most with the dominant social structures the most appropriate forms of service regardless of the cost or risks faced by the faculty member. Somewhat ironically, given that sacrifice is part of how the faculty defines public service, the perceived mandate to do more or do

234

something differently translates into a mandate to make a greater sacrifice that serves both the university and the public good.

Fourth, the lack of saturation of university rhetoric and general information about engaged scholarship and public service combined with disciplinary jargon differences create a number of complications regarding faculty participation. The university is such a large and diverse organization that it functions more as a loose association of multiple organizations with little in common beyond being a part of UNC-Chapel Hill. The logistics of communicating within such a structure means that every single person is not always included, and some that are included choose to ignore it. If faculty don't know what constitutes engaged scholarship and public service according to the university and don't know what opportunities may be available, they can't be expected to participate.

If they are doing such work but don't know it "counts," they can't be expected to report it, and the university cannot accurately portray the breadth and depth of the university's impact on the public good. If faculty are not aware that such scholarship and service are important to the university, it will not be a factor in their choices about where they invest time and effort. If the jargon of their discipline does not align with that of university rhetoric and general information, they may misinterpret, ignore, or become confused about what it actually does mean.

Fifth, even if the social structures of the academic unit, discipline, and university do align for particular faculty members that would allow and reward application of their research efforts toward the public good, they may not realize or consider it. For many, it is simply not an aspect of their socialization and training. Translating research for public use and/or developing an engaged research agenda is difficult even when faculty want to

235

do it; it requires a special skill set and a significant investment of time and effort. The difficulties inherent to this kind of work are further complicated by the diasporic nature of services and support for faculty who want to do it, which creates even more barriers to participation and increases the risks. Consider the impact that a program akin to the Office of Technology Transfer could have relative to engaged scholarship. These missing structures prevent or inhibit achieving the full potential impact of some research on public well-being, under-cutting the university's ability to achieve its service mission, but they also can be perceived as reflecting that contribution to academic knowledge is a higher priority to the university than the impact of that knowledge.

The Neutral Community

The university's goal to maintain neutrality and the historic precedent of the pursuit of academic freedom by those who are a part of the university community come into conflict at the level of public service and engaged scholarship. That conflict is quashed or limited by a combination of factors. Within de Certeau's (1984) language register, historic rhetoric reveres the university, the privilege of being a part of it, and service to the people. Combined with the significant emphasis on the historical and material place as context within the re-articulated rhetoric, the result is an imaginary Carolina where the privilege of association with this community comes at the cost of sacrifice. While a significant number of scholars define community as a group of people with something in common or having a common interest (Barksdale, 1998; Etzioni, 1998; Frazer, 1999; Moemeka, 1998; Rothenbuhler, 2001), it is necessary to note that singular commonality—even if it is just a rhetorically constructed imaginary—may be

disciplining, and it may be masking the different ways in which they experience community, including its negative or marginalizing effects.

Within the social/systemic and material registers, university resources, policies, and practices create a situation where only politically neutral service and research "count" and carry rewards, though they may also carry risks for faculty at the academic unit level. Also within the social/systemic register, socialization reinforces a particular conception of the model student and model faculty member, and particulars conceptions of appropriate behaviors and choices regarding community participation.

"Community" involves a sense of belonging, not just "ties to community," which can be as simple as "I have a job here" or "I go to school here." In redefining ones-self as belonging to Carolina, the privilege of that belonging comes into play. It is a hard-won and much valued privilege for many, but one that also can function to prevent or inhibit individual and collective agency, to quiet voices, and to demonize conflict and controversy.

To maintain the community belonging and the privilege requires not causing conflict as well as denying personal marginalization that relates to issues of conflict—race, class, politics, religion, sexuality, socioeconomics. To speak of being socially or professionally marginalized becomes taboo, a second marginalization, with the goal of maintaining belonging and accordance, harmony. The social structure that is the Carolina community can function to deny not only conflict and discord, but also the multi-faceted nature of individual identity and of community. It also functions to prevent challenging or questioning the institution through which privilege is granted. These findings relate to

the theoretical implications of the intersections of social structures, organizational

rhetoric, and individual and collective agency and voice.

Theoretical Implications

This project is grounded primarily in Michel de Certeau's work on action within

structures, the everyday experience of dominant social structures and the implications for

agency and context. de Certeau (1984) offers three "registers" (p. 103), or ways of

reading and understanding everyday practice. The material register is the fixed

manifestation of dominant powers; the imaginary register is how people make sense of

everyday experience and imagine things to be in their own minds; the symbolic register is

the use of common language that normalizes the fixed manifestations of dominant

powers, but also allows for the imagination of different interpretations and possibilities.

In this study, I extended de Certeau's (1984) registers to include the

systemic/social. Beyond de Certeau's concept of a common language, his system of

registers and illustrative metaphor of "the city" speak in terms of an isolated individual's

experience. Given that people both experience and make sense out of their lives in

relationship to others, his first three registers are incomplete. They also fail to capture

how social structures are collectively experienced, maintained, and reproduced.

While use of this fourth systemic/social register was valuable in understanding the

social structure of the university and experiences of those in the university community,

the analysis also brings to light additional complexities that allow me to amend and

extend de Certeau's (1984) concept even further. First, while there is a degree of

common language within the university, it is comprised of multiple speech communities

with only a degree of overlap, and wherein assumptions about shared meaning can lead to

238

assumptions of shared understanding and experience. The symbolic register, then, must acknowledge the mutability and multiple meanings of shared symbols and the possibility of inhibiting as well as allowing for the imagination of different interpretations and possibilities.

In addition, de Certeau (1984) discusses everyday life as the experience of navigating a single dominant structure. While the experience of some organizations and social institutions may be that of a single dominant structure, this study demonstrates the reality of multiple dominant social structures and the exponentially higher degree of difficulty people experience in navigating the more complex landscape that results. Imagine holographic representations of three different cities and merge them into one— what was a freeway no longer exists, what was a door is blocked by a wall, what was an intersection is now a left-hand turn. The limited possibilities for navigation inhibit both individual and collective agency.

As de Certeau (1984) theorized, the symbolic, imaginary, and social registers reinforce and maintain each other; they function to normalize a social structure, the formal "place," through the standards of appropriate belief and practice. The systemic/social register adds value in making apparent how collective sense-making comes into play. Community members can appropriate and rearticulate an imaginary into a collective imaginary, as students and faculty at Carolina appropriated and rearticulated the historical rhetoric of a revered, privileged, service-oriented university of the people.

