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Civic responsibility is an important ideal of higher education that is rarely considered through a cultural and theoretical lens. Swidler’s (1986) framework linking ideology, culture and action provided a means of studying civic responsibility at two research universities, the University of Virginia (UVA) and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC). The purposes of the study were (a) to understand dominant institutional beliefs about civic responsibility at two research universities, and (b) to understand how their institutional cultures contribute to unique institutional approaches to civic responsibility, specifically for the areas of student involvement and development. This ethnographic study examined campus ideologies and cultural forms that addressed five dimensions of civic responsibility: (a) knowledge and support of democratic values, systems and processes, (b) desire to act beneficially in community and for its members, (c) use of knowledge and skills for societal benefit, (d) appreciation for and interest in those unlike self, and (e) personal accountability. Data collection involved interviews, field observations and document analysis at both campuses. Student questionnaires and site summary reviewers were used to ensure trustworthiness of the findings. Data was analyzed for each site independently, and then a cross-site analysis was conducted. The ideologies, cultures and actions specific to the two institutions aligned with Swidler’s framework and yielded two unique institutional approaches to civic responsibility, namely the “test bed” and “role model” approaches. The significance of the findings from the cross-site analysis are multi-fold, with implications for both organization studies and student development.
CIVIC RESPONSIBILITY AND RESEARCH UNIVERSITIES: IDEOLOGY, CULTURE AND ACTION

by

COURTNEY H. THORNTON

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of North Carolina State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education

HIGHER EDUCATION ADMINISTRATION

Raleigh

2006

APPROVED BY:

John S. Levin            Marvin A. Titus

Rachel A. Willis          Audrey J. Jaeger
                          Chair of Advisory Committee
DEDICATION

To Todd – you are the picture of patience, my anchor when I am flailing, an abiding source of encouragement, editor extraordinaire, and love of my life. As in all things, I would not have wanted to do this without you by my side.

To Mom, Stacey and family – you have blessed my life with the joy and self-confidence that only comes from the love and security of family.

To Paige Elise – you made this process in the last year all the more meaningful. I cannot wait to see the young woman you will become and to support you wholeheartedly in accomplishing your own wonderful dreams.

To my Lord and Savior Jesus Christ – you have given me grace and blessings beyond measure that I do not deserve. I hope I can use my life’s work to your glory.
BIOGRAPHY

Courtney Lynne High Thornton was born October 5, 1975, in Bailey, North Carolina, to Elaine Potter Williamson and the late Gerald G. High. She has one sister, Stacey Lynn High of Boca Raton, Florida. Courtney married Todd Allen Thornton in 1999, and they have one child, Paige Elise Thornton.

A 1993 John T. Caldwell alumni scholar, Courtney Thornton graduated from North Carolina State University in 1996 with a B.A. in Chemistry and a B. S. in Science Education. Her professional positions after obtaining the bachelor’s degrees include high school chemistry teacher, technical assistant in a chemistry lab, and educational program manager for a higher education institute. While working in this last position, Courtney completed her M.Ed. degree in Higher Education Administration (Student Affairs Concentration) at North Carolina State University (May 2003) and began the doctoral program. Courtney has prepared academically for and is presently seeking a faculty position in a higher education and/or student affairs program.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I was honored to have such an accomplished and supportive committee to guide me in this research. I am privileged to call Dr. Audrey J. Jaeger my chair, advisor, mentor, teacher, colleague and friend. Among many other things, she was a constant source of encouragement, a generous giver of time and expertise, and an ideal partner in presenting, publishing, and learning throughout this experience. This accomplishment is made much dearer by virtue of her connection with it. I thank Dr. John Levin for pushing me beyond the higher education literature and specifically for introducing me to the conceptual framework used in this study. Most importantly, he was an invaluable resource for my many questions on qualitative research methodology. Dr. Rachel Willis was a constant source of energy and enthusiasm who saw opportunity and positive potential in all things we undertook together during the time of this study. And, in his unassuming manner, Dr. Marvin Titus always showed interest, kindness, and support that went a long way in encouraging me.

The success of qualitative research studies depend on numerous people who are often unnamed but deserve acknowledgement. Individuals at UVA and UNC agreed to interview, to review site summaries, to share documents, to provide access to special events, and to answer student questionnaires. Dr. Brian Pusser was particularly helpful in arranging my visit to UVA and serving as an advisor and sounding board while I was there. Dr. Rachel Willis served a similar role for the study at UNC. Additionally, this research was partially funded through an Inter-institution Academic Collaborative (IAC) Traveling Scholar
Award, a North Carolina State University College of Education Dissertation Support Award, and the Burns B. Crookston Doctoral Research Award from the American College Personnel Association.

Finally, it did not take long for me to realize that it takes a village to write a dissertation. This work would not be complete without the constant support and sacrifice of my husband Todd and daughter Paige. My family, as well as close friends who are more like family – especially the Funks and the Griggses – aided, motivated and encouraged me in many ways, and I will always love them for their unconditional support.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES ........................................................................................................................................... ix

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION ........................................................................................................................................ 1
  Background .................................................................................................................................................. 1
  Conceptual Framework .......................................................................................................................... 3
  Research Universities as Contexts ....................................................................................................... 5
  Cultural Tensions .................................................................................................................................... 7
  Purpose .................................................................................................................................................. 9
  Significance ........................................................................................................................................... 10

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW ........................................................................................................................................ 13
  Civic Responsibility in Higher Education ............................................................................................. 13
  Philosophical and Historical Roots ......................................................................................................... 13
  Civic Responsibility Defined .................................................................................................................. 18
  Civic Responsibility Outcomes for Students .......................................................................................... 20
    Knowledge and support of democratic values, systems and processes ................................................. 21
    Desire to act beneficially in community and for its members .............................................................. 22
    Use of knowledge and skills for societal benefit .................................................................................. 24
    Appreciation for and interest in those unlike self ................................................................................. 25
    Personal Accountability ...................................................................................................................... 26
  Civic Responsibility and Culture ............................................................................................................ 27
  Study of Organizational Culture ........................................................................................................... 29
  Conclusions ........................................................................................................................................... 32

CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY ........................................................................................................................................ 33
  Study Overview and Purpose .................................................................................................................. 33
  Methodology ........................................................................................................................................ 34
  Study Approval .................................................................................................................................... 35
  Data Collection .................................................................................................................................... 36
    Site Selection ...................................................................................................................................... 36
    Chronology ........................................................................................................................................ 37
    Interviews .......................................................................................................................................... 38
    Observations ..................................................................................................................................... 40
    Documents and Artifacts .................................................................................................................... 41
  Data Analysis ....................................................................................................................................... 42
  Research Integrity .................................................................................................................................. 44
  Bias Statement ....................................................................................................................................... 46

CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA ......................................................................................... 49
  Introduction .......................................................................................................................................... 49
  Conceptual Framework ......................................................................................................................... 52
  Methods ............................................................................................................................................... 53
    Context ............................................................................................................................................... 54
    Data Collection ................................................................................................................................. 55
    Data Analysis .................................................................................................................................. 57
  Findings ............................................................................................................................................... 59
    Culture ............................................................................................................................................... 59
    Thomas Jefferson .............................................................................................................................. 59
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Organizational Culture Studies</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Conceptual Framework</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“University of the people.”</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eminence of Fundamental Rights</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ideology</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional Ideologies</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual Ideologies</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model Definition</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conflicting Actions</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student Contributions</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Limitations</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Implications</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ideologies of Civic Responsibility</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ideological analysis per site</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ideological analysis between sites</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ideological analysis comparing site to individual participants</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Cultural Toolkit and its Uses</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cultural tools communicate civic responsibility ideologies to the public and particularly to incoming students. .......................................................... 133
Cultural tools influence individual and institutional ideologies.................. 134
Cultural tools illuminate actions that are appropriate and inappropriate in an academic community................................................................. 135
Approaches to Undergraduate Civic Responsibility Development ................ 136
Test Bed Approach: University of Virginia ................................................. 138
Role Modeling Approach: University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill ....... 139
Discussion and Limitations........................................................................... 140
Implications..................................................................................................... 146
CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSIONS ........................................................................ 150
Limitations of the Study.................................................................................. 151
Future Research ............................................................................................... 154
REFERENCES .................................................................................................. 160
APPENDIX: APPROVAL AND DATA COLLECTION FORMS ....................... 174
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Model of relationship of key concepts in Swidler’s (1986) framework...........5
Figure 2. Dimensions of civic responsibility in literature.................................................19
Figure 3. Demographic comparison of the University of Virginia and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill during time of study........37
Figure 4. Position demographics of interview participants ............................................40
Figure 5. Categories for within-site and cross-site analysis ...........................................43
Figure 6. Examples of institutional and individual ideologies in the five civic responsibility dimensions..........................................................124
Figure 7. Presence of civic responsibility dimensions in institutional and individual ideologies between sites..................................................125
Figure 8. Role-specific definitions of responsible citizenship........................................130
Figure 9. Civic responsibility at the University of Virginia represented using Swidler’s (1986) framework .........................................................138
Figure 10. Civic responsibility at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill represented using Swidler’s (1986) framework ...............................139
Figure 11. Reconceptualization of relationship between ideology, culture and action in institutional context..........................................................153
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

We [colleges and universities] will know we have made substantial progress when the institutional culture reflects an overarching concern for civic engagement and social responsibility…when we share institutional rituals and symbols that emphasize civic learning and social responsibility (Chickering, 2001).

Background

Societal benefits from higher education depend more on the “kind of people college graduates become than…what they know when they leave college” (Bowen, 1997, p. 270). Altruism, humanitarianism and civic values as outcomes of college attendance are believed to have positive consequences for society at large, not just for the individual who attended college (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991). It is argued that the greater emphasis an institution of higher education places on this type of character development in students, the greater likelihood that its graduates will positively or profoundly impact society for the better (Bowen, 1997). The presence of both personal and societal benefits to be gained from these values suggests that colleges and universities should be intentional about developing a sense of civic responsibility in college students. Institutional ideologies and culture, as related to civic responsibility, can influence efforts to promote this aspect of student development and are the foci of this multi-site study.

Civic responsibility as an outcome of college attendance has received increased attention in recent years, perhaps because the historical ideal of higher education as a public
good is in question (Boyer, 1990; Bringle, Games & Malloy, 1999; Kezar, Chambers & Burkhardt, 2005). In the mid-1980s and throughout the 1990s, several coalitions such as Campus Compact emerged and other commissions were formed that generated reports calling for the renewal of the civic mission of higher education institutions (Boyte & Hollander, 1999; Ehrlich, 1999; Kellogg Commission, 1999). These documents offer considerations for universities in preparing students for “responsible citizenship in a diverse democracy” and also for engaging faculty members “to develop and utilize knowledge for the improvement of society” (Boyte & Hollander, 1999, p. 3). The practical focus of many of these reports was on curricular and co-curricular improvements. Some institutions that took heed of these reports and prioritized civic responsibility were recognized for their outstanding commitment (Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont & Stephens, 2003; John Templeton Foundation, 1999; Princeton Review, 2005). The importance of civic responsibility at these selected institutions is presumed to permeate the culture in a way that faculty, staff and students recognize and appreciate through stories, special language or even daily rituals. Indeed, a recent study using a national and longitudinal data set indicates that institutional promotion of responsible citizenship impacts student intentions to participate in social improvements (Guzman, Stephenson, & Lindsay, 2005). Hence, the role of institutional culture should be better recognized and understood as part of the civic responsibility movement in higher education. This study used Swidler’s (1986) conceptual framework to examine the ideologies and cultural forms that exist around student civic responsibility at the University of Virginia and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Findings from each site were then compared in a cross-site analysis, and this analysis illuminated several considerations regarding the relationship between ideology, culture and action.
Conceptual Framework

Swidler (1986) posits a relationship between three concepts: ideology, culture and action. The way Swidler defines each of the three is crucial to understanding the framework. Central to Swidler’s (1986) framework is the concept of ideology, which she defines as a “highly articulated, self-conscious belief and ritual system” (p. 279). Ideology has historically been defined in a number of ways and is often associated with Marx’s work on political and economic theory and the covert social manipulation and control of classes (Freeden, 2003). Antonio Gramsci shifted the focus of ideology from the state to the civil society, seeing ideology in practice in the world as a “recurring pattern of (political) thinking, one for which there is evidence in the concrete world” (Freeden, 2003, p. 21). Educational institutions have been critically studied for ways that they advance ideologies and social relations that legitimate the dominant society in their content, curriculum, and classroom social relations (Apple, 2004; Ellsworth & Whatley, 1990; Giroux, 1981; Leonardo, 2003; Smith, 2003).

An even broader definition has emerged that defines ideology as the characteristic manner of thinking or ideas of a group, class, or person (Decker, 2004), and this more encompassing definition was used with Swidler’s (1986) definition to inform the study. This notion of ideology does not necessarily address production, power, and economics. For example, businesses can hold ideologies regarding the importance of quality customer service (Biggart, 1977), and community colleges can hold ideologies regarding their traditional transfer function (Shaw & London, 2001). Decker (2004) argues that, for organizations, both institutional and individual ideologies influence one another and hence it is futile to study either in isolation in organizational studies. Individual desire will mirror
cultural desire; or in other words, “the ‘needs’ of an institution manifest themselves via ideology and establish a milieu wherein a subject will ‘naturally’ desire what will benefit the larger institution” (Decker, 2004, p. 11).

The second aspect of the framework is culture. In the study of organizations, culture has generally been defined as shared values and beliefs (Schein, 1992) or a system of accepted behaviors (Deal & Kennedy, 1982). Culture has more recently been described as a “generative framework of meaning” that is not necessarily unifying (Batteau, 2000, p. 737). Organizations such as research universities are goal-oriented, exist to gain strategic advantages, and embrace the differentiation and diversity that are natural counterpoints to a culture of inclusion and authority (Batteau, 2000). Batteau states that shared meanings in organizations are partial and emergent; hence a high degree of ambiguity exists within organizations such as research universities. Batteau (2000) argues that the goal of these organizations, which is never accomplished, is to move from chaos to harmony much in the same manner as an orchestra that starts with a noisy warm-up but then proceeds to make lovely music. The temporary “symphonic voice” of an organization is manifest in the stylized public performance (Batteau, 2000, p. 734).

Swidler (1986) rejects the notion that culture is shared values and assumptions that guide the actions of individuals in an organization. She instead posits that culture is “a ‘tool kit’ of symbols, stories, rituals, and world-views, which people may use in varying configurations to solve different kinds of problems” (p. 273). Finally, Swidler defines action as persistent behaviors and procedures over time, which appears more closely aligned with some prevalent notions of culture, such as “the way we do things around here” (Deal & Kennedy, 1982, p. 4).
Swidler puts forth three arguments based on the relationship between ideology, culture and action (see Figure 1). First, she posits that ideologies exist to offer a unified approach to action, and this is accomplished through the use of the cultural toolkit. Relatedly, Swidler argues that differences in ideology will lead to different strategies of action. Finally, Swidler argues that the cultural equipment available to institutions or individuals will influence their belief system, hence the double arrow in the figure.

![Figure 1. Model of relationship of key concepts in Swidler’s (1986) framework](image)

This framework provided a fresh approach to understanding how and why two research universities approach civic responsibility in the ways that they do.

Research Universities as Contexts

Research universities are the target of many reports that call for reform in undergraduate education (Boyte & Hollander, 1999; Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1998). These institutions maintain vibrant research programs, educate large numbers of undergraduates, and share and create knowledge with the community. Public and private research institutions offer larger student subsidies and competitive financial aid programs, which can often make them more accessible than other types of four-year institutions for large numbers of college-bound students (Winston, 1999). Research institutions constantly perform delicate balancing acts, as the magnitude and breadth of their work can challenge the full achievement of their varied missions. But the diversity and scope of research universities also designates them as beacons of higher education. They are believed to possess a potential for far-reaching change towards the
renewal of the civic mission of higher education (Boyte & Hollander, 1999; Checkoway, 2001).

Although research universities are the targets of many recent reports calling for reform, few research universities tout undergraduate civic responsibility as a priority (Ehrlich, 2003). Research universities house talented faculty who compete for grants, publish findings, and mentor graduate students in research practices. Scholars claim that the emphasis on the research enterprise has negative consequences on the quality of undergraduate education, including de-emphasis of the development of civic responsibility values (Boyer, 1990; Sax & Astin, 1998; Schwartz & Lucas, 1998; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004; Walshok, 2000). The institutional prestige, and oftentimes monetary benefits, associated with high-quality research can propel research activities to the foreground at the expense of other areas. Roles for faculty are changing as they increasingly participate in market-like behaviors, a recent trend in higher education known as academic capitalism (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997). Particularly in the technosciences, faculty seek grant funding and corporate partnerships, often for the survival of their programs and research agendas. Administrators increasingly make similar decisions. Research universities are particularly prone to the trends of academic capitalism because of their focus on the research enterprise, perhaps even to the extent that students learn they are more valued as intellectual workers than as students (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004).

Research universities are not excluded from the educational philosophy that places schools at the heart of teaching democratic values and citizenship skills (Dewey, 1916). In fact, research universities are seen by many as key to the success of the latest civic responsibility movement since a change or initiative among research universities influences
other types of institutions (Checkoway, 2001). Research universities will likely face many challenges, however, if they assume a leading role in this movement.

Cultural Tensions

Research universities are large, complex and filled with competing ideologies, including those about responsible citizenship. They are places where status-quo includes hierarchical decision-making, competition for resources, and the treatment of individual difference as a source of conflict (Guarasci & Cornwell, 1997b). These conditions of institutional life center on issues of power and adversity, two themes that run counter to the unifying vision of democracy and other modernist ideals in which the field of higher education is deeply embedded (Bloland, 2000). Hence, the values of civic responsibility that an institution may try to promote can be negated or diminished by these realities of institutional life.

Mixed messages are found in examinations of the core purposes of these institutions. The Association of American Universities states that research universities exist to “ask questions and solve problems” (2001, paragraph 2). Certainly, some research universities as a whole or in part choose to solve problems that exist in the public domain, but all do not. The mission of teaching and instruction at research universities is another area of conflicting messages. Research universities have been criticized for focusing too little on a general or liberal education curriculum and too much on prestigious technosciences (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1998; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997). The liberal arts and humanities have traditionally been associated with developing students into an informed citizenry and as future leaders for our form of government (Association of American Universities, 2004). Contrarily, a rise in the popularity of science, engineering and
professional fields has been associated with declines in student activism, development of cultural awareness, racial understanding, and faith in the ability of individuals to change society (Altbach, 1997; Sax & Astin, 1998). The workforce training approach often taken at research universities may be instructive about the political economy of citizenship (Kaestle, 2000). Still, savvy students may perceive the lack of “widespread, vigorous commitment” to the pursuit of general education at many research universities (Keat & White, 2002, p. 12). If students perceive that general education is not important at research universities, then it may follow that students perceive that the development of democratic skills and values is unimportant during the college years as well.

Research shows, however, that research universities produce student outcomes similar to other institutions despite some of these obstacles. According to studies using data from the College Student Experience Questionnaire (CSEQ), students at research universities show no difference in learning outcomes from students attending institutions with other Carnegie Classifications (Kuh & Hu, 2001; Pike, Kuh, & Gonyea, 2003). The studies included questions on values, ethical standards, and cultural awareness in the learning outcomes measures, but these were lumped with many other types of outcomes; thus no conclusions can be drawn about the gains in these specific areas. The most recent National Survey of Student Engagement (2005) findings did show appreciable difference between student outcomes at doctoral-extensive and –intensive institutions and other types of institutions in a category called “enriching educational experiences” (p. 48). Doctoral universities fell almost 20 percentage points below the top 10% of all institutions in this category but were on par with the national average benchmarks. Similar to the CSEQ, this
category of benchmarks included a wide range of topics including community service, diversity experiences, technology use and study abroad.

According to Ehrlich (2000), students at research universities must develop core knowledge, virtues, and skills in becoming civically responsible individuals. In order to do this, students need opportunities to be part of projects of impact and relevance in their communities, to participate in scholarship grounded in public problems, to engage in public discourse that brings together people of different experiences and backgrounds, and to experience reinforcing curricular and co-curricular activities (Boyte & Hollander, 1999; Colby et al., 2003). Other documents similarly discuss the opportunities that universities have to develop civic responsibility characteristics through research opportunities, the curriculum, and in particular service-learning and co-curricular activities through orientation, residence life, and club involvement (Colby et al., 2003; Ehrlich, 1999; Ehrlich, 2000; Guarasci & Cornwell, 1997a). These are activities that occur at research universities every day, but not all students are reached by courses in ethics, residence life programs, or applied research opportunities. On the contrary, institutions make efforts to orient all incoming students into campus life, and many also have them attend administratively-sponsored ceremonies where the values of the institution are shared. By and large, reports and documents to date do not acknowledge the importance of culture in promoting the development of student civic responsibility at research universities.

Purpose

Research universities can demonstrate their centrality in a democratic and diverse society by focusing attention on civic responsibility, but indications are that few research universities have intensified their commitment to promoting civic responsibility in
undergraduates (Ehrlich, 2003; John Templeton Foundation, 1999). For those research universities who do promote these ideals, little is known about how their institutional cultures are related to their beliefs around and actions of responsible citizenship. The purposes of this study are (a) to understand dominant institutional beliefs about responsible citizenship at two research universities, particularly as they pertain to student development and outcomes, and (b) to understand how institutional culture contributes to a unique institutional approach to civic responsibility at two research universities. In line with these purposes, there are three research questions.

1. What are the ideologies regarding civic responsibility at two research universities, as described and interpreted by faculty, staff and students?

2. How do these two research universities employ their cultural “tool kits” as a bridge between ideology and action?

3. How can the concepts of ideology and culture be useful in understanding variations in institutional approaches to undergraduate civic responsibility?

Significance

The significance of this study is multi-fold, as evidenced upon consideration of the methods and findings. As the literature review in Chapter 2 demonstrates, this study required the creation of a multi-dimensional definition of civic responsibility that could be used, tested or expanded by future studies in higher education. This study uses knowledge from the field of organization studies and specifically applies Swidler’s (1986) framework in a new area of study, which adds information to the higher education literature on the culturally-distinctive approaches to civic responsibility at and between two research universities. The qualitative research and analysis methods in Chapter 3, both single-site and cross-site, serve to inform
future studies in this area. Specifically, this study employed qualitative and ethnographic methods at two research universities to understand dominant ideologies, cultural tools and persistent strategies of action related to civic responsibility as well as the connection between these three concepts. The data collected from interviews, documents and field observations at each site were first analyzed separately and then between the two sites.

Chapters 4 and 5 present the findings from the two study sites, the University of Virginia (UVA) and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC), respectively. The next chapter of findings, Chapter 6, were identified from the cross-site analysis between the two study sites. Each of these chapters reports the findings in the format of a journal-ready article, and as such, each contains a separate discussion of background literature, methods, findings, limitations, and implications. Implications based on the UVA findings are primarily in the area of college student development, whereas implications based on the UNC findings are primarily in the area of organization studies. The cross-site analysis chapter and the conclusion chapter that follows it, Chapter 7, discuss implications in both areas.