The mixed methods approach of reflexive ethnography and rhetorical criticism provides an opportunity to understand the individual and collective experience of community, organizational rhetoric, and organizing for social change. While

communication may be constitutive of reality (Mumby & Stohl, 1996), it is also constitutive of the imaginary, and a collective imaginary can become the perceived reality through its re-articulation and related consequences. Within the university, the collective imaginary functioned to reinforce the status quo of the normalized social structure as a formal "place," but it also functioned to resist change by existing beyond the control of those in power within the dominant social structure. The collective imaginary and the related social systems that faculty and students navigate on a daily basis prevent saturation and re-articulation of the university administration's contemporary rhetoric, neutralizing or limiting its persuasive power.

Dreyfus and Rabinow (1982) argue that social institutions, such as universities and communities, implement and reinforce ordering principles or appropriate ways of being and thinking through knowledge statements, policies, and rules. Examining the actual impact or lack thereof of the university's rhetoric of service and the perceptions and experiences of the related structure allows a more nuanced understanding of their interplay. In addition to preventing saturation of contemporary rhetoric, the collective imaginary and dominant social structures also function to limit the modes by which students and faculty participate in service and engagement, in part by limiting their perceptions of what modes of participation are possible. They define appropriate beneficiaries, appropriate activities, and appropriate results. The collective imaginary and dominant social structures also result in an emphasis on politically neutral and noncontroversial modes of participation. Students and the majority of faculty avoided political and socially controversial issues in their participation practices. Eliasoph (1998) noticed the same phenomenon of avoiding politics in her study of local advocacy groups

240

and described it as the production of apathy in everyday life. She noted that, in private, people expressed deep concern about community issues and did so in collective and political terms. Conversely, when making public statements about the issues, those same people would speak only in terms of their personal experience and not in terms of a collective experience or greater socio-political implications.

As with students in my study, the political was perceived as being personal, private, and not a topic for public discussion. However, that does not mean that students are apathetic, nor does it mean they are not participating in public life; it makes them apolitical and/or conflict-averse. When the social structures to be navigated demonize controversy and conflict, avoiding politics is not an unreasonable tactic for getting by within that social structure. In addition, it may be a tactic with potential for success in terms of social change: what Eliasoph (1998) fails to recognize is that people can argue against a political, collective position, but they cannot argue with the reality of a personal experience.

However, making the political or controversial into a personal issue limits opportunities for collective agency by fore-stalling public discussion and debate of collective problems. Recall how the student focus groups functioned as sub-altern counter-publics (Fraser, 1992) when, in a private small-group conversation, they felt comfortable enough to disclose their problems with the dominant social structure. In de Certeau's (1984) terms, the groups functioned however temporarily to disrupt formal place and create a turbulent space and the possibility to identify, challenge, and potentially bring about change. Students developed awareness that this was a collective problem and had the opportunity to question the status quo without risk of reprisal.

241

However, students also had a sense of individual lack of agency, the ability to affect change beyond a micro level, which creates a disconnect between the possibility of collective agency and its potential effectiveness as a means of change.

Regarding the issue of avoiding politics and controversy, civic participation through a model of charitable volunteerism has come under fire in other scholarly literature. In a study of international service learning, Crabtree (1998) emphasized the need for curricula to adopt a framework of mutual empowerment that "recast[s] the notion of service from a charity model to a model more grounded in social justice and action" (p. 202). Such a framework, however, has to extend beyond curricula through academic structures and policies and through processes of socialization if it is to have any impact.

In addition, I would argue that to be effective with a generation of students who are apolitical and conflict-averse, the best course of action may be to reframe the notion of service from charity to social transformation and a continuum of related activities instead of reframing it as social *justice* with its political overtones. As Zoller (2000) contends, "When we want meaningful interaction, we have to meet people where they are, not where we want them to be" (p. 206). To encourage participation, it is necessary first to acknowledge and respect who and where they are, as opposed to a prescriptive approach that emphasizes they are not where they should be. Such an approach reinforces a hierarchy of modes of participation that devalues direct service instead of acknowledging that a range of modes exist to address social problems. Direct service to people in need is its own form of resistance, in that it holds the line against conditions getting worse. It is also a necessary piece of the social change puzzle—we can't let

242

people go hungry or die of exposure from homelessness while waiting for systemic social justice approaches to solve the root causes of the problems.

Another concern is that current students, most of whom would have been born in the mid to late 1980s, spent their k-12 years entirely formed within the discourse of students as consumers. McMillan and Cheney (1996) argue a potential outcome of the metaphor is that it "reinforces individualism at the expense of community" (p. 1). I would argue first that individualism and community are neither dialectically nor diametrically opposed, and second, that reinforcing one may not necessarily negatively affect the other. In the case of public service as a mode of participation and a social commodity system, students work collectively through organizations, often in groups. Students and faculty defined public service as an activity that occurs through formal organizations—people in relationship to each other. This confirms Depew and Peters' (2001) argument that a mechanism such as an organization or volunteer group is necessary "to sustain serendipitous public interactions" (p. 19) to work collectively to address social challenges, but also allows us to understand that such a mechanism is necessary to create the opportunity for and enable participation in the first place.

Flanagin et al. (2006), in their study of contemporary social change mechanisms, reconceptualize collective action along perpendicular axes: one for mode of interaction (from face-to-face to mediated), and one for mode of engagement (from loose and self-directed to formal and organizationally managed). It is necessary, too, to consider the modes of social intervention that are possible. Given the findings of this study about the limiting nature of hierarchies and continua, I would propose a matrix that arrays the means of intervention in relationship to the telos or desired ends of intervention.

"By what means" could include the many modes discussed by study participants, including provision of direct service, organizational support, philanthropic support, public education and awareness, political action, public policy, applied research and development, and theoretical research. "To what ends" could include assisting people in need, assisting organizations in need, addressing barriers to individual well-being, addressing root systemic causes of social ills, and addressing root social causes of systemic problems. The array could then be populated with any number of activities to help us better understand and theorize the many ways in which people can and do participate in addressing community and social challenges, including the multiple possibilities for public service and engaged scholarship within higher education.

Practical Implications

In addition to theoretical implications, the findings of this study indicate significant practical implications for participation in public service and engaged scholarship for students, faculty, the CCPS, and the university as a whole. These implications suggest a number of feasible short-term and longer-term responses that would foster, facilitate, and support participation while cultivating a more broadly defined understanding of public service and engaged scholarship. Given that the ongoing financial crisis and related budget cuts continue to be a problem for CCPS and the university, the responses I suggest are primarily no-cost to low-cost changes at the structural and program level, with more resource-intensive responses being developed over time.