Prior to this research, the majority of scholarship on universities and civic responsibility focused on procedures and structures, curricular and co-curricular activities, faculty rewards, student community-related research, supportive infrastructures, and community partnership development (for examples, see Boyte & Hollander, 1999; Ehrlich, 2000). Procedures and findings from this study will enable other higher education institutions to reflect on their approaches to civic responsibility through a theoretical and cultural lens. Through this type of self-examination, institutions can understand the messages students receive about civic responsibility, the success and failure of certain related
programs or initiatives, and the encouragement of holistic citizenship development in a resource-efficient manner. Although this research study primarily contributes in understanding organizations and why they approach civic responsibility in the way that they do, this research also prepares the way for future work that could connect institutional culture to student development outcomes.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Civic Responsibility in Higher Education

This research was undertaken based on the premise that the development of civic responsibility in undergraduate students falls appropriately within the purview of higher education. Although many scholars and practitioners alike agree with this premise, their definitions of civic responsibility vary widely. In this chapter, relevant literature is reviewed regarding the philosophical and historical roots of citizenship development as an educational goal and the multiple definitions of civic responsibility directed at higher education. This information was used to develop a comprehensive definition of civic responsibility that served to guide the research. A brief discussion of the existing research on student outcomes associated with these civic responsibility dimensions is also included. Some scholars and national projects have begun to acknowledge or suggest a relationship between these student outcomes and institutional culture. This research study further attends to that connection. Hence, a brief discussion of relevant literature from the vast field of organizational culture research concludes the review. The literature included particularly attends to the ways organizational culture has been defined and studied in higher education contexts.

Philosophical and Historical Roots

The promotion of democracy and development of good citizens has long been considered by many to be a primary aim of education (Apple & Beane, 1995; Dewey, 1916). The development of civic responsibility in young people was arguably a chief founding principle of American higher education in the 1600s (Rudolph, 1962). Educated leaders were needed in the government, the clergy, and among the greater population to create and
advance a civil society. Over time, higher education’s strategies and equipment for student citizenship development have come in and out of favor, expanded and changed. The next section exemplifies how the curriculum, co-curriculum and popular view of the purposes of higher education, in combination with national and world events, have all affected the approach to and relative importance of civic responsibility in higher education over time.

From the early beginnings of American higher education, the general education or liberal arts curriculum was viewed as an important way to develop democratic skills in a diverse and rapidly changing society (Yale Report of 1828, 1997). Even with the growth of specialized and practical fields, the general education curriculum has been defended continually as critical in educating active and informed citizens and future leaders (Association of American Colleges & Universities, 2002, 2005; Keat & White, 2002; Wingspread Group, 1993).

The development of student life and the extracurriculum in the 1800s expanded the opportunities for students to exercise their democratic skills and values through clubs and organizations. The early 1900s saw the creation of some radical and liberal student groups that were associated with adult organizations which fought for various causes in the larger society (Astin et al., 1997). Student activism peaked in the 1960s and early 1970s with the onset of the civil rights movement, the women’s movement, and the Vietnam War. Although the last three decades seem comparatively quiet, the modest student activism in issues such as divestment are more characteristic of normal student activism involvement than during the decade of unrest (Altbach, 1997).

In the 1800s, students and their families began to place a greater value on the personal benefits of a college education versus the social benefits (Rudolph, 1962). Much
the same as with the value of a general education, the discussion about the relative public and private benefits of higher education continues to the present day. Positive effects of higher education are assumed to spill over into the larger society, but societal benefits such as greater tolerance and openness to change, participation and involvement of citizens in public affairs, volunteerism, and the transmission of humane values are more difficult to quantify and attribute to higher education than a salary figure (Bowen, 1997).

Of special note is the role of student affairs personnel in pursuing the educational aim of citizenship development. These professionals have traditionally connected their work in the development of the whole student with preparation for affecting social change (American Council on Education, 1949; American College Personnel Association, 1994), stating that …a social philosophy… thrusts upon the college an urgent responsibility for providing experiences which develop in its students a firm and enlightened belief in democracy, a matured understanding of its problems and methods, and a deep sense of responsibility for individual and collective action to achieve its goals (American Council on Education, 1949, p. 20).

Standards of good practice in student affairs exist to help students develop coherent values and ethical standards by modeling campuses as learning communities that value honesty, justice, civility, freedom, human dignity, and responsible citizenship (American College Personnel Association, 1996). Student affairs professionals are often viewed as the leading force in the character development of students through programs of community service and service-learning, as well as in the ways these personnel communicate core institutional values through symbols, ritual and tradition, and demonstrate civic responsibility through symbolic moral, political and social action (Dalton, 1999).
Civic responsibility has been an intended outcome of various aspects of higher education for hundreds of years (Rudolph, 1962). Despite efforts in this regard, the appropriateness and success of higher education’s role in civic responsibility development is still debatable and expressed by those who believe that higher education cannot, should not, and has not fulfilled this role. Public education institutions at all levels may be unable to serve as a training ground for democracy until they are free from the control of our democratic government, which Moe (2000) perceives to be ruled by upperclass citizens and special interest groups that often do not represent society, a community or even a majority. The implication is that public institutions of education cannot lead by example when it comes to democratic practice. Another position is that the university’s role in developing the practices of responsible citizenship in students should not extend beyond academic aspects, for example, not cheating or plagiarizing (Fish, 2003; Fish, 2004). Fish argues that emphasis on the personal development of students takes away from the “disciplinary training it is our job to provide” (2003, p. 3), essentially stating that academicians should not be concerned with developing citizens. Furthermore, his position implies that those who do are clearly in the wrong and that this central aspect of student affairs work is unnecessary.

Some evidence also exists that higher education has not advanced, as predicted, certain attitudes and actions that a responsible citizenry would adopt. Putnam (1995) describes the decline in the last 40 years of social capital, defined as “features of social organization such as networks, norms, and social trust that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit” (p. 67). Putnam found that Americans’ engagement in secondary associations such as politics, church groups, unions, school and civic associations have all declined despite the fact that more Americans have benefited from higher education,
a social institution that has been found to foster associational involvement. Instead, involvement has shifted to “mass-membership” (p. 70) organizations such as the Sierra Club, to non-profit agencies, and to self-help support groups. He suggests that none of these foster community in the same manner as traditional civic associations and implies other negative consequences for society associated with this shift, such as a decline in social trust.

Another rarely questioned assumption is that increasing levels of education among Americans will increase political knowledge and civic engagement. A recent examination of various surveys that examine the political knowledge of citizens shows little change in political knowledge over the last 50 years despite the increase in education attainment (Delli Carpini & Ketter, 1996). Nie, Junn, and Stehlik-Barry (1996) found that absolute years of formal education correlates with increased tolerance for unpopular groups or viewpoints, as well as other cognitive skills necessary for citizenship, but they posit that political engagement will not increase with increasing levels of formal education. They argue that political engagement is a result of social networking. Venues for political engagement are viewed as a scarce good, and no matter how many people are educated to become potential participants in these venues, the limited number of possibilities in the social network will keep more people from being involved.

Despite the criticisms and challenges, the majority of literature from inside and outside of the academy, as well as historical precedence, supports the notion that citizenship development is a responsibility of higher education and thus makes it an appropriate topic for research. Some scholars go so far as to say that “in the end, the quality of the undergraduate experience is to be measured by the willingness of graduates to be socially and civically engaged” (Boyer, 1987, p. 278). The view that more can be done in this area has prompted
recent discourse and reporting from many groups composed of university presidents, deans, provosts, faculty, and other administrators (Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2002; Boyte & Hollander, 1999; Ehrlich, 1999). The insights in these reports informed the definition of civic responsibility used for this study.

Civic Responsibility Defined

Ehrlich (1997) suggests that because it is difficult to define important aspects of citizenship for the present day and for the future, higher education institutions may be prevented from concentrating efforts on developing civic responsibility. Civic responsibility has been defined in a number of ways in recent years, with groups often using related terms such as civic engagement, social responsibility, or citizenship to the same effect. For example, citizenship can mean either the simple insurance of individual rights through law, the organization and maintenance of virtuous citizens into communities, or the expansion of citizen rights to additional groups (Shafir, 1998). Although many definitions include a concern for the “rights, responsibilities, and tasks associated with governing” (Degelman, 2000), general agreement exists in the literature that civic responsibility goes beyond the practice of voting. Figure 2 displays recent definitions of civic responsibility that have influenced or are directed at higher education. Not all scholars are in agreement with these dimensions; for example, Bok (2001) states that community service is but a “stepping-stone” towards civic responsibility and describes volunteerism as an alternative to, but not an encourager of, citizenship. Also, some dimensions of civic responsibility less frequently mentioned were not included in the figure, such as “ability to deal with bureaucracies” and “disposition towards law obedience” (Bowen, 1997).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions of Civic Responsibility in Literature</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Voluntary service to the community; commitment to serve the community</td>
<td>(Astin &amp; Sax, 1998; Bowen, 1997; Boyte &amp; Hollander, 1999; Patrick, 1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Knowledge about civic life; understanding of how a community works; knowledge of government institutions and procedures</td>
<td>(Bowen, 1997; Colby et al., 2003; Patrick, 1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Participation in the political system; desire to influence the political structure</td>
<td>(Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2002; Astin &amp; Sax, 1998; Bowen, 1997; Boyte &amp; Hollander, 1999; Colby et al., 2003; Patrick, 1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Public commitment to the values of constitutional democracy (liberty, justice and rule of law); work for justice and dignity for all people</td>
<td>(Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2002; Bowen, 1997; Ehrlich, 1999; Patrick, 1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Desire to help others in difficulty; compassion and commitment to the welfare of others</td>
<td>(Astin &amp; Sax, 1998; Colby et al., 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Desire to promote racial understanding; appreciation of diversity; understanding of differences in ethnicity, race, sexual orientation and class</td>
<td>(Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2002; Astin &amp; Sax, 1998; Boyte &amp; Hollander, 1999; Colby et al., 2003; Ehrlich, 1999; Guarasci &amp; Cornwell, 1997b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ability to solve public problems effectively; use knowledge to benefit society and make decisions</td>
<td>(Boyte &amp; Hollander, 1999; Ehrlich, 1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Skills in debate, listening, teamwork, critical evaluation</td>
<td>(Bowen, 1997; Boyte &amp; Hollander, 1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Understanding of self and ethical consequences of one’s decisions and actions; accountable individuals</td>
<td>(Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2002; Colby et al., 2003)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Dimensions of civic responsibility in literature

The information in Figure 2 was compared and synthesized into five encompassing dimensions that form the definition of *civic responsibility* used in this study (the bracketed
numbers refer to the related dimensions listed in Figure 2): (a) Knowledge and support of democratic values, systems and processes [2,3,4]; (b) Desire to act beneficially in community and for its members [1,5]; (c) Use of knowledge and skills for societal benefit [7,8]; (d) Appreciation for and interest in those unlike self [6]; and (e) Personal accountability [9,10].

After the conception of these five dimensions in early 2004, the researcher became aware of several similar definitions of citizenship, civic responsibility, and civic engagement that guide the current work of other scholars. For example, VanHecke (2004) offers five characterizations of citizenship in her conceptual framework for citizenship which was constructed independently for her own dissertation research and based on literature from sociology, psychology, political science and higher education. These characterizations include civic and political engagement, public good, service learning and community service, moral discernment, and communities across difference. Alvarez, Jacoby and Komives (2005) use a seven-point definition of civic engagement at the University of Maryland that encompasses the five dimensions developed for this study as well as the ability to work civilly through controversy and the promotion of social justice. Nonetheless, the five dimensions of civic responsibility developed here were appropriate for this multi-site study because they were based only on higher education literature and were not context-specific, or based on one institution’s investigation into civic engagement.

Civic Responsibility Outcomes for Students

Extensive research has been conducted to show that higher education does influence several of the aforementioned dimensions of civic responsibility in students. Yet, in a recent study by the Association of American Colleges and Universities, students noted outcomes related to civic responsibility, values and ethics, appreciation of cultural diversity, and global
awareness, as the least important outcomes of their college educations (Schneider & Humphreys, 2005). More is known through the literature about these civic responsibility outcomes in students than is known about their motivations, particularly those stemming from institutional encouragement. Peer groups can be assumed to have significant influence on whether students participate in activities such as community service or political processes (Astin, 1993), but little is known about what other aspects of institutional life may promote this involvement or development. The focus of this present investigation, organizational culture in relation to civic responsibility, does not allow the researcher to attribute causality of student action to culture but rather to gain understanding of what two research institutions and their members value and how they communicate that to students using culture.

This section of the review examines literature related to student outcomes and the five dimensions of civic responsibility but does not purport to cover the extensive research that exists for each area. Rather what follows is a review of only the most recent works and comprehensive studies related to each dimension. Additionally, recent research shows little difference between private and public institutions in regards to citizenship development efforts and student outcomes (Galston, 2001).

Knowledge and support of democratic values, systems and processes

Political participation among college students is generally presented as an area of civic responsibility development that needs attention and improvement. Many of the same factors that contributed to youthful inattention to politics in the 1950s and 1960s continue as factors. The greatest change is that youth in this day cite cynicism, largely based on the highly publicized corruptions and misjudgments of public officials in recent times, as the major reason for indifference and disengagement from politics (Bennett, 1997). The annual
Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) freshman survey of almost 300,000 first year students across the nation found that political awareness has risen three years in a row to the highest level since 1994 (Young, 2004). Nonetheless, young peoples’ interest in politics remains significantly lower than when the freshman survey first began in 1966. A survey of over 160,000 freshmen and seniors at 472 colleges and universities found that the level of participation in civic activities does appear to increase between the freshman and senior year (National Survey of Student Engagement, 2004). Although the figures are relatively low, seniors were more likely to vote in an election (37%), volunteer with a local community or religious group (28%), sign a citizen petition (23%) and contact a public official (13%). Neither freshmen nor seniors, reporting 4% participation each, were inclined to volunteer to work on political campaigns.

Desire to act beneficially in community and for its members

During the mid-1980s, major institutional reforms were recommended in higher education, such as increasing student involvement in community service (Astin, Keup, & Lindholm, 2002). College students’ motivation to participate in community service is influenced by their transition to college, the involvement of their peers, and the information and opportunities made available by the institution (Jones & Hill, 2003). Students at larger institutions, such as many research universities, mention difficulty in finding out about community service opportunities on campus and a lack of a unified campus message on the importance of service. Astin, Keup, and Lindholm (2002) examined longitudinal student databases from the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) to discern if this and other recommended reforms of the mid-1980s had actually resulted in institutional transformation across the nation. In the area of community service, they concluded that
transformation had taken place based on the increased community service participation reported by students between the 1985-1989 CIRP cohort and the 1994-1998 CIRP cohort. Astin and Sax (1998) surveyed 3,450 students, both participants and non-participants in service, over the course of their undergraduate studies to determine the effects of service participation on undergraduates. The twelve student outcomes related to civic responsibility in their study were all positively influenced by service participation, including increased commitment to serving their communities and to promoting racial understanding. In a long-term follow-up, Astin, Sax and Avalos (1999) found that the positive short-term effects of service participation extend beyond college. Evidence exists, however, that increased participation in community service does not necessarily lead students to embrace other duties of citizenship and civic participation, illustrated by the fact that student social activism is on the decline and that low levels of political participation are a perceived problem among college youth (Astin, Keup, and Lindholm, 2002; Ehrlich & Hollander, 1999).

The rise in community service participation may be partially influenced by the spread of groups that promote service-learning, such as Campus Compact (Astin, Keup, & Lindholm, 2002). The literature is vast on many aspects of service-learning, but it is noteworthy that one review of 37 empirical studies spanning all educational levels found that service-learning is the type of service that produces the most consistent positive results on the citizenship development of its participants (Perry & Katula, 2001). Some scholars claim that service-learning has yet to reach its full potential because of questions that arise about its purpose and proper structural home (Kezar & Rhoads, 2001). The learning outcomes of service-learning are potentially broad and far-reaching: Kezar and Rhoads suggest the
realization of these outcomes may be limited at present by the separation of curricular and co-curricular domains and the hierarchical structures of most colleges and universities.

Use of knowledge and skills for societal benefit

Many institutions support endeavors such as service-learning programs described in the previous section that promote the use of knowledge and skills for societal benefit. Undergraduate research programs that partner students with faculty is another potential means of developing undergraduates’ awareness and desire to serve the public through applied knowledge. Employment locales of graduates can serve as an indicator of the effectiveness of these efforts. Some indication exists that recent college graduates are increasingly interested in public sector opportunities such as Teach for America or the Peace Corps (Farrell, 2004). Working against this trend, however, is the prevailing idea of both students and parents that the most important benefits of higher education are individual rather than public (Institute for Higher Education Policy, 1998, 2005).

A telephone survey of 1,015 randomly selected adults over the age of 18 revealed that the adult public viewed the skills and knowledge acquired in higher education largely as contributing to individual success in life as opposed to a societal benefit (Immerwahr & Foleno, 2000). The CIRP survey discussed in the previous section also found that the overwhelming majority of students cited job acquisition, training for a specific career, and the ability to make more money as very important reasons in deciding to go to college (Sax et al., 2003). With the exception of the literature on volunteerism and service-learning, more research is needed to understand how institutions and their members develop this dimension of civic responsibility.
Appreciation for and interest in those unlike self

Diversity can imply any number of individual characteristics, including but not limited to race or ethnicity, religious beliefs, or sexual orientation (Bliming & Whitt, 1999). Both the literature and the interview participants largely approached diversity “in terms of composition and as an exploration of differences,” whereas Milem, Chang and Antonio (2005) add to their definition “an interest in opposing unfair forms of exclusion, prejudice, and discrimination” (p. 5).

The ability to live and work with people unlike oneself was believed to be an essential outcome of higher education by 68% of the 1,015 adults who participated in a telephone survey on college outcomes (Immerwahr & Foleno, 2000). Racial diversity is of particular interest in terms of educational access, the campus environment and educational outcomes, and these areas are the subjects of a great deal of literature not covered in this review. Of interest here, however, are some recent studies that reveal student perceptions and change over time regarding diversity appreciation. Of the freshmen who entered college in fall 2003, 66.2% reported that they would socialize with someone of another race or ethnic group (Sax et al., 2003). Longitudinal research on 1,300 students has shown that seniors’ understanding of people of other racial or ethnic backgrounds may not differ appreciably from their understanding when those same students were freshmen (National Survey of Student Engagement, 2003). While 62% of seniors surveyed in 2004 were exposed to diverse perspectives, as related to race, religion, political beliefs and other areas, in their class discussions and assignments, 58% of seniors also perceive that their institutions only minimally encourage contact among students from different racial and ethnic, social and economic backgrounds (National Survey of Student Engagement, 2005). It is unclear why
little change in diversity appreciation may be reported from freshman to senior year, but factors such as peer groups and student involvement levels are known as key determinants in developing openness to diversity (Pascarella, Edison, Nora, Hagedorn, & Terenzini, 1996). Participation in Greek organizations, particularly for majority students, can have negative effects on openness to diversity (Pascarella et al., 1996).

**Personal Accountability**

Personal accountability may refer to a range of ideas including the control of one’s body (that is, avoiding substance abuse or physical violence towards others) or matters of misconduct typically handled by campus judiciary committees. Since both campuses in the study have an honor code of historical significance, academic honesty is one aspect of personal accountability of particular interest in this study.

Institutions both with and without honor codes can exhibit low frequencies of cheating dependent upon an institution’s abilities to create an environment where academic honesty is important (McCabe & Trevino, 1993). Institutions without honor codes have been successful at reducing instances of academic dishonesty by focusing on this topic in special discussions, orientation, and student handbooks. Institutions with honor codes tend to focus more on creating a sense of community, hence there is encouragement for students at these schools to perceive academic honesty as a communal as well as individual effort (McCabe, Trevino, & Butterfield, 1999). Students do, however, perceive a strong subculture for academic dishonesty among Greeks and athletes, which could be attributed to the strong communal bonds created in these groups that may supercede the community-building efforts of the institution (McCabe, Trevino & Butterfield, 1999). The same study reports that larger higher education institutions with more diverse student populations may find it more
difficult, but not impossible, to create a moral community where each member feels responsibility for upholding the value of academic integrity. This notion has clear implications for research universities, which are often large and comprised of many student subgroups.

Civic Responsibility and Culture

The previous section of the review suggests that student civic responsibility outcomes may differ depending on a student’s peer group, attendance at a school with an honor code, participation in service-learning, membership in a Greek organization, or access to information on campus, as a few examples. Accordingly, the majority of scholarship on how to enhance student civic responsibility recommends changes within these types of areas, such as through curricular and cocurricular activities, student community-related research, supportive infrastructures, and community partnership development (Boyte & Hollander, 1999; Ehrlich, 2000).

Recent literature has begun to acknowledge, both explicitly and tacitly, that aspects of institutional culture have influence in student development as related to the five dimensions of civic responsibility development; however, this literature seems to be based more on an assumption that culture is important than on a theoretical basis for this conclusion. For example, the mission of the Diverse Democracy Project (2005) is to help campuses identify and assess practices that will help students function among society’s diverse perspectives. In accomplishing their mission, the Project created a typology that includes rituals and traditions among the types of cocurricular activities and initiatives that campuses should assess. Yet, the typology gives no parameters around this category nor further explanation as to how the connection between ritual, tradition and diversity
appreciation is defined. Similarly, Colby et al. (2003) describe ceremonial events and symbols related to various civic responsibility ideals at several different types of campuses. Although the scholars attempted to relate these cultural forms to specific actions or lack of actions on the campuses, their explanations are inadequate because no theoretical framework was used to guide their investigation of culture.

Finally, culture has yet to be recognized as an important undercurrent present in some discussions in the higher education literature. For example, students at liberal arts colleges are known to engage in civic activities more frequently than their counterparts at other schools (National Survey of Student Engagement, 2004). Keat and White (2002) assume that the unique values and ideals of liberal arts institutions contribute to this higher level of student civic engagement. One study found, however, that students are more likely to report their intentions to influence social values when they perceive that their college is dedicated to teaching them to influence social values (Guzman, Stephenson, & Lindsay, 2005).

Indeed, Toma, Dubrow and Hartley (2005) argue that higher education has yet to realize the concrete usefulness of institutional culture. With or without conscious acknowledgement, colleges and universities’ cultural tools such as institutional heroes, special mottos, ceremonies and visual images may be related directly to civic responsibility or serve to guide institutional approaches to civic responsibility development (Clark, 1972; Manning, 2000; Trice & Beyer, 1984). A theory-based understanding of culture will assist higher education institutions in tangible ways as they pursue their civic responsibility initiatives. Hence, the next section focuses on organizational culture and particularly how culture has been defined and studied in higher education.
Study of Organizational Culture

Organizations can be described as “mini-societies that have their own distinct pattern of culture and subculture” (Morgan, 1997, p. 129). Organizational culture studies traditionally apply anthropological concepts to management science. The definition of organizational culture has been widely debated. Hallett (2003) offers a useful categorization of the three main approaches to the study of organizational culture. In the first approach, organizational researchers describe culture as beliefs, values, or assumptions shared by all members of an organization (Denison & Mishra, 1995; Schein, 1992). A major assumption of these scholars is that organizational culture should be manageable in that the same values are shared by all members of the organization. Hallet (2003) argues this approach is flawed because this definition does not assist researchers in understanding the conflict inherent in organizations. Conflict could be generated from either external influences on the organization, internal subcultures that do not agree with dominant ideologies, or both. Because it could be reasoned that conflict would not exist in an environment of shared values and beliefs, Hallett (2003) discounts this approach.