Regarding students, a primary barrier to participation was a reliance on opportunism in identifying service work that inhibited both impact and connecting with

subjects or issues that developed into a significant interest or passion. What counts as an appropriate opportunity can be narrowed even more as emphasis on becoming a well-rounded job applicant and preparation for future careers become a priority. CCPS includes a limited number of service opportunities in its e-mail listserv, but that does not include all undergraduates. The student life calendar includes opportunities from the listserv and a link to a public volunteer posting website, but this requires students to seek out and find this resource and reinforces a perception of public service as charitable volunteerism. One possible response is to leverage these existing resources by developing an online clearinghouse where community partners can post opportunities directly for students to view, and to incorporate a feedback system for students to assess the quality of the experience. Another possible response is to push for internship credit courses to identify and recruit service-related job-postings from community partners that are working to improve the public good. A third response that aligns with the current emphasis on entrepreneurism and innovation would be to encourage development of self-supporting student businesses, housed within relevant departments, to provide low-cost solutions to local community needs while offering work experience; one example would be an advertising agency that caters to start-up businesses and nonprofit organizations. All of these responses would also strengthen the university's relationships with outside organizations and communities.

Another practical implication relative to students was the preference for service that makes a difference but also challenges them. Service learning courses in particular that did not meet this preference were seen as "a waste of time," and were usually the last service learning course a student took. Another challenge is that, while the university

245

does have service-learning opportunities, engaged scholarship opportunities are rare for students. The APPLES service learning program has been consolidated into the CCPS since data gathering ended on this project. One possible response to this finding is to push for rigor and deeper engagement in course service components, through the application and review process. Additionally, it may be helpful to redirect a portion of existing course development grants and/or special stipends to faculty teaching service-learning courses in which students conduct engaged research.

While students desire impact and rigor, the perception of public service as charitable volunteerism limits both. It also creates a situation where their research, critical thinking, and problem-solving skills—the foundation of a liberal arts education for civic involvement—are not fully developed. Students did not perceive administration, public policy work, research, or advocacy as "legitimate" forms of service. Several responses can address this challenge. The first is to include a training module on service in first-year orientation, based on the Center for Public Service's orientation for Public Service Scholars. The second is to designate a portion of work/study funds for a research-work/study program in which undergraduates assist faculty doing engaged scholarship. The third is to create capstone teaching assignments for Ph.D. students conducting engaged scholarship in which they would teach service learning or engaged research courses in their area of specialty. Educating students in the intricacies of engaged scholarship creates a larger burden on instructors who are considering such courses or research opportunities, however. This barrier could be alleviated by providing an online educational module to inform and tutor students in the intricacies and ethics of community-based and engaged research. The University of

Michigan has had great success with this approach and is partnering with other universities to adapt and test their module.

Regarding faculty, many faculty members are unclear on what qualifies as service and engaged scholarship, partly due to departmental and disciplinary cultures and jargon differences. Self-reporting of service and engaged scholarship by faculty does not capture the reality of the level of involvement and impact. One possible response would be to conduct individual assessments of faculty research projects and portfolios by qualified researchers, both to educate faculty and to identify research programs that benefit the public interest. Through assessments, it also would be possible to connect potentially beneficial research programs with knowledge transfer and application opportunities (economic development, community development, public policy, etc.).

Another finding is that new faculty in departments and/or disciplines that do not value engaged scholarship may have much greater difficulty finding career, moral, and financial support for such work. Every faculty member interviewed, including those doing engaged research, said they would advise junior faculty *not* to conduct engaged research until after they received tenure. This potentially puts junior faculty on a career track where they never or rarely conduct such work. Junior faculty may be socialized to believe the university values such work in word but not in deed, maintaining a culture where applied research is considered second-class. One response is to include an informational unit on service and engaged scholarship during new faculty orientation that focuses on available support structures and services. Reviewing research portfolios and current projects of incoming faculty would identify engaged scholarship and create the opportunity to connect new faculty to appropriate resources, mentors, and support

247

internally. Another longer-term response would be to scale up the Center for Public Service's Engaged Faculty Fellows program to include an emerging engaged scholar program to support early-career work, potentially in collaboration with the Center for Faculty Excellence. An inter-disciplinary faculty mentorship network for faculty developing engaged scholarship projects but working in department cultures where it is not valued or supported would be beneficial for new and junior faculty, as would training department chairs to understand engagement and service in a more inclusive, comprehensive manner.

Another finding is that the logistical difficulties inherent to engaged research are further complicated by the jargon differences of different disciplines and the diasporic nature of services and support for faculty doing engaged scholarship. Faculty who want to do such research may perceive there to be too many barriers, or that the longer time-frame may endanger promotion and tenure. A possible response would be to leverage current staff and faculty knowledge by creating a clearinghouse function to provide logistical expertise; to connect faculty with existing services and support within the university; and to connect faculty with community partners, funding, publishing, and knowledge transfer opportunities.

Some of the findings have significant relationships to internal structures and systems, or the lack there-of, that inhibit the potential value and impact of faculty research. The primary challenge is that promotion and tenure systems are perceived as not fully valuing or accommodating engaged scholarship by faculty who do such work or would like to. The subject stymies dialogue on how to increase engaged scholarship because it seems to be an insurmountable challenge, but is of critical importance to

248

faculty. As of this publication, a university working group is attempting to address how promotion and tenure systems can be re-tooled to value and accommodate this type of scholarship. Any resulting changes will need to incorporate education of and support for academic unit heads, however, given administrator statements that unit heads control the reward system.

Another finding related to structures and systems is that translating theoretical research, and oftentimes applied research, into practical applications is difficult even when faculty want to do it. In such cases, knowledge may be generated, published, and sometimes applied on a small scale, but the researcher, University, and state do not always reap the full rewards possible from it. One possible solution would be to dedicate an existing position or part thereof as a clearinghouse to provide logistical expertise and to connect faculty with community partners, funding, publishing, and knowledge transfer opportunities as previously discussed. Resources and expertise in translating research into public policy applications and connecting faculty to public policy needs would also be of great benefit to increase research potential and impact. Another possible long-term solution would be to develop an office of knowledge transfer and application, similar to the office of technology transfer to support faculty in the social sciences, humanities, and the arts, which also would develop new funding streams and opportunities.

Directions for Future Research

This study was motivated in part by questions of why people do or do not participate in efforts to address social problems. Regarding social interventions, it is necessary to reconsider affect and social understanding in individual participation. Allahyari (2001) contends that participation in service work such as feeding the hungry,"

requires engagement with the ethical and emotional consequences of political ideologies about the right ordering of the welfare state" (p.196), and that such work evokes both emotional and moral responses. With long-term participation in addressing a particular issue, this may be the case.