Higher education literature reflects one particular aspect of the shared values approach by aiming to understand culture towards the goal of organizational management (Kuh & Whitt, 1988; Tierney, 1988). Although Kuh and Whitt as well as Tierney acknowledge the existence of subgroups that may conflict with dominant ideologies, both, in essence, argue that an understanding of culture can help leaders initiate appropriate institutional change. Furthermore, these scholars note that the “central goal of understanding organizational culture is to minimize the occurrence and consequences of cultural conflict and help foster the development of shared goals” (Tierney, 1988, p. 5).
Hallett (2003) indicates that the second approach “removes organizational culture from the subjective minds of actors and places it in public by emphasizing espoused beliefs, ideologies, stories, myths, rituals, ceremonies, and artifacts” (p. 129). These symbols offer hope and confidence to those internal as well as external to the organization and also to resolve the confusion and uncertainty inherent in the ambiguity of organizations (Bolman & Deal, 2003). In this approach, culture is assumed to be public, outside of the minds of individuals, and hence empirically observable and able to be described (Geertz, 1973). The shortcoming of this approach, Hallett (2003) argues, is its inability to account for organizational change. For example, organizational stories and myths may communicate a public meaning for years that, over time, came to no longer be reflected in organizational practices. This perspective presents organizational culture as stable and certainly not aligned with current understandings of organizations (Bloland, 2000; Gergen, 2000).

Higher education studies have also used this second approach to examine rituals, saga, ethos, ceremony, myths and other cultural forms (Birnbaum, 1988; Clark, 1972; Heath, 1981; Magolda, 2001, 2003; Manning; 2000; Trice & Beyer, 1984). Some of these studies are more critical of higher education ritual and ceremony and also urge researchers to include events beyond what are normally identified as cultural forms, such as the ritual of the campus tours (Magolda, 2001; McLaren, 1999).

Hallett (2003) posits a third approach to organizational culture studies. Culture is defined in this approach as a “negotiated order that emerges through the interactions between organizational actors, an order influenced particularly by people with symbolic power” (p. 129). Hallett (2003) advocates for the use of this approach in studying organizational culture, as it enables researchers to deal with both conflict and change in organizations.
Symbolic power, or “the power to define the situation in which interactions take place,” is a key concept in this approach (Hallett, 2003, p. 130). Members of organizations imbue certain other members with symbolic power, and multiple individuals can have symbolic power. Hallett attributes the work of Swidler (1986) as an influence on his ideas about understanding organizational culture through symbolic power relationships. Swidler’s (1986) work also serves as the framework for this study and is described in detail in Chapter 1 (pp. 3-5).

Although Swidler’s (1986) work influenced Hallett, a scholar taking a more dynamic approach to culture studies, her work also has inherent limitations. Swidler (1986) is concerned with the causal significance of culture and refutes the widely accepted notion that culture influences the values of a group of people. Instead, Swidler states that the values of groups can change while the culture stays the same. The causal significance of culture, then, is found in the way it shapes strategies of action that persist over time. This representation of culture and cultural tools is static and observable and classifies Swidler’s framework as a modernist approach to the study of culture. Modernism assumes that a reality exists that can be discovered through language, observation and reason (Bloland, 2000; Gergen, 2000). Modernism is considered to advance middle-class values and ideas of progress that benefit those who sustain the culture and relegate others to the margins of society (Bloland, 2000). Indeed, the role of higher education in preparing citizens and promoting democracy is considered a modernist objective that, despite the positive language of emancipation and liberation, has resulted in negative consequences for certain groups of people (Bloland, 2005).
Postmodern perspectives of organizations, on the other hand, are focused on the “uncertainty, ambiguity, and contradiction” present within them (Bloland, 2000, p. 579). Postmodern organization research asserts that the meanings of words constantly change and uses the critical practice of deconstruction to “take apart the meanings of that which has been socially constructed” (Goodall, 1993, p. 27) and to address issues of power and hierarchy. Because postmodern perspectives illuminate that which is contradictory and ambiguous, it is difficult to build postmodern theory and instructive to regard postmodernism as an “intellectual trend or condition” (Bloland, 2005, p. 122). Researchers suggest, however, that a critical understanding of organizational culture may help to redistribute information control in organizations and redefine power relations among organizational members.

Conclusions

Higher education institutions have traditionally been and continue to be committed to the development of responsible citizens. Civic responsibility is multi-dimensional, and the impacts of higher education in each of these dimensions have been examined in the literature. Scholars are just beginning, however, to acknowledge that significant linkages likely exist between institutional culture and civic responsibility development. The field of organization studies offers several options for how to consider and conduct research on organizational culture. Conceptual frameworks such as Swidler’s (1986) allow studies such as this one to connect civic responsibility and culture in a way that moves beyond cursory observations and descriptions and into useful and applicable knowledge.
CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY

This chapter provides an explanation of the use of qualitative research methodology as well as of data collection methods and analysis techniques used both for the individual sites and in the cross-site analysis. The Internal Review Board (IRB) documents, interview protocol, student questionnaire, and site summary response form discussed herein are included in the Appendix.

Study Overview and Purpose

Recent studies claim that undergraduate education and the development of civic responsibility, in specific, are not priorities at most research universities (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1998; Ehrlich, 2003; Walshok, 2000). Some argue that research universities have not considered fully how their missions impact undergraduate education. Instead, universities passively accept the model of undergraduate education that is successful for liberal arts schools, which are more intimate and dissimilar settings from research universities (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1998). Research universities in particular have a significant challenge in addressing civic responsibility, as with any other goal, because of their large size and the presence of many subcultures (Checkoway, 2001). Additionally, research universities increasingly exhibit marketlike behaviors that lessen the focus on undergraduate education in general (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). Ehrlich (2003) recommends that institutions help develop civic responsibility in students by making this an explicit goal to be accomplished through three venues: the curriculum, extracurricular activities, and the campus culture. A culture supportive of civic responsibility would infuse values such as honesty,
open-mindedness and respect for others in its symbols, honor codes, and other cultural routines and practices (Ehrlich, 2003). In their in-depth study of undergraduate civic education at twelve institutions of diverse types, including research universities, Colby et al. (2003) cite examples of how the culture and symbols at these institutions reflect commitment to civic responsibility. Yet, these scholars did not employ a theoretical framework in understanding the culture for civic responsibility at their study institutions, nor did any of the cultural examples in their book come from the two research institutions included in the study.

The purposes of this study are to describe ideologies and cultural forms that address civic responsibility and also to move beyond description into a theory-based understanding of the findings. As such, there are three research questions.

(1) What are the ideologies regarding civic responsibility at two research universities, as described and interpreted by faculty, staff and students?

(2) How do these two research universities employ their cultural “tool kits” as a bridge between ideology and action?

(3) How can the concepts of ideology and culture be useful in understanding variations in institutional approaches to undergraduate civic responsibility?

Methodology

Qualitative research methods, founded in sociology and anthropology, are appropriate for studies where the researcher goes to another setting to study the culture and habits of that society or group (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998). Ethnographies, or descriptions of cultures, are the works that traditionally result from this type of study (for an example in higher education, Moffatt, 1989). Ethnographic methods are often employed in “ethnographically informed” investigations that focus only on specific aspects of a culture or that require more expediency
than the traditional ethnographic practice of long-term immersion in a society (Wolcott, 1999). Ethnographic methods include participant observation, interviews, and document analysis, which Wolcott terms respectively as experiencing, enquiring, and examining. These methods of research, all utilized in this study, are useful in describing a culture and understanding complex societies, such as schools (Spradley, 1980). Additionally, Shaw and London (2001) set a precedent for the use of these same methods with Swidler’s framework of analysis in their study of the transfer function at community colleges.

Study Approval

This research was approved by the Internal Review Board (IRB) on May 6, 2004, and the IRB approval was amended on May 6, 2005 (see Appendix). The researcher’s original intention was to protect both institutional and individual anonymities in order for readers to apply the findings to their own situations instead of dismissing the findings as too particular and irrelevant (Childress, 2003). The IRB amendment allowed for an increased level of participant identification, a recommendation from individuals who reviewed the site summary of the first study institution, UVA. In accordance with Wolfe’s (2003) arguments, individuals who reviewed the interim summary of the UVA findings found the institutional anonymity to be awkward (UVA’s cultural tools are easily identifiable) and found the individual anonymities to distance the readers from the findings. Hence, at UNC, the second site, participants were asked for permission to use their professional titles to help further contextualize the data.
Data Collection

Site Selection

The two sites selected for this exploratory, multi-site study were the University of Virginia (UVA) and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC). Both institutions are research institutions, which are often targeted in reports that call for renewed commitment to civic responsibility (Boyte & Hollander, 1999; Ehrlich, 2000). They are also both public institutions, which are generally assumed to be more concerned with aspects of civic responsibility than their private counterparts. Hence, these two public and research extensive institutions met the classification criterion of this study (Patton, 2002). Additionally, these two institutions and their leaders have been recognized by national organizations and their studies for an outstanding commitment to aspects of civic responsibility (John Templeton Foundation, 1999; Princeton Review, 2005). Both institutions are also known for their founding stories, which are tied to ideals of civic responsibility. For these reasons, the researcher assumed UVA and UNC to be rich data sources for the study (Marshall & Rossman, 1999). Finally, both institutions were accessible to the researcher. Figure 3 provides additional details on the two sites.

The researcher had limited familiarity with each site before conducting the study. At UVA, the researcher knew one contact in a correlative graduate program and had no prior experience with the institution. At UNC, the researcher was involved as both a student in a course and as a visiting lecturer in a different course during the period of data collection at that site. Informal observations from these experiences were sometimes documented if relevant to the study but did not contribute as a main source of data.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>University of Virginia (UVA)</th>
<th>University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year of Founding</td>
<td>1819</td>
<td>1789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Charlottesville, VA</td>
<td>Chapel Hill, NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>during academic year when</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research was conducted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student body composition by</td>
<td>68.2% Caucasian</td>
<td>74.3% Caucasian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>race (1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; and 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; highest)</td>
<td>10.9% Asian American</td>
<td>10.9% African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research was conducted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student body composition by</td>
<td>54% female</td>
<td>58% female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender during academic year</td>
<td>46% male</td>
<td>42% male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>when research was conducted</td>
<td>(2003-2004)</td>
<td>(2004-2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-state undergraduate</td>
<td>69% (2005-2006), no cap on</td>
<td>82% (2005-2006), cap on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>composition of student body</td>
<td>out-of-state admissions</td>
<td>out-of-state admissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate schools and</td>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colleges</td>
<td>(largest), engineering,</td>
<td>(largest), journalism,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>education, commerce,</td>
<td>education, government,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nursing, architecture</td>
<td>information and library science, nursing,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>state appropriations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Founded by Thomas Jefferson, third United States President</td>
<td>First public university in the nation, originated in 1776 North Carolina constitution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2004, 2005b, 2005g; University of Virginia, 2004a, 2005a, 2005b

Figure 3. Demographic comparison of the University of Virginia and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill during time of study

**Chronology**

Data collection occurred at UVA from May 2004 through October 2004, beginning with a five-week stay at the campus. During that time, data were collected but also a
significant honing of the interview protocol, field observation techniques, and data
management practices took place. Data were collected at UNC between May 2005 and
October 2005. The researcher also participated in two classes at UNC, once as a student and
once as a visiting lecturer, which provided additional observation and student data collection
opportunities during the Fall 2004 and Fall 2005 semesters.

The data collection strategies for this study were aimed at answering the three
research questions (see p. 34). In order to answer the research questions, this study was
designed to collect information on ideology, culture and action within an organizational
context through participant observation of cultural forms, solicitation of meanings from
individuals and document analysis. Each of these methods have been employed in previous
educational studies to understand ideologies and cultural forms as conveyers of ideologies
(Apple, 2004; Biggart, 1977; Cormack, 1992; Ellsworth & Whatley, 1990; Freeden, 2003;

Interviews

Interviews can serve as a means of understanding a specific cultural group’s way of
doing and seeing (van Maanen, 1990) and also as the primary way to investigate an
educational organization (Seidman, 1991). Individual interviews allowed the researcher to
enter the life-worlds of staff, students and faculty on two campuses and to understand their
experiences and meaning of civic responsibility, both as individuals and as part of the
institution (Kvale, 1996). Another purpose of interviewing is to gain insights on the social
context of learning, such as the organization or units within an organization (Tierney &
Dilley, 2002). In this study, both setting and individuals were mutually pertinent in gaining
insights on ideology, culture and action. For this reason, interview data and field data were
combined to illuminate both the culture and the biographical particulars of the members’ worlds (Warren, 2002).

For this study, a semi-structured interview protocol was used and is included in the Appendix. A total of 30 faculty, administrators, staff and students across the two sites were interviewed regarding personal and institutional ideologies on civic responsibility. Figure 4 displays the numbers and roles of participants by site; since at UNC the researcher was allowed to identify participants by professional title, some examples from UNC of the types of professionals in each category are listed in parenthesis. Over half of the pool of interview participants were student affairs professionals, which is a limitation of the study. Participants also provided insights about campus events and cultural equipment pertinent to the study and identified future interviewees. Interviews ranged from 30 minutes to 2 hours in length. At both sites, initial contacts included administrators that oversee major events (for example, graduation, convocation), new student orientation, and the large student volunteer organizations that exist on both campuses. Through snowball sampling, an appropriate method for identifying information-rich informants in a setting unfamiliar to the researcher, those initial participants and each participant after them identified additional individuals to interview as well as events to observe (Patton, 2002). All interviews were tape recorded and transcribed. Participants had the opportunity to review their transcripts and offer any comments or clarification. This practice is referred to as member checking (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Interview Participants</th>
<th>UVA</th>
<th>UNC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mid- or upper-level student affairs administrators (Dean of students, associate or assistant vice chancellor for student affairs, orientation director, director of student union, directors of student activities, leadership programs and volunteer and service-learning efforts)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic or other non-student affairs administrators (Vice chancellor for research, Director of Admissions, athletics administrator)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student leaders (Student body president)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty (Chemistry professor)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total = 30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4. Position demographics of interview participants

Opportunistic sampling techniques (Patton, 2000) were also used to gather insights from participants, specifically students, at events observed by the researcher. This method was largely used as an exploratory tool and to test researcher understandings of events.

Observations

Field observation is an important method for exploratory research where little is known about the topic and where immersion in the setting is needed to build rich descriptions of aspects of organizational life (Marshall & Rossman, 1999). Public and administratively sponsored events were the main types of events observed for this research. These events provided opportunities for institutions to state and maintain their beliefs and values and to reaffirm their histories (Manning, 2000). Rites and ceremonies such as graduation or convocation are of particular importance as they provide “culturally rich occasions for intermittent observation” and afford access to the public (Trice & Beyer, 1984, p. 655). Rites
and ceremonies also link multiple cultural forms (for example, saga, heroes, and symbol) together in meaningful ways so that these events offer a rich context for studying culture.

A total of 12 public and enculturating events provided opportunities to observe information-rich cases unobtrusively. At both sites, graduation ceremonies, first year convocation, orientation sessions, campus tours, and admissions sessions were observed. Additionally, University Day events were observed at UNC, and at UVA, alumni weekend sessions and an honor induction ceremony were observed. Sensitizing concepts (Cormack, 1992; Patton, 2000) for these observations included the ideologies expressed in the content of messages and speeches, symbols used, the status and position of speakers and presenters involved, missing or avoided content, and perceived status of civic responsibility as presented alongside other ideologies. Field notes were taken for each event observed, and the handwritten notes were typed using word processing software as soon after the event as possible. These notes were coded and analyzed in the same manner as documents and interview text.

Additionally, other informal daily events were observed and documented. In total, the researcher spent 120 days between sites, with 35 days at UVA and 85 days at UNC. These informal observations were sometimes processed as field notes or were included in memos or journaling as appropriate.

Documents and Artifacts

Document analysis is generally viewed as supplemental to the data gathered from observation and interviews (Marshall & Rossman, 1999; Wolcott, 1999) but can become central in studies aimed at understanding the ideologies and culture of an organization (Biggart, 1977). Love (2003) argues that documents are key to understanding the language
and culture of a community and that the failure to include documents in research that seeks to understand students, faculty, or academic life may leave a significant gap in the analysis.

In total, 72 documents and artifacts were collected and analyzed; 43 were from UVA and 29 were from UNC. These materials included admissions literature, meeting minutes, reports from task force and strategic planning initiatives, web pages, student media pieces, annual reports, texts from speeches and programs from observed events. These historical, marketing and media-related documents were collected and offered perspective on institutional ideologies as well as on the groups and events under investigation. They also contained insights as to how research universities use cultural equipment to communicate ideologies of civic responsibility to the public. Per site, each document was given a filing code, and their texts were categorized and coded in the same manner as transcriptions and field notes.

Summary sheets and memos were used throughout the data collection periods at each site to note emerging themes and questions that needed further investigation (Miles & Huberman, 1994). These summary sheets and memos were not treated as text and categorized but were revisited during the analysis process and proved useful in coding and theme generation.

Data Analysis

Inductive data analysis strategies were used and followed closely the 6-step path suggested by Marshall and Rossman (1999). The initial analysis step involved categorizing the data into a matrix formed by crossing Swidler’s (1986) ideology, culture and action with the five civic responsibility dimensions developed for this study (see Figure 5). This categorization scheme was created early in the UVA investigation to help manage the vast...
amount of data. Pieces of data that could fit into more than one category were flagged but initially directed into one category, and data that did not fit into any category were separated into an “other” category and revisited later in the analysis process. Once categorized, the data in each category were coded by analytical themes. In vivo codes or phrases were used when possible in order to maintain the essence of ideologies and cultural tools expressed by interviewees at the two institutions (Strauss, 1987). For example, “University of the People” is a theme that emerged in CUL-COM, IDEO-COM, and IND-COM categories in the UNC analysis. As another example of themes generated, the ACT-COM category for UNC included themes such as “Student Action – Volunteering” or “Institutional Action – Applied Research.” The ideological, cultural and action-oriented themes that were identified from the coding process were condensed into the site summaries that went out for review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Knowledge and support of democratic values, systems and processes</th>
<th>Desire to act beneficially in community and for its members</th>
<th>Use of knowledge and skills for societal benefit</th>
<th>Appreciation for and interest in others unlike self</th>
<th>Personal accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional ideology</td>
<td>IDEO-DEM</td>
<td>IDEO-COM</td>
<td>IDEO-KNOW</td>
<td>IDEO-DIV</td>
<td>IDEO-PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual ideology</td>
<td>IND-DEM</td>
<td>IND-COM</td>
<td>IND-KNOW</td>
<td>IND-DIV</td>
<td>IND-PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural tool</td>
<td>CUL-DEM</td>
<td>CUL-COM</td>
<td>CUL-KNOW</td>
<td>CUL-DIV</td>
<td>CUL-PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>ACT-DEM</td>
<td>ACT-COM</td>
<td>ACT-KNOW</td>
<td>ACT-DIV</td>
<td>ACT-PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative examples</td>
<td>NEG-DEM</td>
<td>NEG-COM</td>
<td>NEG-KNOW</td>
<td>NEG-DIV</td>
<td>NEG-PA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5. Categories for within-site and cross-site analysis
Once the site summaries were composed, reviewed and in final report form for each of the two sites (Chapters 4 and 5), these reports were then used to accomplish a cross-site analysis (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The findings section of each final site report was reviewed line-by-line and categorized using the same categories shown in Figure 5. Categories were then reviewed using sensitizing concepts that were generated after the single-site analyses, such as noting the functional areas of individuals with certain ideologies or the specific events where certain ideologies were identified by the researcher. Miles and Huberman (1994) discuss the use of matrices to assist in the exploration and synthesis of cross-case data. Their discussion was useful and resulted in the generation of several variable-oriented and case-oriented matrices that consolidate information on institutional and individual ideologies, cultural equipment, strategies of action and the interrelationships between these three concepts that were found between the sites. It is the differences and similarities between sites which were illuminated by the matrices that are further described in Chapter 6.

Research Integrity

Hallett (2003) states that in developing case studies using a cultural approach “bias can be reduced by triangulating fieldwork with interview and archival data” (p. 141). Additionally, credibility of qualitative research is determined based on the conduct of the study and the approval of research findings by those who participated in the study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Lincoln and Guba suggest a number of measures to ensure credibility that were employed in this study.

First, prolonged engagement at each site was accomplished through regular visits to observe events identified by interviewees. Additionally, the researcher had two other
opportunities for prolonged engagement at the research sites: (a) a 5-week pilot stay at UVA in the summer of 2004 and (b) coursework three days a week at UNC in Fall 2004 and Fall 2005. Second, persistent observation of salient elements of the study resulted from interviewee suggestions for additional interviewees and events to observe.

Two forms of triangulation were used in the study. Triangulation of data sources occurred throughout the analysis of field notes, interview transcriptions, and documents. Triangulation of data collection methods occurred through the use of observation, participant observations, document analysis, and interviews.

Two particular measures, student questionnaires and site summary reviews, contributed to the integrity of this research. Student focus groups proved difficult to arrange at UVA, thus the researcher instead turned the focus group questions into an online student questionnaire (see Appendix). This method proved more successful and was used again at UNC to obtain student perceptions on beliefs and cultural forms related to civic responsibility. The questionnaire was sent to a database of student leaders at UVA and to students in two classes at UNC; one was a course for upperclass students where the researcher served as visiting lecturer, and the other was a first year student seminar taught by a member of the dissertation committee. A total of 18 students, 9 at each institution, responded to the questionnaire. The respondents from UVA were largely Caucasian and male, and the respondents from UNC were largely Caucasian and female. While these students represented a variety of areas and years of study, they are not intended to be representative of the student bodies at these institutions. At each site, this information was obtained after the analysis for each site was complete, hence the purpose of this step was to help confirm the findings. Students at UVA perceived the same dominant ideologies as the
researcher had found, but only one student mentioned Thomas Jefferson as a symbol of these values. The data did confirm the findings but deserve more attention beyond this cursory analysis.

After analysis for each site was completed, summaries of findings from each site were written separately to provide descriptions of the ideologies and practices revealed in this research. These site summaries were sent to a small number of individuals on each campus for their comment. Individuals contacted for this step were either identified several times through snowball sampling but unable to be interviewed due to scheduling and time conflicts, or they were interview participants who expressed an interest in being kept abreast of the results of the study. Six such individuals were contacted at UVA and two responded with their review comments: one was a faculty member and the other was an administrator with the Center for Politics. Five such individuals were contacted at UNC and three responded with their feedback: one was the Chair of the faculty; one was an associate vice chancellor of student affairs; and one was an interview participant, the executive director of the Johnston Center for Undergraduate Excellence. Similar to the student feedback, this information served to confirm and sharpen the findings, and the additional thoughts from the reviewers were addressed in the text of the final site summaries.

The raw data, coding sheets, analytic memos and both personal and methods logs were collected for any audit trail review (Bernard, 2002; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Miles & Huberman, 1994).

Bias Statement

The researcher, research methods, study sites and study sample all contribute bias in this qualitative research study (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994). The standpoint of the researcher
influences what is seen as data and how it is analyzed (Davey & Symon, 2001). Based on prior educational and personal experiences, this researcher believes that cultural forms are important conveyors of meaning and that higher education institutions have a responsibility in developing active and engaged citizens, which can bias the researcher to seek out evidence that supports these beliefs. Although some disconfirming evidence is presented in the findings chapter, a critical perspective on this topic was not the goal of the study.

The research methods employed, namely ethnographic methods adopted from the field of anthropology, may contribute to bias in the study as well. These methods favor the spoken word over the written word, sometimes to the extent that individual accounts elicited from artificial circumstances such as interviews are overused in analysis as opposed to observations of natural events in the field where meanings are interactively constructed (Davey & Symon, 2001).