It may also be the case when working on an issue one has experienced personally, such as faculty who were motivated to address social injustices in part due to personal experiences. Two students who have personally experienced marginalization due to race and religion did discuss or describe the problems of dominant political ideologies relative their own experiences, but again, they classified this as personal and not political. The remaining students, scatter-shot in participation and apolitical, expressed only awareness of the problems of people in need and a degree of emotional response, but no significant affect or connection to systemic root causes or related political ideologies. A better understanding of the roles of personal experience and personal and collective reflection relative to social understanding and participation is necessary.

Regarding participation in engaged scholarship as a social intervention, faculty doing such work indicated they experienced significant challenges unlike those inherent to non-engaged research. While the literature on the scholarship of engagement addresses the logistical aspects of such challenges, there is a need to explore further the communicative aspects of such work as evidenced by Dempsey's (2009) research on university-community collaborations. Potential areas of research include but are not limited to the translation of academic research into actionable interventions; creating and maintaining the conditions for collective discussion and debate of controversial and political problems; the perspectives of people who are the beneficiaries of engaged

scholarship and other forms of social interventions; and better understanding the dynamics of the interplay of multiple speech communities in the process of organizing for social change. A related need is a further exploration of the myths of academic freedom and the neutral higher education institution and the implications for students and faculty members.

A third subject of interest relates to a population that did not participate in this study: students who *are* involved in political action. Approximately 2,000 undergraduates per year affiliate with the university's student social justice organization, the Campus Y, yet none responded to flyers plastered all over that organization or to an e-mail solicitation that a colleague forwarded to the organization's membership listserv. An exploration of the motivations and modes of participation of students who are engaged in political and controversial social issues would provide a more thorough understanding of participation choices and their individual and community implications. Such research could provide a valuable contribution to the growing literature on the pedagogy of political action and social change in the communication studies literature (See, for example, Murray & Fixmer-Oraiz, in press).

Regarding this study's methodology, an interesting question lingers regarding organizational rhetoric and the audience. This study confirmed that rhetoric's impact is discernable through its re-articulation by the audience (Blair & Michel, 2004), and illustrated how re-articulated text fragments can constitute rhetorical nodal points (Zarefsky, 1986) that transform into a collective imaginary. What about those synchronic rhetorical elements—those that persisted across multiple texts, time, and even multiple rhetors—that fail to achieve re-articulation by the audience, indicating a lack of impact?

It is possible that a rhetorical critique of these elements may reveal further insights into the relationship between organizational rhetoric, identification with or division from the organization by audience members, and participation in civic life.

Finally, given the current sociopolitical and economic contexts and the increased emphasis on public service and engagement in higher education in general, the roles and functions of the public university are under debate. Higher education has focused on its value to individuals, but has had difficulty making the case for how higher education benefits society at large (Kezar et al., 2005). The increased privatization of higher education and the decreased public fiscal support coupled with a growing college-age population and economic mandates to increase college-going rates complicate the situation. Researching faculty and administrator perspectives on the roles and functions of the public university could significantly clarify and enrich the debate while helping to clarify the value of higher education not only to individuals with diplomas, but also to the greater society.

Conclusion

During one interview with a long-time faculty member, he commented that "The little changes are constant, but the pace of change for the university as a whole? That's glacial." I believe nobody would expect it to be otherwise in such a massive, complex, and diverse institution. Some aspects of the status quo may be more easily addressed than others, given the nature of higher education institutions. However, for institutions such as the University at North Carolina at Chapel Hill to fulfill their social compact to contribute to the public well-being fully, it is clear that a change in the status quo is necessary. The contemporary sociopolitical context and social challenges do not align

252

with the traditional models of higher education, inhibiting agency and voice for students and faculty members alike.

At UNC-Chapel Hill in particular, rhetoric, policies, and practices reflect a charity model and unnecessarily restrict "what counts" as public service and engagement, limiting opportunities for participation in public service and engaged scholarship. They do have both positive and negative implications in the lives of students and faculty, but they are also in part the product of the perceived need to maintain institutional neutrality and to maintain a positive public image to protect revenue streams, both of which are important in the current sociopolitical context.

A charity model of public service and engaged scholarship may help prevent life from getting worse for some populations, such as the hungry, the sick, and the homeless. It may create opportunities for an improved quality of life for others, such as children in need of after-school supervision or tutoring. It won't, however, result in the significant changes necessary to the root systemic and social problems that create the inequalities that produce hunger, homelessness, health care inaccessibility, income disparities, joblessness, and ineffective schools. These root problems are likely to persist if our students in particular do not have the knowledge, skills, and experience to think of themselves as capable of dealing with them, and if our faculty members are not free to address them without retribution.

Given the continuing debate over the role of higher education in civic life (Kesckes, 2006) and current economic challenges, public demand for public universities to contribute more to social well-being will likely continue. State funding trends already indicate that universities will have to face those demands with even lower state

appropriations. Regardless of how neutral a university considers itself to be, no single institution can be all things to all people because the people do not agree about what it should be, or what it should and should not be doing. Similarly, no institution has the resources or capacity to solve all the public ills. However, a public university cannot fulfill its commitment to the social contract to the best of its capacity unless it acknowledges and manages the internal conflicts and structural problems that prevent its students and faculty from contributing to the public good through a multiplicity of modes, and in as wide a variety of subject areas as their interests take them.

Cheney (2009) notes that regarding engagement and serving the public good, unfortunately "the rewards side with the status quo," but also that "the status quo is not static" (p. 86). Given that the emphasis on serving the public good is increasing within higher education as a whole, the moment is ripe for change. There is a window of opportunity for scholars to apply our considerable knowledge of persuasion, organizing, and organizational participation to foster new and different perceptions and experiences of public service and engaged scholarship, and to better understand how people working together can bring about social change.

Appendix A:

Student Focus Group Guide

Focusing free-write exercise:

When you think of public service, what comes to mind?

[Participants will share and discuss their responses. As their collective description reaches a point of saturation with no new ideas being introduced, I will begin guiding the conversation by introducing the following questions.]

Is public service important to UNC? Why or why not?

What kinds of things count as public service at UNC?

How does that relate to the kinds of things that you think of as public service?

Have you participated in public service at UNC?

For those who have, why did you?

How did you get involved?

Did anything in particular get you involved?

For those who have not, why not?

Did anything in particular keep you from getting involved?

Appendix B:

CCPS Staff Focus Group Guide

How does CCPS fit within the structure of the university in your opinion?

What challenges do you see inhibiting CCPS from achieving its mission?

What opportunities do you see enabling CCPS to achieve its mission?

What is your understanding of why students get involved in public service here?

What is your understanding of why students do not get involved?

What is your understanding of why faculty get involved in public service and engaged scholarship here?

What is your understanding of why faculty members do not get involved?

What are your highest priorities right now related to helping you achieve your goals as an organization?

This past December, your organization developed a definition of "public service" and "engaged scholarship." Was that important to achieving your goals? Why or why not?