Finally, the site and interview sample selections contribute to bias in the study. UVA and UNC are both public institutions with historical connections to their states that can influence decisions in areas such as student admissions and funding. Private institutions or those that do not share intimate historical ties with their home states may not have been assumed to have the same predisposition for responsible citizenship within the state. Finally, the use of snowball sampling as the sampling strategy resulted in an over-representation of student affairs professionals and their viewpoints and under-representation of faculty viewpoints.

Davey and Symon (2001) acknowledge that the inadequacies of qualitative methods in organizational culture studies have yet to be fully explored, yet these methods still appear to be ideally suited for study in this area. The next three chapters present and discuss the
findings related to ideology, culture and action at two research universities as identified through this qualitative research effort focused on civic responsibility.
CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

Introduction

An individual’s participation in higher education is thought to result in both private
and public benefits (Bowen, 1997). National conversations on these benefits have recently
shifted from a focus on private benefits, such as earning potential, towards understanding the
public benefits (Institute for Higher Education Policy, 1998, 2005; Kezar, Chambers, &
Burkhardt, 2005). Some public benefits of higher education attendance, such as increased
instances of voting and volunteerism, illustrate a heightened sense of civic responsibility
among the college educated (Bowen, 1997; Institute for Higher Education Policy, 2005).
Contrarily, other researchers have noted a sharp decrease in community engagement and
service in the years following college graduation (Vogelgesang & Astin, 2005).

Vogelgesang and Astin posit in the same study that it is important to understand the
“relationships between students’ own values and beliefs, their college experiences, and their
subsequent involvement in civic life” if institutions are serious about fostering civic
responsibility development (p. 2). The researcher attended to this notion by examining
specific cultural aspects of the college experience related to civic responsibility.

Komives, Lucas, and McMahon (1998) defined civic responsibility as “the sense of
personal responsibility individuals should feel to uphold their obligation as part of any
community” (p. 15). Specific aspects of citizenship that are considered to be within the
developmental purview of higher education are inherent in this and other broad definitions of
civic responsibility (Bowen, 1997). Five dimensions of civic responsibility that repeatedly
surface in higher education literature include: (a) knowledge and support of democratic
values, systems, and processes; (b) desire to act beneficially in community and for its members; (c) use of knowledge and skills for societal benefit; (d) appreciation for and interest in those unlike self; and (e) personal accountability (Association of American Colleges & Universities, 2002; Astin & Sax, 1998; Bowen; Boyte & Hollander, 1999; Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont, & Stephens, 2003; Ehrlich & Hollander, 1999; Guarasci & Cornwell, 1997; Patrick, 1991). Society at large is thought to benefit when, through higher education, individuals develop along these five dimensions of civic responsibility (Bowen, 1997).

Two ways that colleges and universities attempt to foster this development are through curricular and cocurricular initiatives. Two such examples are required diversity appreciation courses and service-learning initiatives (Colby et al., 2003). The majority of scholarship on increasing university commitment to student civic responsibility recommends changes in just those types of procedures and structures, such as curricular and cocurricular activities, faculty rewards, student community-related research, supportive infrastructures, and community partnership development (Boyte & Hollander, 1999; Ehrlich, 2000). By supporting programmatic and procedural changes related to civic responsibility development, institutions communicate to students that this type of development is important. Institutions also have cultural means of communicating their values and what they believe is important (Bolman & Deal, 2003). Institutional heroes, special mottos, ceremonies, and visual images on a campus serve to communicate institutional beliefs (Clark, 1972; Manning, 2000; Trice & Beyer, 1984). With or without conscious acknowledgement, higher education institutions may be using these cultural tools to speak directly to students about civic responsibility or to guide their approaches to civic responsibility development.
Aspects of institutional culture have been acknowledged, both openly and tacitly, in recent literature and research as factors that influence the five dimensions of civic responsibility development. For example, the Diverse Democracy Project (2005) created a typology to help campuses identify and assess practices that will help students function among society’s diverse perspectives. Rituals and traditions are included in the typology as types of cocurricular activities and initiatives that campuses should assess; yet, the Project typology and supporting documentation do not discuss why rituals and traditions are included nor offer examples or recommendations. Colby et al. (2003) described how ceremonial events and symbols support and promote various civic responsibility ideals across institutional types. The main objective of Colby et al.’s study, however, was to understand curricular and cocurricular innovations that address civic responsibility: thus, the discussion of culture appears as a secondary discovery and does not move beyond a descriptive level.

Institutional culture is also an undercurrent in some discussions of student civic responsibility development. Students at liberal arts colleges are known to more frequently engage in civic activities than their counterparts at other schools (National Survey of Student Engagement, 2004). One assumption is that the culture of these institutions, which communicates the unique values and ideals of liberal arts colleges, contributes to this higher level of student civic engagement (Keat & White, 2002). Clearly, research on the relationship between institutional culture and civic responsibility has gained somewhat limited attention from researchers and would benefit from investigations using a theoretical lens.

The current ethnographic study thus contributes to the budding conversation on institutional culture’s role in the development of students as active, accountable citizens. The goals of this research were (a) to understand dominant institutional beliefs about the
development of undergraduates as responsible citizens, and (b) to understand how institutional culture contributes to unique institutional approaches to student civic responsibility development. The research presented here is part of a larger study that compared such findings between two institutions.

The context for this study was the research extensive university, the type of institution targeted by many reports and recommendations on civic responsibility (Boyte & Hollander, 1999; Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1998; Checkoway, 2001; Walshok, 2000). Research universities are thought to be key in advancing student civic responsibility development because of the large numbers of students that graduate from these institutions, as well as their perceived access to significant institutional resources (Checkoway, 2001). Nonetheless, research universities are challenged in this movement, as with any other, by their size and the existence of many competing subcultures. Research universities also increasingly exhibit marketlike behaviors in the quest for scarce resources needed to conduct research (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). These behaviors challenge an emphasis on civic responsibility development by lessening the focus on undergraduate education in general. Hence, the importance of a greater understanding of civic responsibility development in the research university context is illuminated by both the significant potential and significant challenge believed to be present there.

Conceptual Framework

Swidler (1986) purported a relationship between three concepts that form a framework for examining and understanding institutional behavior: ideology, culture, and action. She defined ideology as a “highly articulated, self-conscious belief and ritual system” (p. 279), a definition much broader than the classic Marxian notion of ideology as a political
or economic false consciousness. More recently, Decker (2004) described ideology as a characteristic manner of thinking belonging to a group, social class, or individual. This definition, broad like Swidler’s, emphasizes that both individuals and groups (that is, institutions) have ideologies. Decker further suggested that in the research of organizations, it is futile to study the ideologies of individuals but not those of the organization, or vice versa, because individual and institutional ideologies influence one another. This notion is reflected in the research methodology for this study.

Much organizational research is based on the definition of culture as shared values, assumptions, or behaviors (Schein, 1992). Swidler (1986) rejected the idea that culture equals values or behaviors; instead she defined culture as a “tool kit” of symbols, stories, rituals, special language, beliefs, art forms, ceremonies, and gossip (p. 273). Actions, then, are strategies or persistent ways of doing things over time.

Swidler (1986) set forth three arguments that were central to this study: (a) ideology exists to offer a unified approach to action, and this approach is accomplished through the use of the cultural tool kit; (b) differences in ideology will lead to markedly different strategies of action across institutions; and (c) individual and institutional ideologies will be influenced by the available cultural equipment.

Methods

Social constructionism suggests that knowledge is developed and transmitted through interactive human community (Crotty, 1998). Individuals belong to or come to inhabit various cultures and subcultures with established systems of collective meaning. Hence, social institutions influence individual behavior and thinking through a “complex and social process of enculturation” (Crotty, 1998, p. 79). Symbolic interactionism as a theoretical
perspective offers a way to interpret shared, social constructions of meaning while appreciating cultural and historical particularities (Crotty, 1998). Individuals in a social context communicate feelings, attitudes, and perceptions through language and other symbolic forms that researchers can pursue or observe. This theoretical perspective suggests that researchers must take on the roles and perspectives of those they study to understand how they make meaning of their lived experiences.

Ethnographies, or descriptions of culture, employ qualitative methods that are appropriate when researchers visit unfamiliar settings to study the culture and habits of individuals or groups in those settings (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998). Ethnographies traditionally result from a prolonged stay in a setting where culture is studied, but regardless of the length of stay, ethnographic methods are still useful in studies that examine any aspect of culture. The current exploratory research hence exemplifies a type of study that Wolcott (1999) refers to as “ethnographically informed” (p. 31). The purpose of this methodological approach is not to critique but rather to provide a useful interpretation of culture at a research university (Crotty, 1998).

Context

The University of Virginia (UVA) was selected as the site for this study because it is (a) research extensive, (b) public, (c) recognized as being exemplary in at least one of the five civic responsibility dimensions (e.g., John Templeton Foundation, 1999), and (d) accessible to the researcher. Hence, the site meets the criteria of being a research university and also serves as an exemplary case and rich source of data (Marshall & Rossman, 1999; Patton, 2002). In 2004, the researcher spent a total of 35 days at UVA interviewing, observing daily life, and acting as a participant observer in special events. When work
commenced at the institution, the researcher knew only one contact, a faculty member in a correlative graduate program, and had no prior association with the institution.

UVA is located in Charlottesville, Virginia, and was founded in 1819 by United States President Thomas Jefferson. Jefferson intended for the university to attract “public-minded people who take seriously their commitment to their community and their worlds, who are aware, active and involved” (University of Virginia, 2002). The university is consistently ranked among the top 25 public and private universities in the country by *US News and World Report* and for 4 of the last 7 years has been the top public institution (University of Virginia, 2004d).

In the 2003-2004 academic year, UVA had 12,907 undergraduate students and 19,643 total students in the student body. The majority of undergraduates enroll in the College of Arts and Sciences, but other colleges include engineering, education, commerce, nursing, and architecture. UVA also houses a medical school and a law school. The student body was historically male and Caucasian until the first African American male undergraduate received an engineering degree in 1959. The university admitted the first female undergraduates in 1970. In 2003-2004, the undergraduate student body was 68.2% Caucasian, followed by 10.9% Asian American; 54% of the undergraduate student body was female (University of Virginia, 2004a).

*Data Collection*

Interviews, field observations, and document analysis were all employed at UVA to obtain data on the ideologies, cultures, and actions related to student civic responsibility. Interviews are useful for investigating an educational organization’s way of doing and seeing things as perceived by its individual members (Seidman, 1991; Tierney & Dilley, 2002).
Interviews are also useful when both the contextual setting and individuals are pertinent to gaining insights (Warren, 2002), as is the case in this study with respect to ideological information. Two initial interview participants in student affairs were chosen because they work with large numbers of students, enculturate students into campus life, and work directly with one or more of the five dimensions of civic responsibility. These initial participants were then asked to identify other key informants on the campus; this strategy of snowball sampling (Patton, 2002) helps researchers locate key informants in an unfamiliar setting and was used throughout the study. A total of 13 staff, administrators, and student leaders at UVA participated in interviews between 30 minutes and 2 hours in length. Eight of the participants were midlevel student affairs professionals, 2 participants were student leaders, and the remaining 3 were upper-level academic or other administrators. One upper-level administrator held a full faculty appointment and another was adjunct faculty. A semistructured interview protocol was used. Questions centered on individual and institutional beliefs about civic responsibility, perceptions of student and institutional actions, and examples of relevant cultural forms. All interviews were tape-recorded and transcribed, and transcripts were offered to the participants for review and comment. Additionally, some informal conversations with students on the campus were typed up as field notes as soon as possible after the conversations occurred. Interview participants also helped lead the principal researcher to relevant documents and to events for observation.

The second method employed, observation, is a key technique for exploratory research where little is known about the topic and where immersion in the setting is needed to build rich descriptions of organizational life (Marshall & Rossman, 1999). Seven events were observed at UVA that served to enculturate students or communicate a public message
about the University. These events included graduation exercises, first-year student
convocation, a campus tour and admissions session, orientation sessions, alumni weekend
sessions, and an honor induction ceremony. Other informal daily events were also observed
and documented. Field notes were written in a log during the events and typed immediately
following.

The final sources of data, documents and artifacts, are not only key to understanding
the language and historical context of a particular cultural scene, but also they serve to
triangulate other data collected via interviews and field observations (Love, 2003). Forty-
three institutional documents were obtained, in some cases from interview participants, and
analyzed. Documents included admissions materials, meeting minutes and reports from a
recent strategic visioning effort, Web pages, student media pieces, and programs from special
events.

Data Analysis

Summary sheets and memos were written throughout the process to help synthesize
information or to denote emerging ideas requiring follow-up (Miles & Huberman, 1984,
1994). The interview, document, and field note texts were all analyzed in the same manner,
as follows. The contents of the texts were reviewed and categorized using two analytical
frameworks: first by Swidler’s (1986) framework (ideology, culture, action) and then by the
five dimensions of civic responsibility. Once categorized, data were coded and themes were
generated using inductive techniques. In vivo codes were used when possible to keep the
special language of the institution (Strauss, 1987).

Trustworthiness issues were addressed in several ways including prolonged stays at
the research site, triangulation of data sources and data methods, and participant reviews of
transcripts and site summaries (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). An interim site summary was prepared for comment by individuals who were identified via snowball sampling but unable to participate in an interview. Six such individuals were contacted at UVA; three responded with intentions to review the summary and offer comments. Two of these reviews were actually obtained. One review was from a faculty member and historian of UVA, and the other review was from a director at the UVA Center for Politics. In general, the reviewers agreed with the researcher’s interpretation of the ideologies and cultural tools related to civic responsibility that are present at UVA and offered some refining comments that are reflected in this chapter.

Additionally, student focus groups were to be used to test the researcher’s understandings (Morgan, 1997). Two student affairs professionals who worked with orientation and leaders of student organizations twice emailed their listservs of student contacts; however, no positive responses for participation were received. The researcher instead made the focus group questions into an online questionnaire, and the UVA contacts resent this to their listservs. Nine responses to the online questionnaire were received. Respondents were largely male and Caucasian but represented a range of years at UVA and academic majors. Clearly, these student respondents cannot be considered as representative of the large and diverse student body found at UVA, but their responses did lend support to the findings of the study. Their personal definitions of civic responsibility and interpretations of UVA’s approach to civic responsibility largely mirrored the findings of the researcher with one exception: only one student mentioned Thomas Jefferson by name as a symbol of responsible citizenship although each student verbalized some of Jefferson’s ideals, especially his vision for UVA students govern their own campus community. The student
feedback was used only to help confirm the findings and merits further attention in future research.

Findings

The following findings are presented in terms of Swidler’s (1986) framework. The cultural equipment at UVA is presented first, as the terminology and concepts of this discussion inform the subsequent findings on individual and institutional ideologies and strategies of action related to civic responsibility. Ortner’s (1973) guide was useful in recognizing which key symbols, rituals, myths, and other items in UVA’s cultural tool kit were important. A cultural tool was considered to be a key symbol if (a) participants said it was; (b) participants were not indifferent but rather had a positive or negative reaction to the symbol; (c) the symbol came up in different contexts; (d) the symbol was greatly elaborated upon; or (e) restrictions existed around the symbol.

Culture

At UVA, three cultural tools that communicated ideologies around civic responsibility were referenced extensively by both individuals and during institutional events. These cultural tools address all five dimensions of civic responsibility, but their existence leads to an emphasis on two of the five dimensions: (a) the support of democratic values, systems, and processes, and (b) personal accountability.

Thomas Jefferson. UVA was founded by Thomas Jefferson, a prominent national public servant and the third president of the United States. His vision for the university is summarized by a student affairs administrator:

One of the quotes of Jefferson that you hear frequently is that he wasn’t designing a good state school. He was designing a bulwark of the human
mind in the Western hemisphere, so his aspirations were you know, really quite high. I think one of the things that he was figuring out is that this invention of democracy or of a democratic republic was going to require a pretty educated citizenry, and so that’s where I think [the institutional approach to citizenship development] really does come from is that it’s a product of the enlightenment. It was not really born out of an agrarian tradition. It was born out of a sort of public citizen notion, the fact that if we’re going to have anything called democracy, we’ve got to have educated [people]. They’ve got to know how to run it, know how to use it.

Admissions literature further describes Jefferson’s vision for a “public university that attracts public-minded people who take seriously their commitment to their community and their world, who are aware, active, and involved. Above all, the University reflects his intent to produce leaders” (University of Virginia, 2002). Many participants discussed their expectations for students in this regard.

We’re talking about young people who are the potential next generation leaders. Our students are going to be governors, they’re going to be senators, one day there will be a president, there are going to be commanders. They’re going to be the physicians and the researchers who deal with medicine and they need to be able to deal with and work within a culture in which there is tremendous controversy…. Whether they sit on a school committee in their community, whether they run for an office at the state or national level. Some of them could be Supreme Court justices, I mean, who knows. They have the
potential, and that’s why I think that this environment is so important.

[Student affairs administrator]

Jefferson’s vision for the public university as a beacon for democracy and freedom is further manifested in the buildings of the Lawn. For example, the Lawn’s Rotunda, the original campus library, was described for students as “a symbol of a university free from sectarian constraints…the center of debate, community life, and faculty/student interaction” (Excerpt from fieldnotes, August 29, 2004).

Another part of Jefferson’s vision was the influence that the knowledge produced at the institution would have on society. Accordingly, first-year students are told at convocation that UVA was the first university to teach a curriculum of useful sciences such as medicine and engineering in order to prepare students to make change in the world.

As an institutional symbol, Thomas Jefferson himself was not without conflict. One female African American student noted that Jefferson, who owned slaves in colonial times, is not viewed by all UVA students with a sense of reverence and perfection. The institution used this conflicted image of the founder to communicate UVA’s current dedication to diversity and to having students develop an appreciation for others unlike themselves. At first year student convocation, the university president described Jefferson’s belief that some issues must be resolved by the young because they cannot be fixed in the current time. The president stated that the education students receive at UVA would be the key to improving relations in a diverse democracy in a manner that would honor the founder. Jefferson was thus used as both a positive and a negative symbol related to civic responsibility.

Student Self-Governance. Another key piece of Jefferson’s vision for the University was that “students take responsibility for themselves as constituents and representatives of
the University community” (University of Virginia, 2001). Student self-governance, as it is called there, is described by a student affairs administrator:

It’s not fundamentally different from what other institutions are trying to do developmentally, but our tradition here has always been, highly because of the caliber of our students we can do it, is we let students have a major stake over the most substantive elements of their university life. So the honor system is one that is entirely student run, …our judiciary system similarly, our residence staff system, Madison House…It’s a part of why we’re so developmentally powerful, because students are given major responsibilities. They don’t always meet it, they sometimes screw up, but of course we know that most people learn more from their mistakes than their successes. So we tolerate kind of a little chaos and a little mess that some other schools wouldn’t.

Although the concept of student self-governance was frequently mentioned at UVA both by individuals and by the institution, this term has come to hold different meanings across campus. The following three statements from different student affairs administrators exemplify the continuum of perceived involvement of University staff in decision-making processes that involve students.

I see [student self-governance] as more collaborative, that we all come to the table, meaning students as well as faculty members and administrators. We decide…what’s in the best interest of whomever in terms of the decision that has to be made, but it’s a collaborative educational philosophy. It’s not that I as the administrator have a hands-off policy and let the students do whatever
they want without…my perspective or my input, but that I have a voice in the decision-making process as well.

In most of our roles in students affairs we see ourselves more as advisors than supervisors, so the students are empowered to make most of the decisions and we’re there to advise them, to share our “wisdom” or our experience and really to make sure things are safe and legal and fiscally responsible. But questions like “are people going to come, is it going to be fun, is this the right night, is this the right time, is this the right venue,” those decisions are all truly made by students, and from those decisions they make come successes and come failures. We acknowledge that, that sometimes it’s not going to go as planned and that’s part of the learning.

My major criticism of the university is that student leadership is great but it can happen in a vacuum…we need to encourage folks to find advisors and resources and mentors….For our student leaders, how we encourage them is “you run the programs,” but if you don’t run it without any mentors or experienced people to learn from, you’re only learning from yourself and that’s not how you learn….So I think to say student self-governance without any nonstudent participation in that guiding, teaching, directing—we’re not doing a good service to our students.

The institution has acknowledged the difficulty in precisely defining student self-governance because of the changing nature of staff/student relationships (University of
Virginia, 2001). Participants echoed the struggle to be “nec pares nec parentes, neither peers nor parents” (University of Virginia, 2001, p. 15) and the need to constantly reevaluate the meaning of this special language. Nonetheless, many participants stated that the level of student direction and leadership at UVA was unique as compared to their experiences at other institutions. Several participants also expressed their belief that the student self-governance experience influences the future lives of students.

Because they’ve had those [governing] experiences and obligations here, they’re much more prepared to do it elsewhere. That’s one of the things our students, our graduates do tell us is both the kinds of ethical dilemmas that they face and the kind of responsibility that they have make them, and I’m guessing and I haven’t done this research, but you know, more likely to be engaged in their PTA, more likely to be on their local boards or active in society wherever it is. Our level of engagement, involvement outside of the classroom is very very high, and that’s really almost an expectation. That’s again part of what student self-governance is. So we define the success of an undergraduate career in really having a classroom and out-of-classroom experience, and I do think that that is great preparation for…doing well and doing good. [Student affairs administrator]

_Honor._ A report on the UVA student experience states that “UVA is synonymous with honor” (University of Virginia, 2001). One student affairs administrator explained:

We’ve got an overarching honor system that is student run that is about 150 years old that has somewhat mythical beginnings, but that does sort of inform everyone’s
experience to some extent. Certainly not the way it was doing 50 years ago, but every student that leaves this university will talk about honor in some way.

The mythical story referenced by this administrator dates back to the early years of the institution and is relayed to the students and the public during campus tours, orientation, and other events. Despite historical evidence that the honor system began in 1842 in response to a minor incident of drunken and disorderly conduct (Wagoner, 1986), the following version was given by a student guide during a campus tour.

[The guide described that the Lawn] was not always peaceful, and in the early years of the university, a professor was shot three times in the stomach by a masked person. He was able to get the mask off and saw who shot him. When students asked him who had done this, he commented that an honorable person who deserved to be at the university would come forward; otherwise, this person was without honor and should not be here. That was the start of the honor code. At first, it was more chivalrous in nature but emerged into what it is today—do not lie, cheat, and steal. [The code] builds a community of trust. [Excerpt from fieldnotes, May 11, 2004].

Honor has become a part of the daily rituals of life on campus as well, as described by this undergraduate on the Honor Committee.

[Honor] should be showing up in every class. The first day of school in an ideal world every professor would mention it. It would be on the syllabus….But really our focus is to make it part of everyday life. So, to make sure you have copies of the honor pledge in all of your classrooms, to make sure that if you’re walking down the corner at a lot of the businesses
you’ll see stickers that say “UVA honor” on the door next to the credit card stickers, basically saying that that merchant supports the honor systems and so it will run lines of credit for students or take out-of-state checks with only a student ID. I mean, that’s something that hits you every day. If we get members of the residence staff program, faculty members, the sort of people that you’re likely to interact with on a daily basis, to be thinking about the honor system and talking about it, that’s another way that it sort of becomes part of the routine, part of everyday life. Having signs in the library saying, you know, this is a community of trust, take it seriously.

Numerous legends are passed among students about the return of missing wallets, bicycles, and rocking chairs on the Lawn. These stories reference the workings of a community of trust at UVA built on the concepts of honor and integrity. One graduate student told of his experience in the UVA community of trust.

Before I transferred here, my father passed away [when I was attending my previous institution.] I was asked to bring in his obituary because I missed an exam. That would never happen here. They won’t even give doctor’s notes in student health because their feeling is you tell your faculty member you were sick and they believe you and that’s the way it should be.

The institutional emphasis on honor is considered a point of pride by the staff and the students. Similar to student self-governance, participants believe that the strong honor code at UVA influences students beyond their time at the institution.

We hear quite a bit from alumni who will report on their experience at the university and how they felt like having a strong honor system has affected
their ability to go out into the workforce and their ability to gain others’ trust
and sort of display their integrity. [Undergraduate student leader]

Students themselves and our alumni over and over again say that [the honor
code is] what makes this place different and that’s something that should
never change. When you come in, you’re expected to be a person of honor
and that will sustain you not only during your career here at the university,
but once you leave, and that should never change. That has been an enduring
value of the institution. [Administrator in athletics]
The presence of these cultural tools prompted participants to express the perception of
UVA as a unique institution. Many described that what exists as developmental programs at
other institutions is a way of life at UVA.

I think the students at UVA see holding each other accountable, governing
themselves, being responsible for your actions as a philosophy and not a
program. [Student affairs administrator]

Several participants expressed a belief that students choose to attend UVA because
they want to experience these unique cultural tools and live in a self-governed and honorable
community.

I guess [the institution’s] tradition and its reputation precedes it, so I think
largely [students] know the experience and they know what UVA is all about
before they get here. So, they are self-selecting themselves into this civic-
minded, student-led, honor-focused university, and so they are ready for that
experience, I think. They are eager to either take part or just be among the
number of students who are here and enjoying those privileges and those experiences. [Graduate student on Honor Committee].

Ideology

The influence of these cultural tools is further reflected in the characteristic manners of thinking (Decker, 2004), or highly articulated belief systems (Swidler, 1986), around civic responsibility at UVA.

Institutional Ideologies. Institutional ideologies on civic responsibility were communicated in a number of venues, including speeches at public events, language used in institutional literature and reports, and symbols and artifacts. Mission statements, such as the one described by a student affairs administrator, are one of these venues.

Our mission statement for my office is “fostering community to promote student learning, growth and citizenship.” We chose that word carefully…we ended up with citizenship because we saw it as sort of the broadly inclusive word and because even if you have no aspirations for anything in public life, we still want to be graduating good citizens, contributing more than they are taking.

These venues communicated that all five dimensions of civic responsibility are valued and considered important at UVA. One poignant example of this is the statement of core values of the student experience at UVA. Initial work to define the core values yielded four: academic rigor, honor, student self-governance, and public service (University of Virginia, 2001). Student action resulted in the inclusion of diversity and multiculturalism as a core value (University of Virginia, 2003b). Wellness and health was later added, and honor was expanded to include the concept of integrity. These six core values align with the five
dimensions of civic responsibility using language that is institutionally meaningful. The values were mentioned by many participants and were communicated to students at orientation.

Students have many other opportunities to learn institutional beliefs about aspects of civic responsibility. UVA admissions literature speaks to the institution’s historical commitment to attract and shape future leaders and public-minded individuals to be active and involved in their community and world (University of Virginia, 2002). At the graduation ceremony, called final exercises, the president articulated how UVA is a “unique institution…organized by its founder to be a small democracy” (Excerpt from fieldnotes, May 16, 2004). He also stated the importance of a UVA education in preparing students to be international citizens and to use the knowledge they gained to serve others, uphold justice, and improve society. Education and honor gained from the students’ experiences at the university were touted as pillars of strength for the entire nation. Students were told at orientation and reminded through everyday ritual that the university is a unique community of trust where the expectation of honorable action provides students with benefits, such as the ability to take unproctored exams or to leave their personal belongings in public areas without worry of them disappearing.

*Individual Ideologies.* Individuals at UVA were more narrowly focused in the way they considered civic responsibility. When asked to define responsible citizenship, participants primarily discussed the importance of participating in and giving back to the community, followed by discussion of student self-governance. They then generally defined civic responsibility as the acceptance of responsibility and consequences for one’s actions,
hence alluding to the Honor Code. The following statement from a student affairs administrator is typical of the responses given.

From my perspective, it’s really someone who just thinks about the broader societal implications of their decisions, that there’s that broad frame of reference and their actions and decisions have consequences beyond themselves.

Participant definitions of responsible citizenship were also logically aligned with their roles. For example, participants who worked with student conduct defined responsible citizenship in terms of personal accountability. Only those participants that belonged to or worked with minority groups specifically mentioned one dimension of civic responsibility, appreciation for those unlike oneself.

Action

The emphases on self-governance and on honor foreshadow the centrality of the campus community in student citizenship development at UVA. Participants shared metaphors for this special role of the campus community that describe campus as not only a place where students practice citizenship skills but also as a reflection of the larger society.

A lot of people see student self-governance as this is how we are training to become citizens…[Our director] has a quote like “affording them responsibility we allow them to be responsible, by affording them leadership we train them to be leaders.” So they grab on that and say you know this is our test bed, this is what we’re doing to learn how to be good citizens and be leaders. [Student affairs administrator]
I guess maybe a little democracy might be the way to describe it because they are always trying to get more students to come out and vote for the honor committee or for the student council elections. It’s just like, it’s sort of reflective of the United States. Only a third of them will go even though everybody’s complaining about how bad it is. [Student affairs administrator]

Use of the campus community as a test bed for citizenship development seems logical based on the ideals of student self-governance and honor that are prevalent at UVA. The model is perceived by staff to be attractive to students. Still, UVA faces challenges in the area of civic responsibility development. Student affairs administrators such as this one are challenged to initiate their own programs and ideas focused on civic responsibility development.

[Student self-governance] does make it difficult to launch new initiatives and whatnot. If they don’t bubble up from the students, their ability to take hold is really limited.

Student involvement levels vary in the test bed model. Because student affairs professionals’ actions are limited, their ability to address these discrepancies are minimized. Several participants described an overinvolvement phenomenon that is perpetuated by student self-governance.

There’s a lot of peer pressure around participation and involvement here, to the extent I think that [for] first-year and second-year students at times, it can lead to overinvolvement. It’s such a part of the culture and it’s such an expectation that if you’re not involved in 10 things outside of the classroom, what are you doing? Why are you here? In the same way academically you’re
competing, there’s this activities competition here that isn’t always good. From a leadership perspective it becomes third or fourth year, if you’re not the president of something or the chair of something or living on the Lawn you really haven’t made it in a UVA sense. The fear, and again, I think this goes back to the type of students that are attracted here, you know, they’re coming to be leaders, they’re coming with a sense of a bigger purpose, and it becomes a fear, peer pressure. [Student affairs administrator].

It seems like there’s this pressure here…among the students at UVA, undergrads…to volunteer. There’s this pressure to be involved, be active in student government, be active in student organizations and groups and going out and doing service projects and running benefits for UNICEF or whatever it may be. Since I’ve been here I’ve really noticed that there’s a pressure to do that whereas when I was an undergraduate there really was not that huge pressure to do anything. [Graduate student on Honor Committee].

Participants also described underinvolvement of the student body in the honor system. They perceived this underinvolvement to be caused by fear, hesitancy to act, and diverse student perceptions of what is and is not honorable action.

We know from surveys that a lot of students may not turn a student in on an honor charge, so to them its ratting somebody out who’s not honorable. So then maybe being a good citizen is protecting that friendship and not serving the broader community. We’re trying to educate a different type of
responsibility that some students may not believe in. [Student affairs administrator].

So the honor system is both an ideal and a problem….Many of us in the faculty are concerned that the students seem to have abandoned responsibility of their system by which I mean that the clear majority, more than 80%, I heard at a recent faculty meeting, of cases referred for student honor violations are initiated by faculty. What does that tell you?...Students relativize [honor] in the sense that, “Oh yeah, I know what’s going on, I’m not dumb or blind, but I don’t think it’s worth my getting involved, and I often don’t think it’s worth getting a person kicked out of the university, so I’ll just keep my mouth shut.” [Academic administrator]

Additionally, participation is sometimes lessened because the honor code is associated by some staff and students with ideals that are not civically responsible.

The ideal of an honor system I think has been established in some people’s minds…with some of the things that go on at UVA that may not be as attractive….Well, if the university’s been here since 1817, and it’s had an honor system since the 1840s and it didn’t let Blacks in until 1966 under court order, then you can understand how some people can associate the values of the institution with a certain class that was racist. These are hard things to say but I don’t hear people contesting them. It’s painful, so people aren’t always ready to discuss it. So the honor system is seen, I think, by
some people as a vestige of a kind of system that hasn’t always welcomed diversity. [Academic administrator]

Discussion

The findings generally coincide with the arguments set forth in Swidler’s (1986) conceptual framework. First, an ideological focus on student self-governance and honor offers a unified approach to actions on campus. This approach, namely treating the campus as a “small democracy,” is influenced by the symbolic founder, special language, daily ritual, and stories in the university’s cultural tool kit. At UVA, institutional culture facilitates student civic responsibility development through treating the campus community as a test bed. Hence, students practice civic responsibility skills within their own campus community, and these behaviors are assumed to carry over into their life experience outside of college.

Second, UVA as an institution has clearly come to value those dimensions of civic responsibility for which its cultural equipment is well suited. Personal accountability issues gained heightened importance subsequent to the honor code’s creation and the perpetuation of that story and other stories of the community benefits of honor. Service to the community, particularly the campus community, and participation in democratic processes on campus were ideals present from the institution’s founding through Thomas Jefferson’s example of public service and his belief in governance by the people. Structures and ideas that exist on many campuses, namely an honor code and student governance, are thus elevated as developmental tools at UVA because of the institution’s cultural equipment. Participants repeatedly and expressly connected the special language and stories associated with student self-governance and honor to developmental outcomes and goals.
At UVA, participants largely neglected to mention two dimensions in their personal ideologies of civic responsibility: (a) appreciation for those unlike oneself and (b) the use of knowledge and skills for societal benefit. This apparent exemption may be explained through further consideration of the methods, framework and findings of the study. First, the lack of individuals’ attention to the second dimension, use of knowledge for societal benefit, may be explained by the fact that most participants were student affairs professionals who may have regarded this dimension of civic responsibility as largely the developmental purview of faculty. Second, the lack of attention to the appreciation for those unlike oneself may simply reflect the strength of the cultural tools available at UVA and not a devaluation of this dimension. Individual ideologies largely mirrored the institutional ideologies at UVA, which were influenced by the cultural equipment. If different cultural tools were present at UVA and the institution had a longer history of inclusion, then other dimensions of civic responsibility may have been more dominant aspects of institutional and individual ideologies.

Finally, the alignment of an individual’s ideology around civic responsibility with his or her professional role does suggest that administrators, student affairs professionals, and faculty all have unique roles in holistic student civic responsibility development that should be recognized, understood, and encouraged.

Limitations

The focus on one research extensive university is both a strength of the study and a limitation. This approach allowed for a level of in-depth detail in the application of the conceptual framework. Nonetheless, the highly specific nature of institutional culture forbids the generalizability of results. Additionally, the interview sample was relatively small with a
majority of interviewees in the snowball sample being student affairs or administrative professionals. Hence, faculty and student ideologies are less well represented. Regardless of this fact, a degree of data saturation was reached within this small sample (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998) especially regarding the eminence of honor and student-self governance on the campus. Observations of student action would further complement the staff perceptions of their engagement in the test bed model and the application of the conceptual framework.

Relatedly, one site summary reviewer was correct to point out that UVA is home to many student organizations and academic centers that also contribute to the students’ sense of civic responsibility. The fact that many of these cocurricular entities do not appear in the findings does not discount their contribution. Rather, the study’s focus on ideology and culture only brought to the forefront those groups who are widely regarded on campus as working with civic responsibility ideals.

Finally, this constructionist research does not address the difficult issue of causality; that is, if and how student behaviors are affected by institutional ideology and culture. This university’s cultural tools encourage students to practice and develop civic responsibility ideals, such as personal accountability and democratic governance, within their own campus community. Certainly, the existence of an honor code does not guarantee that students will not cheat or commit violations against student codes of conduct. At UVA and other institutions, the transfer of these civic responsibility lessons and experiences after undergraduate study needs to be further examined.

Implications

This research reinforces Wildman’s (2005) argument to move learning research beyond the focus on cognition and toward the investigation of learning as a social practice.
Students learn when they acquire roles in new cultural contexts. Practice in these roles results in new skills for the students. The test bed model in place at UVA exemplifies these notions. The unique context at UVA encourages students to take on new roles of leadership and accountability in their campus community. The focus on practicing self-governance and honorable action leads to the development of new skills related to civic responsibility. Wildman suggests that successful learning is evidenced in improved social practice, and the researcher further suggests that for civic responsibility development, successful learning is evidenced in prolonged social practice. Additional research should consider the influence of UVA and other unique cultural contexts on postcollege civic behavior.

Relatedly, much of the discussion on learning and civic responsibility focuses on off-campus experiences through volunteerism and service-learning. This research implies that on-campus experiences can be equally important and useful in developing civically responsible students, as some campuses have also discovered (Hoffman et al., 2005). Because UVA’s cultural tools are shared by the campus community and are intertwined into various learning processes and goals, the student community is connected in a culturally supported developmental process. This type of shared experience may parallel those achieved through service-learning courses or other community-building activities that teach civic responsibility.

Research extensive universities can desire and work towards specific student development outcomes related to all five dimensions of civic responsibility. To accomplish this through a cultural approach, these institutions must critically examine their publicly expressed beliefs and cultural equipment to understand what is and is not communicated, and hence valued, in regards to civic responsibility. Additionally, a more general examination of
institutional cultural equipment will allow more effective use of these symbolic vehicles of meaning, expansion of their use, and possibly discovery of new institutional cultural tools in communicating civic responsibility values.

The findings at UVA offer several practical points for research extensive and other universities interested in elevating civic responsibility development through a cultural approach. First, know the institution’s cultural tools and consider how they relate to the five dimensions of civic responsibility. Cultural tools, such as architectural symbols or stories of individuals and their accomplishments, may already exist, but cultural tools related to civic responsibility may also be created. For example, an institution may develop a new motto by seeking to understand the public’s view of the institution’s role in the state or local community. Also, both positive and negative cultural equipment can offer lessons on citizenship, as shown in examining the entire life of Thomas Jefferson. Second, articulate expectations for the student experience that include developmental goals for civic responsibility. The statement of core values of the student experience at UVA touched on all five dimensions of civic responsibility while using institutionally meaningful language that students would encounter again. Hence, special institutional language will develop through this activity and will likely become part of individuals’ ideologies on civic responsibility as well. This second point also implies the need to remain cognizant of how institutional values regarding civic responsibility influence both personal and divisional beliefs and practices. A strong cultural focus on one or two dimensions of civic responsibility may serve to narrow both individual and institutional outlooks on this area of development. Third, include administrators, student affairs professionals, and faculty in these conversations to encourage a more holistic approach to student civic responsibility development. The natures of these
professional roles lead to concentrations on different perspectives on citizenship. Finally, support and encourage student leadership and initiative in efforts to understand how cultural tools can enhance civic responsibility development. Student participation can influence the identification of meaningful institutional symbols as well as the successful adoption of any resulting developmental practices.

Certainly, many aspects of the college experience will force students to assume new roles and exhibit new knowledge, behaviors, and characteristics of responsible citizenship. This research offers a rare glimpse at student citizenship development through a cultural lens. An institution that chooses to better understand its beliefs and cultural equipment related to civic responsibility may create, discover, or in any regard, more powerfully use a unique and culturally supported institutional approach that can connect the entire campus community in the efforts and rewards of student civic responsibility development. Thus institutions will be more equipped to help students understand and carry out their civic responsibilities both on campus and beyond.
CHAPTER 5: FINDINGS FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT
CHAPEL HILL

In sum, for more than 200 years, the people of North Carolina, Carolina’s academic leaders, and public spokespeople have shared a powerful narrative that emphasizes the interrelationship between the common good and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (Wegner, 2005, p. 49).

Introduction

The multifaceted connections between higher education and ideals of responsible citizenship have been common discussion topics during the last two decades (Ehrlich, 2000; Kellogg Commission, 1999; Kezar, Chambers, & Burkhardt, 2005). Both the actions of institutions and of the individual faculty, staff and students that comprise the institutions have been examined (for example, Boyer, 1990). Student citizenship development has received significant attention in this national discussion, driven by the notion that society in general benefits when undergraduate students develop as responsible citizens through higher education (Bowen, 1997). Five dimensions of civic responsibility are repeatedly discussed in higher education literature as key areas of this student citizenship development: (a) knowledge and support of democratic values, systems, and processes; (b) desire to act beneficially in community and for its members; (c) use of knowledge and skills for societal benefit; (d) appreciation for and interest in those unlike self; and (e) personal accountability (Association of American Colleges & Universities, 2002; Astin & Sax, 1998; Bowen, 1997;
Several reports have offered recommendations for higher education institutions to help them strengthen both institutional commitment and student development with regards to civic responsibility (Boyte & Hollander, 1999; Ehrlich & Hollander, 1999; Kellogg Commission, 1999). Often, these recommendations focus on updates and improvements in the curriculum and in co-curricular programming efforts (Colby et al., 2003). Additionally, research universities are often the central focus of these discussions and resulting recommendations (Boyte & Hollander, 1999; Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1998; Checkoway, 2001; Walshok, 1995, 2000). Research universities graduate large numbers of students and are perceived to have access to significant institutional resources; for these two reasons alone, research universities are often called to lead in national change movements (Checkoway, 2001). But the large size of research universities also serves as a barrier when trying to focus the campus on initiatives such as civic responsibility. An additional barrier for the civic responsibility movement is the preeminence of the research endeavor at these institutions, which may lessen the focus on undergraduate education and can encourage individualistic versus communitarian behaviors in the ongoing efforts to gain resources for research (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004).

Many research universities are responding to the call with increased attention to civic-mindedness (for examples, see Colby et al., 2003; Walshok, 1995). Tensions exist at the institutional level just as they do within the field of higher education as a whole. In these complex institutions, there are few common references related to civic responsibility that can be cited by biology professors, groundskeepers, and athletics directors alike. Organizational
culture can provide common references across campus entities (Bolman & Deal, 2003), but
the importance of this feature of organizational life in higher education has only gained
surface attention thusfar in the literature on civic responsibility (Colby et al., 2003; Diverse
that higher education has yet to realize the concrete usefulness of institutional culture. This
present ethnographic study aims to augment the discussion that connects culture to civic
responsibility at higher education institutions. The goals of this exploratory research were to
(a) understand dominant beliefs at a research university about its role in advancing civic
responsibility, and to (b) understand how institutional culture contributes to a unique
approach to civic responsibility at a research university. The single-site research presented
here is part of a larger study that compares such findings across institutions.

Organizational Culture Studies

Organizations can be described as “mini-societies that have their own distinct pattern
of culture and subculture” (Morgan, 1997, p. 129). Although the definition of organizational
culture has been widely debated, the field of study has traditionally applied anthropological
concepts to management science. The study of organizational culture has been categorized
into three main approaches (Hallett, 2003). Some organizational researchers describe culture
as beliefs, values, or assumptions shared by all members of an organization (Denison &
Mishra, 1995; Schein, 1992). A major assumption of this approach is that organizational
culture should be manageable since the same values are shared by all. Hallett (2003) argues
that the problem with this approach to organizational culture is that the idea of culture as
shared beliefs and values does not account for the conflict that exists within organizations.
This conflict is generated from both external influences on the organization and internal subcultures that do not agree with dominant ideologies.

Higher education literature has included the approach of understanding culture towards the goal of organizational management (Kuh & Whitt, 1988; Tierney, 1988). Although Kuh and Whitt as well as Tierney acknowledge the existence of subgroups that may conflict with dominant ideologies, both, in essence, believe that an understanding of culture can help leaders initiate appropriate institutional change. Further, these authors believe that the “central goal of understanding organizational culture is to minimize the occurrence and consequences of cultural conflict and help foster the development of shared goals” (Tierney, 1988, p. 5).

The second approach Hallett (2003) describes “removes organizational cultures from the subjective minds of actors and places it in public by emphasizing espoused beliefs, ideologies, stories, myths, rituals, ceremonies, and artifacts” (p. 129). Bolman and Deal (2003) describe culture, or the symbolic frame of analysis for organizations, as offering hope and confidence to those internal as well as external to the organization. Organizational rituals, myths and symbols are meant to resolve the confusion and uncertainty inherent in the ambiguity of organizations (Bolman & Deal, 2003). Culture is assumed to be public, outside of the minds of individuals, and hence empirically observable and able to be described (Geertz, 1973). Hallett (2003) argues that the shortcoming of this approach is its inability to account for organizational change. In other words, stories and myths that communicate a dominant public meaning can exist for years even though organizational practices may shift over time and become less of a reflection of these meanings.
This second approach has also been used or advocated extensively in the study of higher education to examine rituals, saga, ethos, ceremony, myths and other cultural forms (Birnbaum, 1988; Clark, 1972; Heath, 1981; Magolda, 2001, 2003; Manning; 2000; Trice & Beyer, 1984). Some studies of ritual and ceremony in education, and specifically higher education, urge researchers to be more critical of ritual practices and to research events beyond what is normally identified as ritual and ceremony, such as the campus tour (Magolda, 2001; McLaren, 1999).

Hallett (2003) posits a third approach to the study of organizational culture. In it, culture is defined as a “negotiated order that emerges through the interactions between organizational actors, an order influenced particularly by people with symbolic power” (p. 129). Members of organizations imbue certain other members with symbolic power, and there are always multiple individuals with symbolic power. This approach to understanding culture enables researchers to deal with both conflict and change in organizations. Hallett’s approach was influenced by the work of Swidler (1986), which serves as the framework for this study.

Conceptual Framework

Swidler (1986) purported a relationship between ideology, culture, and action. These three concepts form a framework for examining and understanding institutional behavior. Swidler defined ideology as a “highly articulated, self-conscious belief and ritual system” (p. 279), a definition much broader than the classic Marxian notion of ideology as a political or economic false consciousness. More recently, Decker (2004) described ideology as a characteristic manner of thinking belonging to a group, social class, or individual. This definition, broad like Swidler’s, emphasizes that both individuals and groups (that is,
institutions) have ideologies. Decker further supports the notion that in the research of organizations, it is futile to study the ideologies of individuals but not those of the organization, or vice versa, because individual and institutional ideologies influence one another (Jaskyte & Dressler, 2004). This notion is reflected in the research methodology for this study.

Swidler (1986) also rejected the idea that culture is equivalent to the shared values or behaviors that guide the actions of individuals in an organization. Instead she defined culture as a “tool kit” of symbols, stories, rituals, special language, beliefs, art forms, ceremonies, and gossip (p. 273). Actions, then, are strategies or persistent ways of doing things over time.

Three arguments set forth by Swidler (1986) were central to this study: (a) ideology exists to offer a unified approach to action, and this approach is accomplished through the use of the cultural tool kit; (b) differences in ideology will lead to markedly different strategies of action across institutions; and (c) individual and institutional ideologies will be influenced by the available cultural equipment.

Methods

Higher education institutions are homes to various cultures and subcultures with established systems of collective meaning (Crotty, 1998). When individuals come to inhabit or belong to these social institutions, their behaviors and thinking are influenced through a “complex and social process of enculturation” (Crotty, 1998, p. 79). This is the crux of social constructionism - knowledge is developed and transmitted through interactive human community. As a theoretical perspective, symbolic interactionism offers a way to interpret shared, social constructions of meaning while appreciating cultural and historical particularities (Crotty, 1998). Researchers can observe or pursue the language and other
symbolic forms that individuals in a social context use to communicate feelings, attitudes, and perceptions. To do so, this theoretical perspective suggests that researchers can only understand how individuals make meaning of their lived and shared experiences by taking on the roles and perspectives of those they study.