You deal with both faculty and students. Could you describe for me how you approach engaging these two populations?

Appendix C:

Faculty Interview Guide

Could you describe for me your scholarly background, interests and activities?

In your opinion, is public service important to the university? Why or why not?

How do you define public service?

Have you been involved in public service or engaged scholarship while you've been at UNC?

If so, how did you originally get involved? And in what way? How does your involvement in public service affect you personally and professionally?

If not, why not? Would you like to be involved in such work? How does your not being involved in public service affect you personally and professionally?

From the university's perspective, what kinds of things count as public service?

What kinds of things count as public service for you?

Are you aware of the Carolina Center for Public Service? If so, what do you think about the organization and its work?

Is there anything we have discussed that you would prefer I leave out of the study?

Appendix D:

Administrator Interview Guide

What do you feel is the role of public service in a public university?

In your opinion, has there been an increasing emphasis on public service and engaged scholarship in higher education? Why or why not?

What are reasons for the increasing emphasis here at the university?

How do you define public service?

How do you define engaged scholarship?

From your perspective what kinds of things count as public service? Could you give me an examples?

From your perspective, what kinds of things count as engaged scholarship? Could you give me an examples?

Could you suggest who else in the administration might be appropriate for me to talk with regarding these topics?

Is there anything we have discussed that you would prefer I leave out of the study?

Appendix E:

CCPS Staff Individual Interview Guide

What do you feel is the role of public service in a public university?

From your perspective, what is the most important thing CCPS does?

How do you think public service is perceived by students and faculty here?

How does that play out for CCPS? For you in your work?

From your perspective what kinds of things count as public service? Could you give me an examples?

From your perspective, what kinds of things count as engaged scholarship? Could you give me an examples?

Is there anything we have discussed that you would prefer I leave out of the study?

Appendix F:

Institutional Review Board Approval

References

Adams, C. A., Schlueter, D. W., & Barge, J. K. (1988). Communication and motivation within the superior-subordinate dyad: Testing the stories of volunteer management. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, *16,* 69-81.

Adams, C. H., & Shepherd, G. J. (1996). Managing volunteer performance: Face support and situational features as predictors of volunteers' evaluations of regulative messages. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *9*, 363-388.

Alcoff, L. (1991). The problem of speaking for others. *Cultural Critique, 20*, 5-32.

Allahyari, R. A. (2001). The felt politics of charity: Serving "the ambassadors of God" and saving "the sinking classes." In J. Goodwin, J. M. Jasper & F. Polletta (Eds.), *Passionate politics: Emotions and social movements.* (pp. 195-211). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Althusser, L. (1978). *Lenin and philosophy.* New York, NY: Monthly Review Press.

Annie E. Casey Foundation. (2006). *Kids count*. Retrieved from http://www.aecf.org/kidscount/sld/profile_results.jsp?r=35&d=1&c=a&n=1&p=5 &x=154&y=9

Arney, J. (2006). Uniting community and university through service learning. *Business Communication Quarterly*, *69*, 195-198.

Artz, L. (2001). Critical ethnography for communication studies: Dialogue and social justice in service-learning. *Southern Communication Journal*, *66*, 239-261.

Asen, R. (2004). A discourse theory of citizenship. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *90*, 189-211.

Ashcraft, K. L., & Kedrowicz, A. (2002). Self-direction or social support? Nonprofit empowerment and the tacit employment contract of organizational communication studies. *Communication Monographs, 69*, 88-111.

Barge, J. K. (2003). Hope, communication, and community building. *Southern Communication Journal, 69*, 63-81.

Barge, K., & Shockley-Zalabak, P. (2008). Engaged scholarship and the creation of useful organizational knowledge. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 36*, 251-265.

Barge, K., Simpson, J. L., & Shockley-Zalabak, P. (2008). Introduction: Toward
    purposeful and practical models of engagement scholarship. *Journal of Applied
    Communication Research, 36*(3), 243-244.

Barksdale, J. (1998). Communications technology in dynamic organizational
    communities. In F. Hesselbein, F. Goldsmith, M. Beckhard, & R. F. Schubert
    (Eds.), *The community of the future* (pp. 93-100). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Barthes, R. (1974). *Mythologies.* (A. Lavers, Trans.). New York, NY: Hill and Wang.

Battistoni, R. (2006). Civic engagement: A broad perspective. In K. Kecskes (Ed.),
    *Engaging departments: Moving faculty culture from private to public, individual
    to collective focus for the common good* (pp. 11-26). Bolton, MA: Anker
    Publishing.

Becker, S. L. (1999). Rhetorical studies for the contemporary world. *Communication
    Studies, (50)*1, 28-44.

Blair, C., & Michel, N. (2004). The Rushmore effect: *Ethos* and national collective
    identity. In M. J. Hyde (Ed.), *The* ethos *of rhetoric* (pp. 156-196). Columbia, SC:
    University of South Carolina Press.

Bloor, M., Frankland, J., Thomas, M., & Robson, K. (2001). *Focus groups in social
    research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bodnar, J. (1992). *Remaking America: Public memory, commemoration, and patriotism
    in the twentieth century*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgment of taste*. Cambridge,
    MA: Harvard University Press.

Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton,
    NJ: Princeton University Press, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of
    Teaching.

Brummett, B. (1976). Some implications of "process" or "intersubjectivity": Postmodern
    rhetoric. *Philosophy and Rheotric, 9,* 21-51.

Brummett, B. (1991). *Rhetorical dimensions of popular culture.* Tuscaloosa, AL:
    University of Alabama Press.

Buber, M. (1958). *I and thou* (2nd ed., R. G. Smith, Trans.). Edinburgh, Scotland: T. & T.
    Clark.

Burke, K. (1969). *A grammar of motives*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Campbell, K. K. (2005). Agency: Promiscuous and protean. *Communicational and Critical/Cultural Studies*, *2*, 1-19.

Campus Compact. (n.d.). *About us.* Retrieved from http://www.compact.org/about/

Carnegie Foundation. (n.d.). *Carnegie classifications/Institutional profile*. Retrieved from http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/lookup_listings/view_institution.php

Carnegie Foundation. (2006a). *Carnegie invites institutions to participate in new elective community engagement classification*. Retrieved from http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/news/sub.asp?key=51&subkey=1138

Carnegie Foundation. (2006b). *Carnegie selects colleges and universities for new elective community engagement classification*. Retrieved from http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/news/sub.asp?key=51&subkey=2126

Carolina Center for Public Service. (n.d.). *About engagement*. Retrieved from http://www.unc.edu/cps/learn-more-about-engagement.php

Carolina Center for Public Service. (n.d.). *The public service scholars program*. Retrieved from http://www.unc.edu/cps/scholars/

Carroll, A. B. (1999). Corporate social responsibility: Evolution of a definitional construct. *Business & Society, 38*, 268-295. doi: 10.1177/000765039903800303

Cheney, G. (1991). *Rhetoric in an organizational society: Managing multiple identities*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina.

Cheney, G. (1999). Values *at work: Employee participation meets market pressure at Mondragon*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Cheney, G. (2005). Theorizing about rhetoric and organizations. In S. May & D. K. Mumby (Eds.), *Engaging organizational communication theory and research* (pp. 55-84). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Cheney, G. (2008). Encountering the ethics of engaged scholarship. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 36*, 281-288.

Cheney, G. (2009). Organizational communication comes out. *Management Communication Quarterly, 21*, 80-91.

Cheney, G., & McMillan, J. J. (1990). Organizational rhetoric and the practice of criticism. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 18*, 93-114.

Cheney, G., Wilhelmsson, M., & Zorn, T. (2002). 10 strategies for engaged scholarship. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *16*, 92-101.

Coates, A. (1988). *Edward Kidder Graham, Harry Woodburn Chase and Frank Porter Graham: Three men in the transition of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill from a small college to a great university.* Chapel Hill, NC: Author.

College Board. (n.d.). *Public appropriations.* Retrieved from http://www.collegeboard.com/html/costs/pricing/4_3_public_appropriations.html

Conquergood, D. (1992). Ethnography, rhetoric, and performance. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 78,* 80-97.

Conrad, C., & Malphurs, R. (2008). Are we there yet? Are we there yet? *Management Communication Quarterly, 22,* 123-146. doi: 10.1177/0893318908318265

Cox, R. (2007). Nature's 'crisis disciplines': Does environmental communication have an ethical duty? *Environmental Communication: A Journal of Nature and Culture, 1,*5-20.

Crable, R. E. (1990). "Organizational rhetoric" as the fourth great system: Theoretical, critical, and pragmatic implications. *Journal of Applied Communication, 18,* 115-128.

Crabtree, R. D. (1998). Mutual empowerment in cross-cultural participatory development and service learning: Lessons in communication and social justice from projects in El Salvador and Nicaragua. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 26*, 182-209.

Davies, C. A. (1999). *Reflexive ethnography: A guide to researching selves and others*. New York, NY: Routledge.

de Certeau, M. (1998). *The capture of speech and other political writings* (T. Conley, Trans.). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

de Certeau, M. (1984). *The practice of everyday life* (S. Rendall, Trans.). Berkley, CA: University of California Press.

Deetz, S. (2002). *Democracy in an age of corporate colonization*. New York, NY: State University of New York Press.

Deetz, S. (2008). Engagement as co-generative theorizing. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 36,* 281-288.

Dempsey, S. E. (2009). Critiquing community engagement. *Management Communication Quarterly Online First.* 1-32. doi: 10.1177/0893318909352247

Denzin, N. (2003). *Performance ethnography: Critical pedagogy and the politics of culture.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2003*). Strategies of qualitative inquiry.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Depew, D., & Peters, J. D. (2001). Community and communication: The conceptual background. In G. J. Shepherd & E. W. Rothenbuhler (Eds.), *Communication and community* (pp. 3-21). Mahway, NJ: Erlbaum.

Didow, N. (1999). *Report on the Carolina Center for Public Service September 1999 UNC-CH Faculty Council meeting*. Retrieved from http://www.unc.edu/faculty/faccoun/transcripts/PT99FC09D.htm

Drayton, W. (2006). Everyone a changemaker: Social entrepreneurship's ultimate goal. *Innovations: Technology, Governance, Globalization, 1*(1), 80-96.

Dreyfus, H. L., & Rabinow, P. (1982). *Michael Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Dubinsky, J. (2006). The role of reflection in service learning. *Business Communication Quarterly*, *69*, 306-311.

Eble, M., & Gaillet, L. (2004). Educating "community intellectuals": Rhetoric, moral philosophy, and civic engagement. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, *13*, 341-354.

Etzioni, A. (1998). *The essential communitarian reader*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Fall, L. (2006). Value of engagement: Factors influencing how students perceive their community contribution to public relations internships. *Public Relations Review*, *32*, 407-415.

Fernback, J. (1997). The individual within the collective: Virtual ideology and the realization of collective principles. In S. G. Jones (Ed.), *Virtual culture: Identity and communication in cybersociety* (pp. 36-54). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Finet, D. (2001). Sociopolitical environments and issues. In F. M. Jablin & L. L. Putnam (Eds.), *The new handbook of organizational communication* (pp. 270-290). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fixmer-Oraiz, N., & Murray, B. (2009). Challenging pedagogies: Reflections on communication activism and service-learning. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Communication Association, Chicago, IL.

Flanagin, A. J., Stohl, C., & Bimber, B. (2006). Modeling the structure of collective action. *Communication Monographs, 73*, 29-54.

Fraser, N. (1992). Rethinking the public sphere: A contribution to the critique of actually existing democracy. In C. Calhoun (Ed.), *Habermas and the public sphere* (pp. 109-142). Cambridge: MIT Press.

Frazer, E. (1999). *The problem of communitarian politics: Unity and conflict*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gibson, M., Kostecki, E., & Lucas, M. (2001). Instituting principles of best practice for service-learning in the communication curriculum. *Southern Communication Journal*, *66*, 187-201.

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks*. London, England: Lawrence and Wishart.

Hartelius, E. J., & Browning, L. D. (2008). The application of rhetorical theory in managerial research: A literature review. *Management Communication Quarterly, 22*, 13-39.

Harwood Group. (1993). *College students talk politics*. Dayton, OH: Kettering Foundation.

Hauser, G. A., & Grim, A. (Eds.). (2004). *Rhetorical democracy: Discursive practices of civic engagement*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Holland, D., D. Nonini, C. Lutz, L. Bartlett, M. Frederick, T. Guldbrandsen, & E. Murillo. (2007). *Local democracy under siege: Activism, public interests and private politics*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

JanMohamed, A. R. (1985). The economy of Manichean allegory: The function of racial difference in colonialist literature. In H. L. Gates, Jr. (Ed.), *"Race," writing, and difference* (pp. 78-106). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Johnson, J., Orton, S., Umble, K., Porter, J., & Velt., S. (2007). Management academy for public health: Creating entrepreneurial managers. *American Journal of Public Health, 97,* 601-615.

Joseph, M. (2002). *Against the romance of community*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Kane, T. J., & Orzsag, P. R. (2003). *Funding restrictions at public universities: Effects and policy implications*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Kanervo, E., Zhang, W., & Sawyer, C. (2005). Communication and democratic participation: A critical review and synthesis. *Review of Communication*, *5*, 193-236.