In order to provide a useful interpretation of culture at a research university, ethnographic methods were employed. Ethnographies, or descriptions of culture, employ qualitative methods that are appropriate when researchers visit unfamiliar settings to study the culture and habits of individuals or groups in those settings (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998). The current exploratory research exemplifies a type of study that Wolcott (1999) refers to as “ethnographically informed” (p. 31). Hence, the length of stay and targeted research questions were atypical of a traditional ethnography, but the ethnographic methods were still useful in examining aspects of culture.

Context

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC), located in Chapel Hill, North Carolina, was selected as the site for this study because it is (a) research extensive, (b) public, (c) recognized as being exemplary in at least one of the five civic responsibility dimensions (e.g., John Templeton Foundation, 1999; Princeton Review, 2005), and (d) accessible to the researcher. Therefore, the site meets the criteria of being a research university and also serves as an exemplary case and rich source of data (Marshall & Rossman, 1999; Patton, 2002). In 2004-2005, the researcher spent over 50 days at UNC observing daily life, interviewing, and acting as a participant observer in special events. During the time of data collection, the researcher was also involved both as a student and as a visiting lecturer in two different UNC
Informal observations from these experiences support but do not contribute to the data used in the findings.

UNC originated in the North Carolina state constitution of 1776, achieved its charter in 1789, and is known as the nation’s first public institution of higher education. The constitutional provision for higher education, proclaiming that “all useful learning shall be duly encouraged and promoted in one or more universities,” is somewhat unique in the nation (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2005a, p. 7). The constitution also mandates that “the benefits of The University of North Carolina and other public institutions of higher education, as far as practicable, be extended to the people of the State free of expense” (North Carolina General Assembly, 2005, Section 9). Language such as this shows that UNC is clearly regarded as the State’s flagship institution with a special mandate to serve North Carolina citizens. In fulfilling these purposes, fully 82% of the undergraduate population is from North Carolina (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2005b). UNC has often been recognized by other national ranking publications as a “best buy” for affordable, high quality education (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2005b). Additionally, UNC’s undergraduate and professional schools are consistently ranked among the top public and private universities in the country by *US News and World Report* (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2005b).

In the 2004-2005 academic year, UNC had 26,800 total students in the student body with 16,525 of them being undergraduates (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2004). All undergraduates enroll in the College of Arts and Sciences for their first two years for a core liberal arts curriculum. Students may stay in the general college or matriculate to other schools at UNC including journalism, education, government, and information and
library science. UNC also houses six professional schools in the health sciences as well as law and business schools. The student body was historically male and Caucasian until the first African American male undergraduate was admitted in 1955 and the first female undergraduates in 1963 (Courtright, 1997; University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2005c). In 2004-2005, the undergraduate student body was 74.3% Caucasian, followed by 10.9% African American; 58% of the undergraduate student body was female (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2004).

Data Collection

The ideologies, cultures, and actions at UNC related to student civic responsibility were determined through interviews, field observations, and document analysis. Interviews provide insights into an educational organization’s way of doing and seeing things, as perceived by its individual members (Seidman, 1991; Tierney & Dilley, 2002). Interviews also prove useful in examining both the contextual and individual ideologies that are central to the study (Warren, 2002). Two student affairs administrators were selected as the first interview participants. They were chosen because they work with large numbers of students, enculturate students into campus life through their programming, and work directly with one or more of the five dimensions of civic responsibility. These initial participants were then asked to identify other key informants on the campus; this strategy, snowball sampling (Patton, 2002), helps researchers in an unfamiliar setting to locate key informants and was used throughout the study. A total of 17 staff, administrators, faculty, and student leaders at UNC participated in interviews between 30 minutes and 1.5 hours in length. Eight of the participants were mid- and upper-level student affairs professionals, 6 participants were upper-level academic or other administrators, 2 participants were faculty with additional
administrative responsibilities, and the remaining interview participant was a student leader. Questions in the semistructured interview protocol centered on individual and institutional beliefs about civic responsibility, examples of cultural forms, and perceptions of student and institutional actions. All interviews were tape-recorded and transcribed. Participants were given the opportunity to review and comment on the transcripts. Additionally, the researcher had ongoing opportunities to engage in informal conversations with students on the campus through her participation and leadership in two academic courses. Any relevant insights from these interactions were typed as field notes as soon as possible after the conversations or instances occurred.

Field observation was the second method employed. Observation is considered a key technique for exploratory research where little is known about the topic and where immersion in the setting is needed to build rich descriptions of organizational life (Marshall & Rossman, 1999). Five ceremonial events were observed at UNC that either served to enculturate students or communicated a public message about the University. These events included graduation exercises, first-year student convocation, a campus tour and admissions session, orientation sessions, and University Day (the annual commemoration of the laying of the cornerstone at Old East, and the day regarded as the tangible beginning of the University). Additionally, informal daily events were also observed and documented. Field notes were written in a log during the events and were immediately typed following the event.

Documents and artifacts were the final sources of data, some of which were obtained from interview participants or at observed events. Documents and artifacts are key to understanding the language and historical context of a particular cultural scene and also serve
to triangulate other data collected via interviews and field observations (Love, 2003). In total, twenty-nine institutional documents were analyzed. Documents included items such as admissions materials, task force reports, alumni publications, Chancellor speech archives, Web pages, student media pieces, and programs from special events.

Data Analysis

Interview transcripts, documents, and observation field notes were all reviewed and categorized into a 4 x 5 item matrix formed by Swidler’s (1986) framework (institutional and individual ideologies, culture, action) and the five dimensions of civic responsibility. Data were then coded using in vivo codes when possible to keep the special language of the institution (Strauss, 1987). For each dimension of civic responsibility, themes were generated using inductive techniques. Memos were written during analysis to help synthesize information or to denote emerging ideas requiring follow-up (Miles & Huberman, 1984, 1994).

Prolonged stays at the research site, triangulation of data sources and data methods, and participant reviews of transcripts and site summaries were some of the ways that trustworthiness issues were addressed (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Some interview participants, as well as other key informants unavailable for interviews, were invited to review and comment on an interim site summary. Five such individuals were contacted at UNC, and all responded with intentions to review the summary and offer comments. Three of these reviews were actually obtained: one from the Chair of the Faculty, one from an associate dean of students, and one from the executive director of the Johnston Center for Undergraduate Excellence. In general, the reviewers agreed with the researcher’s interpretation of the ideologies and cultural tools related to civic responsibility that are
present at UNC. The Chair of the Faculty particularly offered several refining comments that are reflected in this chapter.

Additionally, student focus groups were to be used to test the researcher’s understandings (Morgan, 1997). The difficulty in arranging these groups at the first study site, UVA, led the researcher to only seek student feedback through an online questionnaire at UNC. Two sets of students were approached to participate in the online questionnaire: (a) advanced undergraduates in a course where the researcher was on the teaching team and (b) first year students in a seminar course taught by one of the dissertation committee members. Nine responses to the online questionnaire were received. Respondents were largely female and Caucasian but represented a range of years at UNC and academic majors. Although these student respondents cannot be considered as representative of the large and diverse student body found at UNC, they did lend support to the findings of the study. Their personal definitions of civic responsibility and interpretations of UNC’s approach to civic responsibility largely mirrored the findings of the researcher.

Findings

Certainly, UNC believes it has a role in the development of responsible citizens, as described by the Chancellor.

We have educated generation after generation of citizens, government and business leaders, teachers, doctors, and journalists. And the University has grounded them not only in the academics of their chosen professions, but also the responsibilities and obligations that accompany citizenship in an American democracy. (Moeser, 2001)
The following findings, presented in terms of Swidler’s (1986) framework, present the cultural equipment, ideologies, and actions at UNC that are believed to support this statement. Cultural equipment is discussed first, as it informs the rest of the findings on ideologies and actions. Ortner’s (1973) guide was useful in recognizing which key symbols, rituals, myths, and other items in UNC’s cultural tool kit were important. A cultural tool was considered to be a key symbol if (a) participants said it was; (b) participants were not indifferent but rather had a positive or negative reaction to the symbol; (c) the symbol came up in different contexts; (d) the symbol was greatly elaborated upon; or (e) restrictions existed around the symbol.

Culture

At UNC, two cultural tools related to civic responsibility were extensively referenced by both individuals and during institutional events. Their existence leads to a primary emphasis on two of the five dimensions of civic responsibility: the desire to act beneficially in community and for its members, and the support of democratic values, systems, and processes. Secondary emphases related to these cultural tools are also discussed.

“University of the people.” In 1993, at the bicentennial celebration of the university, UNC graduate and journalist Charles Kuralt spoke the following words:

“What is it that binds us to this place as to no other? It is not the well or the bell or the stone walls. Or the crisp October nights or the memory of dogwoods blooming. Our loyalty is not only to William Richardson Davie, though we are proud of what he did 200 years ago today. Nor even to Dean Smith, though we are proud of what he did last March. No, our love for this
place is based on the fact that it is, as it was meant to be, the University of the people” (Tepper, 1998, p. 219).

This special language, “University of the people,” was cited by most participants as an important part of the culture at UNC that conveys institutional beliefs about civic responsibility. As such, the meaning behind this language was twofold for participants. First, for most participants the phrase connotes the special connection between UNC, the nation’s first public institution, and the citizens of North Carolina whose foresight called for its founding. Participants often recalled the words of prominent figures in institutional and state history who emphasized this connection.

If you look at some of the people in the early part of the 20th century, Edward Kidder Graham, saying ‘If you have a problem, write to the university and we’ll help.’ That was a serious offer. [Executive Associate Provost]

We talk about Edward Kidder Graham, who was President in 1916, and he had two lines that are often quoted…one was write to the university when you need help. So there’s a map of North Carolina and the public service the university did in 1916. And then the other was that the boundaries of the University are coterminous with the boundaries of the state. So really saying that we exist for the people of North Carolina. [Director, Carolina Center for Public Service]

Hence, the entire state is regarded as UNC’s community and area of service. Entities on campus, such as the student-led Campus Y, and certain faculty research projects have also come to symbolize this connection with the state and the way that UNC research and public
service is affecting the lives of North Carolinians. Consequently, a secondary emphasis of this special language is the use of knowledge and skills for the betterment of society.

Second, for some, “University of the people” alluded to a sense of egalitarianism. This notion was regarded as both within the low stone walls that form the boundaries of the institution and beyond those walls. As the Director of Admissions stated,

The other way that [symbol] plays out is that one student is not necessarily better than another. They may be better in some things, but they are still students. They have more in common than they’re not the same, and they have an equal claim on the resources of this place.

He later spoke more to the perceived regard in which the people of the state of North Carolina hold UNC, namely “this notion that people at Carolina are just folks who are really good at something but they are just folks.”

Eminence of Fundamental Rights. The knowledge and support of democratic values, systems, and processes was also emphasized at UNC through several stories, beliefs, and institutional figures. In specific, free speech, expression, inquiry, and assembly were often discussed by participants and through these symbols. One specific story cited by many participants was the role UNC played in overturning the state’s speaker ban law in the 1960s.

It’s amazing to me still the students at Chapel Hill, 18, 19, 20 year olds, they know about the speaker ban. You know, in the McCarthy era the legislature banned [communist] people from speaking on public property and so [the university] would have people, you know, sort of speak on Franklin Street over across the wall [that bordered University property], and students here, a lot of them can tell you about that. [Director of Admissions]
Participants also often cited their pride in the sometimes controversial book choices that the university has supported for its annual summer reading program. The summer reading program and the university’s defense of its book choices symbolize for many UNC’s commitment to free inquiry. This type of commitment led many to further describe UNC as a campus of activism and to discuss institutional figures like Frank Porter Graham who embody these ideals. Graham’s activism in issues such as racism and his commitment to help students understand their own power for change were often cited. The campus’s openness to freedom of beliefs precludes the need for the campus to be open to multiple ideas and viewpoints.

…Among students and faculty we are seeing increased interest regarding expressions reflecting a diversity of viewpoints in our daily campus life. It is natural that we should be having these conversations here in Chapel Hill, where, in fact, we have been in the spotlight and at the eye of the storm since our creation in 1793. Our University's history has been marked by the yeast of democracy, and we are very proud of it. This discussion is all to the good. It is healthy. It goes to our core values of Carolina — our genetic code — and the great traditions we have here with respect to academic freedom and the free marketplace of ideas. That is why we exist: to promote the free exchange of ideas….we must defend the right of those who have opposing views. That is the role of our academy and, indeed, the right of all of us as individual citizens…. Civil discourse is a core value at Carolina. The University's proper role is to increase knowledge and understanding — light and liberty. Lux. Libertas. (Moeser, 2004a)
Hence, this belief in the eminence of fundamental rights has as a secondary emphasis the appreciation for and interest in others unlike oneself, the fourth dimension of civic responsibility development.

**Ideology**

Institutional publications, speeches, and ceremonies at UNC all served as opportunities to observe the “highly articulated belief systems” or characteristic manner of thinking about civic responsibility at the institution (Swidler, 1986; Decker, 2004). All five dimensions of civic responsibility were mentioned through these venues. The mission statement of the institution, for example, states that UNC regards all five dimensions of civic responsibility as central to its work.

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. … To fulfill this mission, the University must:…extend knowledge-based services and other resources of the University to the citizens of North Carolina and their institutions to enhance the quality of life of all people in the state…(University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1994)

Still, one of the five dimensions of civic responsibility received more attention than the others, both from the institution and individual participants, as a direct consequence of the cultural tools present at UNC.
Institutional Ideologies. The dimension of acting beneficially for and in community dominates the public messages about civic responsibility at UNC. Namely, the importance of service to the state of North Carolina is often relayed to students and the general public. Students receive broad messages about the importance of public service, such as in admissions literature that explains “what makes Carolina unique is its exceptional balance of academics, public service, and fun” (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2005e). The student body president commented more specifically about students’ obligations to the citizens of North Carolina.

I think the main, the dominating message [about civic responsibility] here is public service in a lot of ways, and that message is due in large part, and should be in my opinion, to the taxpayers of the state who are subsidizing our education.

Faculty also advance the message through reports such as this one generated by the Task Force on Intellectual Climate (Conover, 1997).

North Carolina expects UNC-CH to help solve its most pressing problems – poverty, racism, illiteracy, violent crime, drugs – and it is our moral and legal responsibility, as the state’s premier public university, to do so.

Individual participants agreed that this aspect of responsible citizenship is most dominant at the institution. Relatedly, participants often expanded the message of service beyond North Carolina to emphasize more the importance of being involved in community. Participants, particularly in student affairs, described the dominant messages about citizenship in this more broad way.
The dominant messages that I hear include active involvement and engagement, and certainly a lot of that is civic oriented but it can be engagement in something that develops that person more than what they were. [Associate Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs]

Beginning at orientation, students are told that being involved is the “Carolina Way.” Groups such as the Campus Y and APPLES (Assisting People in Planned Learning Experiences in Service) were often mentioned as symbols for students that at UNC people are involved in the larger community. Participants also frequently mentioned student self-governance as an important way that UNC students become involved in their campus community, as well as practice leadership in a democratic model. Some participants, such as this one from the Office of Minority Affairs, offered more critical perspectives on what it means to be the “University of the People.”

One [message] that resonates clearly here is a commitment to the people. Chapel Hill prides itself in being the institution of the people. That’s what’s on our marquis, right? Well, what does that mean? Are we an institution that embraces all people? Well, no. We are a predominantly white university. Are we, as a public institution, allowing all students to come into our walls? Well no. We’re fairly academically competitive, so there are certain restrictions and limitations there. I would say that we do well at complying with what the State asks us to do in being a public institution and in that when the students do come to campus we create an environment for them that is healthy, responsible. I don’t think we’re doing it all that well which is why offices like mine exist but having said that, I think some of the key areas that
Carolina is doing its job with responsible citizenship, I think that we value community service and encourage that.

Knowledge and support of democratic systems, values, and processes followed as the second dimension of civic responsibility emphasized by the institution. A recent issue of the Alumni magazine recounted the story of the speaker ban law and stated “[UNC] has a special, historic role to play in the free expression of ideas. It has cast its lot on the side of a full-throated vision of democracy” (Nichol, 2005, p.45). Individuals agreed, often describing the campus as open to many ideas and to activism.

I think we’re known more for being a place of I guess political correctness, activism, all of that stuff. I think is what we’ve kind of been tarred and feathered with, but I think what we are is a really active, really vibrant intellectual community that is trying very hard to make space for every idea that is out there. [Executive Director, Center for Undergraduate Excellence].

Students at UNC often hear of the importance of free inquiry and free expression. At first year student convocation, the Chancellor told the students that UNC is proud to stand for light and liberty, the translated Latin words from the institution’s seal. He described for the students that liberty requires each individual to question and speak out and that these students are joining the traditions of debate, critical thinking, and the honest exchange of ideas at UNC. Hence, the democratic values most often discussed were free inquiry and expression.

In recent years at UNC, some students have disagreed that all ideas are welcome. Many participants spoke of this conservative/liberal tension but overwhelmingly discounted it as contrary to their observations.
There is a vibrancy in the way that people express themselves and express their values, and Chapel Hill has been criticized a lot in the last couple of years as being less open minded about conservative folks and especially less open minded about conservative Christians than it should be. I don’t know if its true or not. I tend to think it’s not, but I’m not sitting in the seat of those students so I don’t know what it’s like to be one of those students here. I tend to see people mixing it up pretty well. I don’t think people are shy here about saying what they think here and I also don’t think they are bad at listening to what other people say in responses. [Director of Admissions].

An institution that promotes free expression encourages the presence of many and opposing ideas. Hence, this dimension of civic responsibility was also closely tied to the dimension of appreciating and taking an interest in others who are unlike oneself, specifically in terms of personal beliefs and convictions. But all participants did not agree that UNC valued this dimension. Speaking specifically about racial diversity, one student affairs administrator said “I don’t see that the institution knocks itself out” while an academic administrator said “there are great messages about diversity, tolerance, freedom of speech and a kind of global neighborliness….welcoming others into the Carolina world and taking the Carolina world out to explore worlds that are nothing like what happens on campus.” Participants also held mixed perceptions about institutional ideologies related to other dimensions of civic responsibility. Regarding the dimension of using knowledge and skills for societal benefit, a few participants commented that students often heard messages about developing their skills but not about further using those skills for societal benefit. A
chemistry professor provided an interesting perspective on how this particular dimension intersects with the notion of involvement that is highly regarded at UNC.

I don’t know if we’re doing a good job explaining to young people how it’s possible for them to use what they’re specifically and uniquely good at to impact the outside world, outside themselves. I think we have this sort of laundry list of things that you should do. You should be a boy scout or do something at your church, or you should work in a soup kitchen and we’re not allowing people to be creative.

Individual Ideologies. When participants at UNC offered their individual definitions of civic responsibility, almost all of them centered around service to and involvement with the community. This definition from an academic administrator was typical of participant responses.

I think [responsible citizenship] requires active engagement and participation in the community and that means that you have an obligation and a duty to work in the best interest of that community even if you have to take an unpopular stance sometimes. It’s important that you contribute to your community and think about what’s going to be best for everybody in that community, kind of work in that direction.

This personal definition also hinted at democratic values. Although participants such as this one mentioned other dimensions of civic responsibility in their personal ideologies, these other dimensions were secondary and largely tied to their professional roles. This is consistent with the trends in individual ideologies about civic responsibility that were observed at UVA. Participants from student affairs often focused on community. A faculty
member defined responsible citizenship in terms of using skills to benefit society. The
director of admissions gave a very broad definition of civic responsibility that covered almost
all dimensions, just as the institution does in its admissions literature. Academic
administrators often mentioned actions such as voting and staying informed on current
issues.

*Action*

UNC has a unique approach to student civic responsibility development based on its
relevant cultural tools and ideologies. As the “University of the people,” institutional actions
at UNC are often intended to model responsible citizenship for the students.

*Modeling.* The Chancellor frequently described UNC as a model of responsible
citizenship, namely in the areas of appreciating both democratic values and individuals
different from oneself. Participants also described the institution as modeling free inquiry
and expression in its actions.

Our engagement with the state and the world will be incomplete, and we
cannot be a leading university, if we do not model as a community the
potential for people of diverse backgrounds and beliefs to live and work
together within a framework of honor, integrity, compassion, and mutual
respect. (Moeser, 2004b)

This University was created at the beginning of the American republic to be a
laboratory for democracy. We can show America how to have civil discourse
about difficult topics. We can have a campus culture where Gays and
Lesbians feel welcome, where faith-based groups and political conservatives,
as well as liberals, feel that their voice can be heard and respected, and we can do this without adopting speech codes or infringing upon the First Amendment or academic freedom. We can do this. (Moeser, 2005)

When you see the university stand up for the things like summer reading when they got a lot of heat, there’s hopefully some modeling of those sorts of things, that you can take positions that aren’t always popular but if you think they’re right. [Director, Carolina Center for Public Service]

In 2003, UNC initiated the Carolina Covenant, a program to enable students from low-income families to attend and graduate from UNC debt-free. This program was frequently cited by participants, during institutional ceremonies and in publications as modeling UNC’s commitment to responsible citizenship and fulfilling the legislative mandate to serve North Carolina citizens with affordable higher education.

The covenant sends a powerful message about Carolina’s core values, of its commitment to access as well as excellence. It expressed who we are. We are American’s first public university, and these values are in our genetic code. The covenant embodies what we proclaim to be, “The University of the People.” (Moeser, 2003)

The cost of education here is low, so the institution is walking the talk about being egalitarian…. This whole Carolina Covenant thing now, that’s another way the institution is walking the talk and sending that message of being the
University of the people. There are some things that the institution does pretty well. [Director, Student Union]

The institution takes actions to model civic responsibility through its academic programs as well. The University’s Entrepreneur in Residence and Senior Lecturer in Economics discussed how academic programs are influenced by the institutional culture around civic responsibility and improving the community.

We’re going to have a whole track in the entrepreneurship program that is social entrepreneurship [for] people who are interested in making a difference in the world. We thought that for entrepreneurship to be central to this university it had to include both commercial and social entrepreneurship or the whole initiative would not be perceived as congruent with the values of this university.

Conflicting Actions. Interviews often moved into a discussion of the climate for civic responsibility on the campus at that time. Several participants mentioned instances where they perceived that the actions of the institution did not reflect responsible citizenship. It is important to note that some of these perceptions were found to be inaccurate through the trustworthiness measures taken in this study. Even so, inaccurate perceptions are important, as they represent reality for individuals and guide individual behavior and expectations (Peterson & Spencer, 2000). As a research extensive university, UNC values and rewards excellence in research. Faculty research is often highlighted in speeches and publications out of UNC for its benefit for the citizens of North Carolina, the nation, and the world. Despite the cultural emphasis on service to the state, some participants described that this is likely not
the true motivation for most faculty research. Other cultural factors may be stronger influencers of faculty behavior.

If you buy into the notion that scientific discoveries that help people are part of citizenship then I can come up with a bunch of [examples]. But I’d be sort of kidding if I said they were done out of altruism. They’re done because people are interested in good science and they do it and do a good job, and it turns out that it has a big impact. [Chemistry professor]

Additionally, faculty who do pursue research connected to service have a difficult time achieving reward and recognition for this work. As the faculty who comprised the Task Force on Intellectual Climate wrote, “The faculty will continue to view service as an “invisible mission” until the University treats service as a serious and tangible counterpart to teaching and research…” An administrator of service-learning programs also supported this idea.