Kecskes, K. (2006). Big questions for engaging departments. In K. Kecskes (Ed.), *Engaging departments: Moving faculty culture from private to public, individual to collective focus for the common good* (pp. 1-10). Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing.

Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities. (2001). Returning to our roots: Executive reports of the *Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities*. Washington, DC: National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.

Keyton, J. (2001). Integrating service-learning in the research methods course. *Southern Communication Journal*, *66*, 201-210.

Kezar, A. J., Chambers, T. C., & Burkhardt, J. C. (2005). *Higher education for the public good: Emerging voices from a national movement*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kim, Y. C., & Ball-Rokeach, S. J. (2006). Civic engagement from a communication infrastructure perspective. *Communication Theory, 16*, 173-197.

Krone, K. J., & Harter, L. M. (2007). Organizational communication scholars as public intellectuals. *Management Communication Quarterly, 21*, 75-91. doi: 10.11777/0893318907302637

Laclau, E., & Mouffe, C. (2001). Hegemony and socialist strategy: Towards a radical democratic politics (2nd ed.). London, England: Verso.

Ladd, E. C. (1999). *The Ladd report.* New York: Free Press.

Leff, M. (1986). Textual criticism: The legacy of G. P. Mohrmann. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 72,* 377-389.

Leff, M. C. (1992). Things made by words: Reflections on textual criticism. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 72,* 377-389.

Leff, M. C. (1997). Hermeneutical rhetoric. In W. Jost & M. J. Hyde (Eds.), *Rhetoric and hermeneutics in our time.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Lewis, L. K. (2005). The civil society sector: A review of critical issues and research agenda for organizational communication scholars. *Management Communication Quarterly, 19*, 238-267.

Lindlof, T. R., & Taylor, B. C. (2002). *Qualitative communication research methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Madison, D. S. (2005). *Critical ethnography: Methods, ethics, and performance.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mara, A. (2006). Pedagogical approaches: Using charettes to perform civic engagement in technical communication classrooms and workplaces. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, *15*, 215-236.

Maras, S. (2006). Social capital theory, television, and participation. *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies*, *20*, 87-109.

Martinez, E., & Garcia, A. (1998). What is 'neo-liberalism'? *Third World Resurgence, 99,* 7-8.

May, S., Cheney, G., & Roper, J. (Eds.). (2007). *The debate over corporate social responsibility*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

May, S., & Mumby, D. (Eds.). (2005). *Engaging organizational communication theory and research: Multiple perspectives*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Mayo, M. (2000). *Cultures, communities, identities*. London: Palgrave.

McEachern, R. (2006). Incorporating reflection into business communication service-learning courses. *Business Communication Quarterly*, *69*, 312-316.

McGee, M. C. (1980). The "ideograph": A link between rhetoric and ideology. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 66,* 1-16.

McMillan, J. J., & Cheney, G. (1996). The student as consumer: The implications and limitations of a metaphor. *Communication Education, 45*, 1-16.

MDC, Inc. (2004). *The state of the South, 2004: Fifty years after Brown v. Board of Education*. Chapel Hill, NC: Author.

Mitchell, L. (1999). Combining focus groups and interviews: Telling how it is; telling how it feels. In R. S. Barbour & J. Kitzinger, (Eds.), *Developing focus group research: Politics, theory and practice* (pp. 36-46). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Moemeka, A. A. (1998). Communalism as a fundamental dimension of culture. *Journal of Communication, 48*(4), 118-141.

Mohrmann, G. P. (1980). Elegy in a critical graveyard. *Western Journal of Speech Communication, 44,* 265-274.

Monge, P. (1998). Communication structures and processes in globalization. *Journal of Communication*, *48*(4), 142-153.

Morgan, D. L. (1988). *Focus groups as qualitative research.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Morgan, G. (1997). *Images of organization* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mumby, D. K., & Stohl, C. (1996). Disciplining organizational communication studies. *Management Communication Quarterly, 10*, 50-72.

Murray, B., & Fixmer-Oraiz, N. (in press). Challenging pedagogies: Reflections on communication activism and service-learning. In L. R. Frey & D. L. Palmer (Eds.), *Communication Activism Pedagogy.* Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Najam, A. (1996). Understanding the third sector: Revisiting the prince, the merchant, and the citizen. *Research Reports, 7*, 203-219.

Napolitano, V., & Pratten, D. (2007). Michel de Certeau: Ethnography and the challenge of duality. *Social Anthropology/Anthropologie Sociale, 15*(1), 1-12. doi:10.1111/j.0964-0282.2007.00005.x

North Carolina State Center for Health Statistics. (2004). *North Carolina cancer facts and figures: 2004*. Retrieved from http://www.schs.state.nc.us/SCHS/CCR/FactsFigures2004.pdf

Office of the Chancellor. (2008). *Message to faculty and staff: University budget update*. Retrieved from http://www.unc.edu/chan/chancellors/thorp_holden/081106-budget-staff.php

Office of Institutional Research and Assessment, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (2006a). *Fall 2006 undergraduate enrollment by race*. Retrieved from http://oira.unc.edu/index.php?option=comm_comment?task=view&id=46&itemid=77

Office of Institutional Research and Assessment, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (2006b). *Female full-time permanent faculty, 2001-2006*. Retrieved from http://oira.unc.edu/content/view/80/115

Office of Institutional Research and Assessment, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (2006c). *African-American full-time permanent faculty, 2001-2006*. Retrieved from http://oira.unc.edu/content/view/81/116

Office of Institutional Research and Assessment, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (2006d). *Full-time permanent faculty, 2006*. Retrieved from http://oira.unc.edu/content/view/78/113

Oster-Aaland, L., Sellnow, T., Nelson, P., & Pearson, J. (2004). The status of service learning in departments of communication: A follow-up study. *Communication Education*, *53*, 348-356.

Panici, D., & Lasky, K. (2002). Service learning's foothold in communication scholarship. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, *57*(2), 113-125.

Papa, M. J., Singhal, A., & Papa, W. (2005). *Organizing for social change: A dialectic journey of theory and praxis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pasek, J., Kenski, K., Romer, D., & Jamieson, K. (2006). America's youth and community engagement: How use of mass media is related to civic activity and political awareness in 14- to 22-year-olds. *Communication Research*, *33*, 115-135.

Perrucci, R., & Stohl, C. (1998). Economic restructuring and changing corporate-worker community relations. In R. Hodson (Ed.), *Research in the sociology of work: The globalization of work* (pp. 177-195). Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Petersen, A., Barns, I., Dudley, J., & Harris, P. (1999). *Poststructuralism, citizenship, and social policy.* London, England: Routledge.

Pigg, K. (2001). Applications of community informatics for building community and enhancing civic society. *Information, Communication & Society*, *4*, 507-527.

Powell, W. S. (1972). *The first state university.* Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Putnam, L. (1983). The interpretive perspective: an alternative to functionalism. In L. Putnam & M. Pacanowsky (Eds.), *Communication and organizations: An interpretive approach* (pp. 31-54). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community.* New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Putnam, R. (2002). Bowling together. *The American Prospect, 13*(3). Retrieved from http://www.prospect.org/print/v13/3/putnam-r.html.

Ramírez, R., Aitkin, H., Kora, G., & Richardson, D. (2005). Community cngagement, performance measurement, and sustainability. *Canadian Journal of Communication*, *30*, 259-279.

Reason, P., & Bradbury, H. (2001). Introduction: Inquiry and participation in search of a world worthy of human aspiration. In P. Reason & H. Bradbury (Eds.), *Handbook of action research: Participative inquiry and practice* (pp. 1-14). London, England: Sage.

Register, L. M., & Henley, T. B. (1992). The phenomenology of intimacy. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 9*, 467-482.

Rothenbuhler, E. W. (2001). Revising communication research for working on community. In G. J. Shepherd & E. W. Rothenbuhler (Eds.), *Communication and community* (pp. 159-180). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Sapp, D., & Crabtree, R. (2002). A laboratory in citizenship: Service learning in the technical communication classroom. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, *11*, 411-432.

Saltmarsh, J., & Gelmon, S. (2006). Characteristics of an engaged department: Design and assessment. In K. Kecskes (Ed.), *Engaging departments: Moving faculty culture from private to public, individual to collective focus for the common good* (pp. 11-26). Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing.

Schmierbach, M., Boyle, M., & McLeod, D. (2005). Civic attachment in the aftermath of September 11. *Mass Communication & Society*, *8*, 323-346.

Scott, B. (2004). Rearticulating civic engagement through cultural studies and service-learning. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, *13*, 289-306.

Shah, D., McLeod, J., & Yoon, S. (2001). Communication, context, and community: An exploration of print, broadcast, and internet Influences. *Communication Research*, *28*, 464-490.

Shepherd, G. J., & Rothenbuhler, E. W. (2001). Preface. In G. J. Shepherd & E. W. Rothenbuhler (Eds.), *Communication and community* (pp. ix-xv). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Simpson, J. L., & Seibold, D. R. (2008). Practical engagements and co-created research. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 36*, 266-280.

Sirianni, C., & Friedland, L. (2001). *Civic innovation in America: Community empowerment, public policy, and the movement for civic renewal.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Skocpol, T. & Fiorina, M. P. (1999). *Civic engagement in American democracy*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Sloop, J. M. (1996). *The cultural prison: Discourse, prisoners, and punishment.* Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press.

Smith, S. R. (2003). Government and nonprofits in the modern age. *Society, 40*, 36-45.

Stohl, C. (1992). *Exploring the new organizational horizon: IGOS, INGOS, and BINGOS.* Paper presented at the New Directions for Organization Communication conference, Tempe, AZ.

Stohl, C., & Cheney, G. (2001). Participatory processes/paradoxical practices: communication and the dilemmas of organizational democracy. *Management Communication Quarterly, 14*, 349-407.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Trethewey, A. (1997). Resistance, identity, and empowerment: A postmodern feminist analysis of a human service organization. *Communication Monographs, 64*, 281-301.

Tolman, E. (2005). Service-learning in the interpersonal communication course: Using field notes and storytelling. *Texas Speech Communication Journal*, *30*(1), 92-97.

Totten, L. D. (2004). *Growing hope for community revitalization: A model for broad-reaching community engagement*. Chapel Hill, NC: MDC Inc.

Townsley, N., & Stohl, C. (2003). Contracting corporate social responsibility: Swedish expansion in global temporary agency work. *Management Communication Quarterly, 4*, 599-605.

UNC History. (n.d.). *University history*. Retrieved from http://www.unc.edu/about/history.html

UNC News. (2008). *Back-to-school facts*. Retrieved from http://uncnews.unc.edu/content/view/2785/107/

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (n.d.). *University mission*. Retrieved from http://www.unc.edu/about/mission.html

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (2009). *UNC diversity plan*. Retrieved from http://www.unc.edu/diversity/09divPlanWeb.pdf

U.S. Census Bureau. (n.d.). *American community survey, 2005*. Retrieved from http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/DatasetMainPageServlet?_program=ACS&_submenuId=datasets_1&_lang=en&_ts=

U.S. Census Bureau. (2006). *Current population survey, 1960-2006: Annual social and economic supplements*. Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/hhes/poverty

U.S. Department of Agriculture. (n.d.). *Understanding rural America.* Retrieved from http://www.nal.usda.gov/ric/resources/backgrnd/12cpov/poverty.htm

Uslaner, E., & Conley, R. (2003). Civic engagement and particularized trust: The ties that bind people to their ethnic communities. *American Politics Research*, *31*, 331-361.

Wahl, S., & Quintanilla, K. (2005). Student civic engagement and media literacy. *Texas Speech Communication Journal*, *30*(1), 89-91.

Waltman, M. S., & Haas, J. W. (2007). Advertising hate on the internet. In D. W. Schumann & E. Thorson, (Eds.) *Internet advertising theory and research* (pp. 397-426). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Wander, P. (1984). The third persona: An ideological turn in rhetorical theory. *Central States Speech Journal, 35,* 197-216.

Wilkins, K. G. (1999). Accounting for power in development communication. In K. G. Wilkins (Ed.), *Redeveloping communication for social change: Theory, practice, and power* (pp. 197-210). Oxford, England: Rowman & Littlefield.

Wilkinson, S. (1998) Focus groups in feminist research: Power, interaction, and the co-construction of meaning. *Women's Studies International Forum, 21,* 111-125.

Williams, J. (2006). *Understanding post-structuralism*. Montreal, Quebec, Canada: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Wisely, D. S., & Lynn, E. M. (2002). *Toward a fourth philanthropic response: American philanthropy and its public*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press

Wood, J. T. (2004). Monsters and victims: Male felons' accounts of intimate partner violence. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 21*, 555-576.

Worley, R., & Dyrud, M. (2006). Service learning, part 2. *Business Communication Quarterly*, *69*, 305-306.

Zarefsky, D. (1986). *President Johnson's war on poverty: Rhetoric and history*. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press.

Zhang, W., & Chia, S. (2006). The effects of mass media use and social capital on civic and political participation. *Communication Studies*, *57*, 277-297.

Zoller, H. M. (2000). "A place you haven't visited before": Creating the conditions for community dialogue. *Southern Communication Journal, 65*, 191-207.