Something that we’re constantly facing in our office is that tenure and promotion don’t involve public service in any way and in fact, faculty that do engage in service learning are often penalized because of the nature of service-learning, with small classes and, you know, departments are enrollment driven and FTEs and all that….The nature of the academy gives roadblocks along the way. [Student affairs director]

Other participants such as this student affairs administrator described institutional actions that seemed inconsistent with stated values at UNC.

I have a hard time accepting why the university is unwilling to take a stand on sexual orientation. If we espouse non-discrimination why not put it in a
non-discrimination policy and really advocate for that strongly? I know that political realities dictate that we have to tread the waters very carefully, but I hear statements of value and then I see inconsistent actions backing up or not backing up those statements of value, and it’s not an uncommon sentiment I don’t think. I see a lot of people frustrated by the powers that be failing to be 100% congruent with their value systems.

Another participant mentioned that UNC hired only one individual in the office charged with mobilizing university resources for economic development in North Carolina, a task clearly central to the institution’s role in serving the State. Finally, several participants mentioned the following example from residence life that occurred during the 2004 election.

I think we talk about responsibility to the community, but [UNC’s] messages are more communicated through actions and behaviors on this campus, more so than through language. Different messages are given from staff to students. For example, student government tried to register voters in the residence halls and across campus. The Director of Housing decided to enforce a solicitation policy and prohibited student government from registering students in the residence halls by going door to door. During such an exciting election year, I felt like that was a mixed message to students. Particularly because during student government elections, Housing allows for candidates to go door to door during specific hours on specific days. I would have thought they could have made the same arrangement for a presidential election. [Student affairs director]
Student Contributions. One important action UNC takes in advancing civic responsibility is through the admissions process. UNC expressly aims to bring in diverse students committed to service and leadership.

Few schools are more careful about choosing their students than Carolina…we invite students who want to be part of a diverse community where people with all types of backgrounds, ideas and achievements feel at home. [University of North Carolina, 2005d]

Because of this attention in admissions, participants perceived the students as a key piece in UNC achieving its mission to serve the state. Many examples of civically responsible actions offered by participants were initiated by students. They led the efforts in recent years to open a Black cultural center and to change the names of certain awards and buildings named for Ku Klux Klan sympathizers. Hence, some participants perceived that the institution is “getting a ride” off the students selected to attend.

Overall, the students and their actions were positively viewed in terms of responsible citizenship. Participants most frequently saw students acting as responsible citizens in alignment with UNC’s cultural tools and dominant ideologies of service to the state and protection of fundamental rights.

I see the vast majority of [students] speaking up and speaking out. With tuition increases that’s being talked about, our students have gone to Raleigh once or twice a week speaking to the legislators, the board of trustees, board of governors. They are making their voices heard. Students here spoke up about the fact that we needed a black cultural center, protested and also worked hard finding alliances and building alliances to get it to happen.
Students here raise issues about sports and athletics deals in terms of Nike and making sure we aren’t profiting off of sweat shops. At the graduate level students have a long standing program called Student Health Action Coalition and they have established free clinics in rural areas across the state, and they volunteer their time….So I mean, they do a tremendous amount. It is awe inspiring to me. Some days when I go home and I do my little bit in my neighborhood and my volunteer work once and twice a month and I look at what these students are doing and I think gosh, am I a good citizen mentor or model? I don’t know. [Director of Student Activities]

[I see] the constant number of houses that we build with Habitat for Humanity. The Labor Day and weekend activities that they go and participate in where they have not just one or two students, but hundreds. They have to turn students away, we can’t take any more with us to do these community service activities. [Dean of Students]

Participants still discussed room for improvement in terms of student civic responsibility. Students show little interest in issues that some participants thought would be enticing, including “leading change in their own culture,” issues with the town of Chapel Hill, and issues involving low-wage workers on campus. A student affairs director described that “they’re passionate about what they’re passionate about,” further indicating that students do not always move from involvement to roles of advocacy or encouraging community dialogue. Hence, these comments on ways to improve student citizenship often harkened back to the notion of involvement that is promoted at UNC. Another student affairs
administrator summed up the need to approach student civic responsibility development more holistically in order to capitalize on out-of-classroom experiences.

It’s the emotional, it’s the psychological, it’s the social experiences that I think cultivate that student to be a sound citizen, a sound person and it’s in that area that I don’t think the institution has figured out how to define it, how to create it and how to make those experiences so that a student really gets it when they graduate.

Discussion

The findings at UNC generally support Swidler’s (1986) arguments. For example, a key aspect of UNC’s cultural equipment is its history as the nation’s first public institution, created by and for the people of the state of North Carolina. The connection between UNC and the people of North Carolina remains an emphasis of the institution. Also, UNC has exercised its right to free expression and free inquiry in many public, and sometimes unpopular, instances during its 212 year history. These occasions where the university stood up for fundamental rights have produced revered stories and legendary figures that are still regarded and used on campus as motivators for action. Hence, as Swidler (1986) predicts, the institution has clearly come to value those dimensions of civic responsibility for which its cultural equipment is well suited: namely, acting for the benefit of community and supporting democratic values, systems, and processes. Individual ideologies on civic responsibility also aligned with the dominant cultural equipment and with participants’ own professional roles. Civic responsibility was largely regarded by individuals as two actions: speaking up on issues and helping out the community.
Also as Swidler (1986) posits, the presence of cultural tools at UNC advances a strategy of action on campus in regards to civic responsibility. The cultural equipment at UNC primarily focuses on the institution and its role in North Carolina and in our democracy. For this reason, when participants were critical or mentioned areas of improvement regarding civic responsibility, their comments were generally about actions of the institution and less frequently about actions of the students. Hence, the actions of the institution are central to the institution’s approach to civic responsibility and positions UNC as a “role model” in its civically responsible actions.

The campus whose cultural equipment lends it to the “role model” approach to responsible citizenship has some special considerations. With the cultural equipment of the campus focused on the campus’s actions, UNC can expect heightened scrutiny from its employees, students, and external agencies. Participants cited several examples when the institution or its representatives displayed actions they regarded as examples of irresponsible citizenship. These instances resound with Tierney’s (1991) desire to improve our understanding of “what occurs when cultural practices diverge from institutional ideologies” (p.56). When culture is considered as a negotiated order (Hallett, 2003), then the conflict inherent in organizations and the development of subgroups along ideological divides (Van Maanen & Barley, 1985) can be analyzed. Participants’ awareness of incongruencies between ideology and actions may have resulted from an unsettled period (Swidler, 1986) at UNC. During unsettled periods, ideologies are explicit, highly articulated, and directly govern action, so any actions counter to these ideologies would be widely obvious.

Nonetheless, the approach to civic responsibility at UNC raises questions in terms of the impact of culture on accountability. For example, what would happen if the “University
of the people” suddenly enacted an admissions policy that decreases access of North Carolina citizens to the institution? Such actions have been proposed there but have failed thusfar. Accountability is often discussed at the individual level and less so at the organizational level (Gelfand, Lim & Raver, 2004). High-profile corporate scandals such as Enron should prompt the public to ask whether aspects of the organization’s culture enabled such abuses of the public trust. The same types of questions may be asked about universities in cases where public trust is exploited. Further study along this strand can enhance our understanding of how culturally-informed approaches to civic responsibility direct accountability when either institutions or individuals within institutions act in ways that are deemed civically irresponsible.

Limitations

In describing the study of complex organizations, Czarniawska-Joerges (1992) paraphrases an analogy from Charles Perrow (1980) saying,

Organizations are beasts, said Perrow, which we as organization students see only on our visits to the zoo. We do not know much about their habitat and only slightly more about their behavior. What is more, we tend to visit only certain cages, and we believe that whatever we happen to see represents the whole of the animal world (p. 17).

She further conveys that organizational researchers building theories are like children who build sandcastles: each child considers his castle to be beautiful, but beach strollers see many different-shaped piles of sand along their walk. They are numerous, unstable, and built by toddlers. This research is no different; it does not claim to observe all of the cages at the zoo nor to have the built the archetypal sand castle.
For obvious reasons, culture studies are highly specific and cannot be generalized into practical applications for other institutions. Another limitation of this research is the prominence of the student affairs perspective, since the majority of interview participants held these positions. Although observations and document analysis served to support and complement the interview data, the study could benefit from additional faculty and student perspectives. Student insights were, however, sought via an online open-ended questionnaire and helped confirm the findings. Also, early in the study a student focus group was conducted to help provide direction for the researcher. Results from that focus group indicate that in-state students and out-of-state students may interpret “University of the people” differently and hence have conflicting perceptions about their responsibilities to the state of North Carolina. This notion directly points to a final limitation of the study, namely that it does not address the issue of causality. Understanding the cultural equipment at UNC and how it prompts the institution to act as a civically responsible role model does not necessarily preclude that UNC students are receptive to or influenced by this modeling. It may be logical to think, however, that student ideologies about civic responsibility would be influenced by the institution similar to the way campus employees’ statements were highly congruent with dominant beliefs. Additional research is needed to understand the connections between unique cultural approaches to civic responsibility and to student development outcomes.

Implications

Research to date on the culturally-influenced approaches to civic responsibility at two research universities has yielded two different models, namely the “test bed” and the “role model” approaches. In terms of actions of responsible citizenship, one approach focuses
more on students and the other more on the institution. Although culture research is highly specific, the findings can still inform other research universities who aim to better understand their culture in this regard or who seek to increase their emphasis on civic responsibility. For example, research extensive universities with a land-grant mission likely display strong connections to their states, similar to UNC. These institutions may be enlightened to examine the relative strength of their land-grant mission in guiding their approach to civic responsibility, as opposed to other cultural equipment present at the institutions. Additionally, since cultural equipment is assumed to be available to and understood by multiple campus constituencies, a culturally sensitive approach to civic responsibility initiatives and development may be more far-reaching and less resource-intensive than creating new programs, for example. This type of reflection may also help foster a consistent, strong and useful message about civic responsibility across the institution.

Finally, Swidler’s (1986) framework is useful in examining civic responsibility, and numerous other topics in higher education, but the analysis could be enhanced in conjunction with other analytical frameworks. Research universities are complex organizations. A campus approach to civic responsibility cannot be fully understood by this type of culture analysis alone. Other cultural frameworks in addition may provide relevant insights by examining facets of campus life such as faculty governance or staff development (Kezar & Eckel, 2002).

Additional work can certainly enhance what is known about the connection between institutional culture and civic responsibility in higher education. As a start, the framework utilized in this research can help institutions better understand why they behave in certain ways in terms of responsible citizenship. This research also primes institutions to expect
certain consequences based on their culturally-informed approaches to civic responsibility. Institutions or their students may be more openly criticized for certain behaviors related to those dimensions of citizenship central to their cultural equipment. Responsible citizenship at the institution may be narrowly focused on one or two dimensions, as directed by the cultural equipment. No matter what cultural equipment is present on a campus or which dimensions of civic responsibility are the foci of those tools, campuses that aim to change their emphases on civic responsibility will be more successful if their strategies are culturally coherent (Kezar & Eckel, 2002). This research provides a starting point for leaders who need to be in tune with those ideas and will help them avoid missteps in the process due to cultural misunderstandings.
CHAPTER 6: FINDINGS FROM CROSS-SITE ANALYSIS

Introduction

Although state support for higher education shows growth after years of decline, tuitions continue to rise at public colleges and universities across the nation (Fischer, 2006). The citizens who are forced to pay these higher tuitions then become primarily concerned with the private benefits of higher education (Institute for Higher Education Policy, 1998, 2005); for example, will a college degree ensure a salary that will enable one to both live comfortably and pay off college loans? The public benefits of higher education may be, for most institutions and the general public, secondary emphases at best and afterthoughts at worst.

Perhaps now more than ever, however, higher education institutions could benefit from a focus on public benefits such as responsible citizenship. The intended outcomes of higher education include an impressive array of benefits for the greater society, albeit they are difficult to measure and attribute to higher education (Bowen, 1997). College-educated individuals are thought to gain skills in citizenship, to develop their capacities for human understanding, to value ethics in the workplace, and to have a better disposition towards healthy practices. Beyond the obvious benefits that can be inferred from that list, society is also thought to gain from individuals’ development in areas of economic growth, national prestige, progress towards the solution of social problems and democratic governance (Bowen, 1997). It is difficult to identify another American institution that is charged with and aspires to such broad individual and societal influence. Certainly, the results are impressive when these colleges and universities are resourced to excel in an area, such as the
research enterprise. It is powerful to imagine the potential impact if civic responsibility were elevated as a focus across higher education institutions.

Some recent efforts have attempted to elevate this focus and advance the conversation on civic responsibility in higher education (Boyte & Hollander, 1999; Ehrlich, 2000; Kellogg Commission, 1999). Reports generated from these conversations include recommendations that target research universities, based on the thought that progress at these large, well-resourced and respected institutions can inspire and propel the national movement (Checkoway, 2001). Indeed, changes have been made as evidenced in the growth of organizations such as Campus Compact or in the efforts to increase recognition for public service scholarship among faculty (for example, Boyer, 1990). And, the increased conversation on civic responsibility in higher education provides a means for generating the five-dimension definition of civic responsibility used in this study: (a) knowledge and support of democratic values, systems and processes, (b) desire to act beneficially in community and for its members, (c) use of knowledge and skills for societal benefit, (d) appreciation for and interest in those unlike self, and (e) personal accountability.

Structures, goals, policies and procedures are often the first and easiest place to address the changes that are asked for in organizations (Bolman & Deal, 2003). Indeed, the civic responsibility movement in higher education has followed this protocol, generating recommendations that call for new programs, curriculum additions or changes, and other means that would require time, resources and often additional personnel (Boyte & Hollander, 1999; Ehrlich & Hollander, 1999). Those who hope to advance the focus on civic responsibility are obstructing their own efforts when asking universities to give more in a time of scarce resources. An underutilized and powerful resource, institutional culture, is
accessible and is beginning to receive some attention (Ehrlich, 2000; Colby et al., 2003; Diverse Democracy Project, 2005). Nevertheless, the role of culture as related to civic responsibility in higher education is poorly understood. This study aims to enhance that understanding by using a conceptual framework to investigate the influence of culture on civic responsibility at two research universities and to generate new knowledge in this area of study. Results are used to argue that institutions can approach civic responsibility initiatives in a powerful and resource-efficient manner if they consider the influence of their cultural tools through the framework used here.

**Conceptual Framework**

The connection between culture and civic responsibility was studied using a three-part framework from sociologist Ann Swidler (1986). Whereas some scholars suggest that culture is synonymous with values or influences values (Schein, 1992), Swidler instead views culture’s main influence in the persistent ways that people or groups behave or act over time. Her framework (see Figure 1, p. 5) illustrates the relationship between ideology, culture and action. Swidler defines ideologies as highly-articulated belief systems. Decker’s (2004) definition of ideology as a characteristic manner of thinking about something is similar and provided another useful way to think about ideology in this study. The second part of the framework is culture, which Swidler (1986) defines as the “symbolic vehicles of meaning” for a group or individual. As such, culture is easily observable in cultural tools such as symbols, stories, ceremonies and language. The final part of the framework is action, or strategies for doing things that persist over time. As seen in Figure 1, culture is the lynchpin that joins ideology and action together.
In the explanation of her framework, Swidler (1986) presents three arguments. First, ideologies exist and aim to offer a unified strategy of action through use of the “cultural toolkit” (p. 273). Second, differences in ideology across institutions result in marked differences in strategies of action. Finally, culture does in turn influence ideology in that institutional ideology will adapt to include values reflected in the cultural equipment (hence the double arrow in the diagram).

This study provided an opportunity to investigate the usefulness of Swidler’s (1986) framework while considering culture and civic responsibility together using a fresh exploratory approach. The research questions are:

(1) What are the ideologies regarding civic responsibility at two research universities, as described and interpreted by faculty, staff and students?

(2) How do these two research universities employ their cultural tools as a bridge between ideology and action?

(3) How can the concepts of ideology and culture be useful in understanding variations in institutional approaches to undergraduate civic responsibility?

Methods

The idea that individuals develop and share knowledge through their exchanges in human community is termed social constructionism (Crotty, 1998). In these human communities, a “complex and social process of enculturation” occurs where the behaviors and meanings of both individuals and the collective group are influenced by social institutions (Crotty, 1998, p. 79). Researchers can observe language and symbols and ascertain attitudes and perceptions of individuals in these contexts (Crotty, 1998). This type
of research, that aims to understand the meaning of lived experiences, is best accomplished using qualitative research methods (Patton, 2002). These methods allow for the interpretation of shared meanings while the contextual particularities are still valued. Specifically, ethnography is the study of the culture and habits of individuals and groups in a setting (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998).

The aim of this study was to understand ideologies and aspects of culture as specifically related to the five dimensions of civic responsibility and between two settings. Accomplishing these research goals did not require one characteristic method of most ethnographies, the complete immersion in either of the two sites being studied. Hence, this research study can be termed an ethnographically-informed study (Wolcott, 1999), meaning modified methods and practices of ethnography were still useful in addressing the aspects of culture that were of interest for this study.

Ethnographic studies typically result in rich descriptions about the realities of some bounded context (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Sometimes it is useful to examine more than one of these descriptive cases together in a cross-site analysis. Miles and Huberman (1994) offer two reasons why it could be appropriate to do so: (a) to enhance the generalizability of the findings and (b) to deepen understanding and explanation. Both of these arguments are relevant for this particular study. Some aspects of the findings cut across both campuses, which may then be viewed as more generalized results. But for other concepts in the study, the most interesting findings were in the differences between the sites, and in looking at them side by side, the explanatory power of the conceptual framework is enhanced.
**Contexts**

Two sites were selected for the study, the University of Virginia (UVA) and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC). As two of America’s oldest higher education institutions, these universities share several similarities (see Figure 3, p. 35). Both are both public, research extensive and appear in national rankings for both their undergraduate programs and for their professional schools. Additionally, both institutions have been recognized as exemplary in one or more of the dimensions of civic responsibility (John Templeton Foundation, 1999; Princeton Review, 2005); so, they were considered to be potentially rich data sources (Marshall & Rossman, 1999; Patton, 2002). Finally, both sites were accessible to the researcher.

**Data Collection**

Interviews, documents and field observations were the sources of data at both sites. The interview protocol was semi-structured and was designed to elicit information about individual and institutional ideologies, cultural equipment and both institutional and student actions related to the civic responsibility dimensions. Interview participants were also key in identifying or providing documents as well as information on or access to the events that were observed.

In total, 30 interviews ranging from 30 minutes to 2 hours were completed between the two sites, and participant demographics break down in the following manner: 16 student affairs professionals, 9 administrators (2 with faculty appointments), 3 students and 2 faculty. Interview participants were identified using snowball sampling methods (Patton, 2002). All interviews were tape recorded, transcribed, and the transcriptions were offered to the participants for review and comment. A total of 70 documents were collected and analyzed
between the two sites and included speeches from campus leaders, admissions literature, task force reports and minutes, strategic planning documents, programs from events and student media pieces. Twelve events were observed between the two campuses and included first year convocations, graduation ceremonies, orientation sessions, honor induction ceremonies, campus tours and alumni events. Field notes were taken during the events and typed immediately afterwards. Lastly, the researcher spent 120 days between these two sites observing everyday life on the campuses.

Data Analysis and Integrity

First, each site was analyzed separately. Textual data from interview transcripts, institutional documents and observational field notes for each site were categorized using a system that crossed Swidler’s (1986) framework with the five dimensions of civic responsibility (see Figure 5, p. 41). Once data were categorized for each site, the data in each category were further separated into themes. In vivo codes and phrases were used when possible in order to retain the special language used at the institutions (Strauss, 1987).

Measures to ensure data integrity were accomplished at the stages of single-site data collection and analysis (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). These measures included prolonged stays at each site and triangulation of data sources, but two particularly important measures were student questionnaire feedback and the site summary reviews. A pool of students from each site (student leaders at UVA and two classes at UNC) were emailed a link to an online questionnaire which asked open-ended questions resembling those asked of interviewees. The feedback from students at both sites served to confirm the dominant ideologies and cultural equipment at each site. Also upon completion of coding, a site summary was written for each site and sent to potential site reviewers selected from a list of prospective
interviewees at each site. Two such reviews were obtained from UVA reviewers and three from UNC reviewers, with reviewers being either faculty or administrators. Again, these reviews served generally to confirm the findings from each site. Some reviewers did offer comments where their experiences either refuted an interviewee comment or expanded the discussion, and these were taken into consideration and addressed in the texts.

These two site summaries are considered the final research reports for the two sites: Chapters 4 and 5 represent the final site reports. These reports were then compared in a cross-site analysis to gain a deeper understanding of the relationship between ideology, culture and action (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The reports were reviewed in a line-by-line fashion, and data was categorized using the same system as was used with the individual site analyses. Additional sensitizing concepts were used when accomplishing the in-category coding, such as noting the functional areas of individuals with certain ideologies. The exploration of data, analysis and presentation of findings were guided by Miles and Huberman’s (1994) discussion on the synthesis of cross-case data through a mix of variable-oriented and case-oriented matrices. The development of the variable and case-oriented matrices, as appropriate to the data, illuminated both similarities and differences between sites that are further described in the next section.

Findings

Findings presented in the following sections address the research questions and Swidler’s (1986) framework on the relationship between ideology, culture and action.

I
deologies of Civic Responsibility

The aim of the first research question was to identify the ideologies around civic responsibility at two research universities, as described and interpreted by faculty, staff and
students. Figure 6 contains representative statements from interview participants, institutional documents and field observations that illustrate how all five dimensions of civic responsibility were present within the two campuses in defining responsible citizenship.

Clearly, some overlap exists between the dimensions; for example, one who advocates for freedom of speech (that is, supporting democratic values) is simultaneously, according to those same democratic values, acting for the benefit of a community and its members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension of Civic Responsibility</th>
<th>Illustrations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and support of democratic values, systems and processes</td>
<td>“A responsible citizen is someone who gives of him or herself to society, public service, who is aware of and increasingly educates him or herself on the needs of society, the plights of those who would be denied fundamental freedoms and rights.” [Student affairs administrator, UVA] “We have educated generation after generation of citizens, government and business leaders, teachers, doctors, and journalists. And the University has grounded them not only in the academics of their chosen professions, but also the responsibilities and obligations that accompany citizenship in an American democracy” (Moeser, 2001).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to act beneficially in community and for its members</td>
<td>“I think a responsible citizen finds some aspect of the welfare of the larger community and devotes some time and energy to it. I think it is good to be informed and read the papers and talk to people, but it’s not enough. I think a responsible citizen has to find some path to active involvement in the community.” [Student Affairs Director, UNC] “We all live under this umbrella of the community of trust and because, you know, [he] lives in that community, we both live in it, I can trust him. I think [the honor system] is a big part of how UVA tries to send that message.” [Student affairs administrator, UVA]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6. Examples of institutional and individual ideologies in the five civic responsibility dimensions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension of Civic Responsibility</th>
<th>Illustrations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Use of knowledge and skills for societal benefit | “[Responsible citizens] are aware of what their skills, interest and talents are and employ those specifically to benefit people outside themselves.” [Chemistry Professor, UNC]  

“[The president] said the mission is both simple and complex, to expand and teach human knowledge but also ‘to teach the world how to apply knowledge to make the world a better place for all of us.’” [Excerpt from UVA orientation fieldnotes, July 26, 2004] |
| Appreciation for and interest in others unlike self | “…Carolina is a warm, friendly, and diverse community where people with all types of cultural backgrounds, ideals, and achievements feel at home. At Carolina, we open our hearts and minds to people from every corner of the world” (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2005f, p.1).  

“Diversity appreciation is perhaps the most important aspect of honor. There is no honor in excluding different people, for example those who are sorting our their sexuality.” [Excerpt from UVA honor induction fieldnotes, August 29, 2004] |
| Personal accountability | “[Responsible citizenship] starts with…the maturity to take responsibility for his or her own actions, his or her own development, his or her own decisions, so it’s that acceptance of responsibility.” [Administrator, UVA]  

“There has been a real press to encourage students to adhere to the honor code and to make certain that they are behaving ethically and with integrity and as representatives of Carolina in whatever they are doing.” [Executive Director, Johnston Center for Undergraduate Excellence at UNC] |

---

The mere mention of a specific dimension of civic responsibility by an individual in a speech or during a ceremony does not make that aspect part of the campus ideology around responsible citizenship. As Swidler (1986) and Decker (2004) describe, ideologies are highly
articated and characteristic ways of thinking about a phenomenon. Pieces of data in each category were not counted; rather, Figure 7 displays the relative presence of each dimension of civic responsibility in each row. For example, individual ideologies at UVA produced significant data in each of the two dimensions marked with “D,” followed in relative amount by the dimension marked with “M.” One dimension was absent (“A”) from all individuals’ comments, and another category contained only a few pieces of data (“I”). Several ideological patterns were selected from this representation of the data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Knowledge and support of democratic values, systems and processes</th>
<th>Desire to act beneficially in community and for its members</th>
<th>Use of knowledge and skills for societal benefit</th>
<th>Appreciation for and interest in others unlike self</th>
<th>Personal accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UVA (Institutional)</td>
<td>D from D</td>
<td>M from M</td>
<td>I from I</td>
<td>I from I</td>
<td>D from D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNC (Institutional)</td>
<td>M from M</td>
<td>D from D</td>
<td>I from I</td>
<td>M from M</td>
<td>I from I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UVA (Individual)</td>
<td>D from D</td>
<td>M from M</td>
<td>A from A</td>
<td>I from I</td>
<td>D from D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNC (Individual)</td>
<td>M from M</td>
<td>D from D</td>
<td>I from I</td>
<td>I from I</td>
<td>A from A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: (D)= Dominant; (S)= Mentioned frequently; (I)= Mentioned infrequently; (A)= Absent

Figure 7. Presence of civic responsibility dimensions in institutional and individual ideologies between sites

*Ideological analysis per site.* First, the emphases on civic responsibility dimensions at each individual site were examined. The following examples from UVA, one from the admissions prospectus and the other from a DVD on the honor code that is mailed to
incoming students before the first day of classes, show that civic responsibility was most often characterized there as either (a) knowledge and support of democratic values, systems and processes or (b) personal accountability.

[Thomas Jefferson envisioned UVA as] a public university that attracts public-minded people who take seriously their commitment to their community and their world…. Above all, the University reflects his intent to produce leaders… (University of Virginia, 2002)

Your enrollment at the University means…a further commitment to personal integrity. (University of Virginia, 2004b)

The next most frequent characterization of civic responsibility was the desire to act beneficially in community and for its members; this dimension was often described as an outcome or by-product of the other two dominant dimensions of civic responsibility. For example, if one demonstrates personal accountability by adhering to the honor code, then one is also acting for the benefit of the community and its members. This notion was often reflected in UVA participants’ reference to the “community of trust” that is established and upheld at UVA when students choose to act in accordance with the honor code and student code of conduct.

At UNC, civic responsibility was most often characterized as the desire to act beneficially in community and for its members. The following examples are a personal definition given by the Senior Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education and a series of statements from the first four speakers who briefly welcomed students and families at a UNC graduation ceremony.
I think that someone who is a responsible citizen is someone who is aware of and participates to the best extent of their own ability in their local affairs. I think that means they vote….That means you volunteer for a variety of organizations or if you don’t have the time that you write a check. [Senior Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education]

[The Chancellor] strongly encouraged students at all levels to give back to the community…. [The UNC System representative said] go forth and help others just as you have been helped…. [The Chair of the UNC Board of Trustees said] community work can catapult you into greatness and outlast your other legacies. You’ve done lots of service….Don’t stop. [The President of the Alumni Association said] I urge each of you to consider some public service, whether as a substitute teacher, on town council or in Congress. [Excerpts from graduation ceremony fieldnotes, May 15, 2005]

Secondary characterizations of civic responsibility were (a) knowledge and support of democratic values, systems and processes and (b) the appreciation for and interest in others unlike oneself. Unlike at UVA, these two secondary emphases were related to each other and not to the dominant dimension. For example, one who advocates for freedom of expression is simultaneously acknowledging that she appreciates the views of others who may hold a belief different from her own. The Executive Director of the Undergraduate Center for Excellence discussed this notion in terms of students actively arranging events where multiple viewpoints on a topic can be heard.
There’s that kind of overarching idea [among the students] that ‘even if I don’t agree with this [viewpoint], it’s good that they are [sharing] it,’ or ‘they should be allowed to [share] it.’

*Ideological analysis between sites.* A second pattern identified from the ideological data in Figure 7 is that specific dimensions of civic responsibility clearly receive more attention than others within the two institutions. The data in the previous section support this finding as well. The knowledge and support of democratic values, systems and processes was a dominant or frequently mentioned dimension of civic responsibility on both campuses, albeit with slightly different foci. At UVA this dimension focused on developing democratic leadership while at UNC it focused on supporting fundamental rights. Similarly, the desire to act beneficially in community and for its members was a favored dimension of civic responsibility, again with different foci. For UVA, this dimension was a secondary emphasis based on the dominant focus on personal accountability. When students are accountable for themselves and their actions, they form and support a “community of trust” where each student member acts for the good of all in the community. For UNC, the desire to act beneficially in community and for its members was the dominant dimension and generally related to community or public service actions such as volunteerism or service-learning. Conversely, the use of knowledge and skills for societal benefit received little attention at either campus while the other two dimensions receive mixed levels of emphases.

*Ideological analysis comparing site to individual participants.* Finally, a third way to interpret the representation of ideological data in Figure 7 is that ideologies of individual participants largely mirror their institutions’ dominant ideologies around civic responsibility.
The following definitions of responsible citizenship from participants at UVA and UNC reflect each institution’s characteristic way of thinking about civic responsibility.

I would say that [responsible citizenship] starts with one that has the maturity to take responsibility for his or her own actions, his or her own development, his or her own decisions. So it’s that acceptance of responsibility. [Athletics administrator, UVA]

I would say a responsible citizen in one who is invested in the life of their community, as broadly defined, and responsive to helping meet the needs of that community. [Director, Carolina Center for Public Service, UNC]

This finding lends support to Decker’s (2004) argument that institutional and individual ideologies influence one another. Following this argument, the existence of a correlation between institutional and individual ideologies also serves to confirm the findings of the dominant ideologies around civic responsibility at these campuses.

The lens of job roles and responsibilities offers another relationship between individual and institutional ideologies. Documents, speeches and other institutional sources of data at each site contained the dominant ideologies while also providing a broader view on civic responsibility that touched on all five dimensions. Individuals tended to focus on just the dominant campus ideologies in their personal definitions of responsible citizenship and on those ideologies closely related to their job responsibilities. Student affairs professionals most often defined responsible citizenship in terms of community and personal accountability while other university administrators such as the Admissions Director often covered all five dimensions, similar to the coverage given in institutional documents and
speeches. Figure 8 displays unique examples from individual definitions of responsible citizenship that are connected to job responsibilities, such as policy making, skill-related public service, and attention to diversity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role and institution of individual</th>
<th>Dimension of civic responsibility addressed</th>
<th>Quotation from interview transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student affairs administrator working with community service, UVA</td>
<td>Desire to act beneficially in community and for its members</td>
<td>[A responsible citizen] is someone who cares about their community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student affairs administrator working with honor and integrity initiatives, UVA</td>
<td>Personal accountability</td>
<td>Honesty and trust are the bedrocks of a democratic society, so those are probably the most important things to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Associate Provost at UNC</td>
<td>Knowledge/support of democratic values, systems and processes</td>
<td>[A responsible citizen is] someone who is in a nutshell informed and participates in democracy and is engaged to some extent in helping influence how policies are made, at least locally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry professor at UNC</td>
<td>Use of knowledge and skills for societal benefit</td>
<td>[Responsible citizens are] people who are aware of what their interests and talents are and who employ those specifically to benefit people outside themselves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Recruitment and Support Services, Office of Minority Affairs, UNC</td>
<td>Appreciation for and interest in those unlike self</td>
<td>I do believe that there are some key components…understanding and appreciating self, understanding and appreciating, or you could say valuing others, and then giving back.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8. Role-specific definitions of responsible citizenship
The Cultural Toolkit and its Uses

The cultural toolkit and its relationship to both ideology and action were the focus of the second research question. Swidler (1986) defines culture as “publicly available symbolic forms through which people experience and express meaning” such as ceremonies, language, stories and beliefs (p. 273). As expected, unique cultural tools existed at each of the campuses. Cultural tools and symbols were regarded as important if individuals identified them as such, but also if they invoked a positive or negative reaction, appeared in multiple venues, or inspired elaboration (Ortner, 1973).

At UVA, three cultural tools were often referenced in relation to civic responsibility, and these tools centered around two dimensions: (a) knowledge and support of democratic values, systems and processes, and (b) personal accountability. Thomas Jefferson, the institution’s founder, served as a symbol of American government, of a life dedicated to serving that government and the people of the nation, and of the importance of higher education in advancing and maintaining democracy. The stated importance of student self-governance relatedly stemmed from Jefferson’s beliefs that people should govern themselves and that UVA should be a place to hone those essential leadership skills for the future. The following quotation, which appeared in a booklet of Thomas Jefferson’s writings that was presented to first year students at convocation, discusses the importance of education in preparing people for self-rule.

Every government degenerates when trusted to the rulers of the people alone. The people themselves, therefore, are its only safe depositories.
And to render them safe, their minds must be improved to a certain degree.

(University of Virginia, 2004c)

The final cultural tool related to civic responsibility was a story about the shooting of a professor in the 1840s; although inaccurate (Wagoner, 1986), tour guides and guest speakers at events trace the origins of the campus honor code back to this story.

[The Guide described that the Lawn] was not always peaceful, and in the early years of the University, a professor was shot three times in the stomach by a masked person. He was able to get the mask off and saw who shot him. When asked by other students who did it, he commented that an honorable person who deserved to be at the university would come forward; otherwise, this person was without honor and should not be here. That was the start of the honor code. At first, it was more chivalrous in nature but emerged into what it is today – lie, cheat and steal. [The Code] builds a “community of trust.” [Excerpt from fieldnotes, May 11, 2004].

The two dominant cultural tools that existed at UNC were also related to two dimensions of civic responsibility: (a) the desire to act beneficially in community and for its members, and (b) knowledge and support of democratic values, systems and processes. The phrase “University of the People” was special institutional language that described the institution’s historical connection with and lasting commitment to the people of the state and public. Also, several stories, symbols and rituals of practice centered on the eminence of fundamental rights and the University’s role in protecting them. One of the key stories mentioned by several participants was UNC’s role in the 1960s in overturning North Carolina’s speaker ban law.
In the 60s there was actually a state law that you could not have…Communist speakers on the university campus. And the campus as a whole said, you know, that feels like a violation of the fundamental rights of a university and a citizen. So they invited a [Communist] speaker to come and speak, and he stood on Franklin Street and the students sat on the other side of the wall all the way to McCorkle Place to hear him. So he was on campus but he was not speaking on campus…people do still talk about that….There’s that kind of tradition, standing up for fundamental rights. [Director, Carolina Center for Public Service]

Beyond the identification and description of these cultural tools related to civic responsibility, three distinct purposes of cultural equipment emerged between the two sites. These purposes suggest the role of culture in communicating and influencing ideas.

*Cultural tools communicate civic responsibility ideologies to the public and particularly to incoming students.* It is difficult to escape Thomas Jefferson’s likeness and quotations at UVA, not to mention his vision of higher education made manifest in the buildings of the Lawn. He and his ideas were discussed at each of the events observed on that campus and present in most documents and reports such as the following from UVA’s president.

Thomas Jefferson viewed higher education as the means “to form the statesmen, legislators, and judges, on whom public prosperity and individual happiness are so much to depend.” He hoped to instill in our youth ‘habits of reflection and correct action, rendering them examples of virtue to others, and of happiness within themselves. [University of Virginia, 2003a, p. 16]
By upholding Thomas Jefferson as the main symbol of the institution, UVA acknowledged that Jefferson’s vision for democracy, higher education, and the role of UVA students in the nation are valued. Similarly, the presence of an honor code plaque in every classroom and the signing of the honor code on student applications to UVA communicated the importance of personal accountability within the UVA community. At UNC, the phrase “University of the People” is liberally used in speeches such as the annual State of the University addresses to segue into discussions faculty research and campus service endeavors that demonstrate how the institution enacts its responsibility to the state. As the Chancellor explained, “…being the leading public university starts with fulfilling our mission close to home. This University must continue defining its research and public service agendas around the needs of the state” (Moeser, 2004b). This notion of service to the state is communicated more broadly to students as the importance of service and the “Carolina Way,” as discussed in orientation sessions. These cultural tools communicate to incoming students what is expected of them in terms of responsible citizenship – leadership, honor and integrity, involvement and service.

*Cultural tools influence individual and institutional ideologies.* Swidler (1986) argues that people and institutions “will come to value ends for which their cultural equipment is well-suited” (p. 277). The honor code at UVA is an example of this phenomenon. Certainly, the first UVA students, “the young sons of Southern gentlemen,” brought with them to school a conception of honor, but honor was not solidified as a core value at UVA until after a time of student rebellion and misconduct in the 1840s (Wagoner, 1986, p. 164). The somewhat mythical story of the honor code’s beginnings is now engrained in the identity of the institution, and it believes “to America and the world, the University of
Virginia is synonymous with honor” (University of Virginia, 2001, p. 4). This example shows that cultural tools influence institutional ideologies. But according to Decker (2004), the influence of cultural tools on individual ideologies should follow suit as well, and this relationship can be inferred from the match between institutional and individual ideologies seen in Figure 7.

*Cultural tools illuminate actions that are appropriate and inappropriate in an academic community.* The cultural tools of these two research universities, as described previously in the presentation of the findings, teach lessons in appropriate and inappropriate behavior. At UVA, the prominent stories, beliefs and symbols related to civic responsibility discourage cheating, lying and stealing (and shooting professors) as unacceptable behaviors while they encourage student actions that will strengthen and sustain the campus community, particularly student leadership and involvement. At UNC, the special language related to civic responsibility encourages students to view themselves as part of communities beyond the campus and to do their parts to serve those communities. Examples from stories and campus heroes encourage students to “do the hard, right thing” (Director of Admissions, UNC) and to speak up when they see or experience injustices and denial of freedoms. The Assistant Director of Student Activities was one of several participants at UNC who mentioned Frank “Dr. Frank” Porter Graham, President of the University from 1930-1949, as one such symbol.

[Graham] consistently spoke up about issues that he viewed as needing attention and change that needed to be addressed. Racism was one he was way ahead of his time on. He also worked very hard to develop relationships with students and helping
them see the value in themselves and what they could contribute,…and I think
students recognize that still.

UNC’s cultural tools also demonstrate that fundamental rights apply to all people;
hence, it is inappropriate to not listen to individuals with viewpoints different from one’s
own or to not provide a space and opportunity for all such viewpoints to be heard. Students
learn about values and behaviors that characterize American public higher education: ethical
conduct of work, shared governance, public service and academic freedom (Bowen, 1997).

While cultural tools instruct about the ideologies of civic responsibility and
appropriate and inappropriate actions, they also set the stage for developmental strategies of
action on the campuses. For example, stories such as the following are circulated among
students at UVA by both administrators and each other.

There’s a story…of a student who worked with the Honor Committee who
left his bike out without a lock on it. It was stolen. He wrote a…letter in
the Cavalier Daily about ‘Please return my bike. I’ve had it since I was
ten,’ and it was on his doorstep the next day. [Student affairs administrator,
UVA]

Based on the cultural equipment available at UVA, students can infer that these
actions are unacceptable, but they also know that they will have to decide the consequences
for their peers. These strategies of action are the focus of the next section.

*Approaches to Undergraduate Civic Responsibility Development*

The aim of the final research question was to bring together the previous two
discussions of ideology and culture by asking how these concepts are useful in understanding
variations in institutional approaches to undergraduate civic responsibility. This section
connects the findings specifically to students by discussing the distinct approaches to student civic responsibility at each site that result from the relationship between ideology, culture and action.

The Director of Admissions at UNC had worked previously at UVA and offered this comparison between the two sites, which provided confirming insights to support the findings of the study. In his statement, the Director of Admissions alluded to the distinct cultural tools at the two campuses and their resulting distinct approaches to civic responsibility.

I think that Virginia is a place with a strong sense of commitment to the public good. The honor code is a high profile system, a higher profile thing there than the honor code is here [at UNC]. The notion that students are trained for citizenship and the University [of Virginia] exists to train citizens is the express mission [of UVA] at the undergraduate level….It’s articulated explicitly again and again and again and from setting to setting. That notion is not articulated as explicitly or consistently here [at UNC]. We don’t say that the purpose of an undergraduate education at Chapel Hill is to train people to take their rightful place as citizens in a democracy. I think a lot of the same values are behind the scenes or implicit. One thing that is true at Carolina that is not true at Virginia, I think, is that Carolina has a sense of obligation to the state, to the people of the state. I don’t think anyone would ever call UVA the “University of the people,” at least that’s my gut feeling….Virginia is training students for life in a democracy and Chapel Hill is more of a democratic institution.
Test Bed Approach: University of Virginia. Figure 9 shows the ideologies, cultural tools and strategy of action related to student civic responsibility at UVA.
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Figure 9. Civic responsibility at the University of Virginia represented using Swidler’s (1986) framework

The “test bed” approach is a culturally-informed strategy of action for student civic responsibility development at UVA. In this approach, students are responsible for governing their own campus and for deciding on consequences for each others’ actions through the honor and judicial systems. Students are encouraged to create new policies and programs in areas where they find current offerings lacking for the UVA community. These actions are supported by the historical example of Thomas Jefferson and the enduring ideals of honor and self-governance. The concept behind the “test bed” approach is to develop leadership skills in a small, model community that will transfer into the larger democratic society when the student leaves UVA. The high levels of student involvement and leadership in the campus community compel the faculty and staff to find their comfort level with and sometimes negotiate their welcome into student-led issues and activities.
Role Modeling Approach: University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Figure 10

shows the ideologies, cultural tools and strategy of action related to student civic responsibility at UNC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideologies</th>
<th>Cultural Tools</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible citizens work to the good of the communities that they inhabit</td>
<td>“University of the People” Historical Activism for Fundamental Rights</td>
<td>Show students what responsible citizenship looks like</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Role Modeling

Figure 10. Civic responsibility at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill represented using Swidler’s (1986) framework

The “role modeling” approach is a culturally-informed strategy of action for student civic responsibility development at UNC. In this approach, the institution is responsible for (a) making decisions and acting in ways that benefit the citizens of the state and supporting public and for (b) standing up for fundamental rights and freedoms of citizens within and outside of the university. Cognitive changes in students are expected as they observe these instances and make conscious choices to participate in and emulate them. Cultural tools are employed to assist in this development. Special language, when invoked, reminds the entire campus of its connection with the state of North Carolina. Annual events such as the summer reading program give the institution a chance to bring to the forefront issues of injustice that need to be examined. The concept behind role-modeling is to set a good example for students to that they will emulate these traits and actions while at UNC and beyond. A challenge with this strategy for staff and faculty is to move students beyond
participation and involvement and into understanding and advocacy. One student affairs director at UNC stated that “students are passionate about what they are passionate about” and went on to discuss that student activists often experience “tunnel vision” and lack the desire to turn their activism into constructive community dialogue.

The representations of these two models do not suggest that role modeling does not occur at UVA or that aspects of the UNC experience do not serve as a “test bed” for student development. Actually, several participants at UNC mentioned student self-governance as an important aspect of campus involvement and responsible citizenship.

I think the level of involvement the students have in the governing of the University [shows that civic responsibility is a priority]….I think when you have students that involved in the management and the function of the university, you’re going to have students who are activists and who see issues outside of themselves. [Dean of Students, UNC]

But, this topic received far less attention at UNC than those ideas shown in Figure 10. Hence, these figures are meant to show the strategies of action as based on the dominant ideologies and cultural tools found in this study.

Discussion and Limitations

Swidler (1986) is concerned with culture’s causal significance and refutes the idea that its significance is found in culture’s influence on values. Rather than culture influencing values, she argues that culture instead influences strategies of action and offers a poignant example of this idea using the “culture of poverty” (p. 275). Swidler refers to several studies which found that middle and lower-class individuals share many of the same values, including stable marriages, steady income and higher education. Nevertheless, the poor often
do not attain what they say they value. This supports Swidler’s idea that actions are not determined by one’s values. If so, she argues that the poor student who values education would take advantage of opportunities to assimilate to middle-class culture and go to college, but often this is not the case. Instead of values determining action, Swidler posits that “action and values are organized to take advantage of cultural competencies” (p. 275). To put this idea in the context of the current study, a student at UVA, when faced with a policy that she perceives as inhibiting for her peers, may form a student coalition and take a resolution to the student government. A student at another institution that does not support a culture of student self-governance may also want the same inhibiting policy eliminated but may never considers taking action herself because that option is not a part of the accepted skills or style at her institution. Thus, the enduring aspects of culture are not found in values, which may change over time. Rather, the enduring nature of culture is found in the strategies of action that persist for individuals and institutions.

This prior discussion on culture’s causal significance is restated in the first of Swidler’s (1986) three arguments that were central to and supported by the findings of this study: that ideologies exist to offer a unified approach to action, and this is accomplished through the use of the cultural toolkit. The test bed and role model approaches give site-specific examples that support the connection between these three elements. Her second argument is that differences in ideologies around civic responsibility clearly lead to different strategies of action for student citizenship development. The characteristic way of thinking about responsible citizenship at UVA is in the form of participation in democratic government and honorable action. Hence, specific campus experiences serve as “test beds” where UVA students can practice leadership skills and experience the freedoms of living in a
“community of trust.” The characteristic way of thinking about responsible citizenship at UNC regards the commitment to use the resources of the institution to serve the citizens of the state who support the institution. The institution is charged with role modeling actions that benefit the state, and students are thought by administration and staff to adopt these practices and values through participation and observation. The ideological focuses regarding civic responsibility are different, and the approaches to student citizenship reflect that difference.

Another distinction that the cross-site analysis illuminates between the two approaches concerns the central actor in the culturally-informed strategy of action. For UVA, the central actor in the “test bed” approach is the student. For UNC, the central actor in the “role modeling” approach is the institution. This realization helps to explain some of the comments that participants at each site offered on the competing ideologies that serve to diminish a focus on civic responsibility. At UNC, competing ideologies radiated from the actions or inactions of the institution.

I hear a lot of verbiage [about citizenship]. I don’t believe the actions match the verbiage in substantial aspects….I’m not ready to say that a dominant focus is on active citizenship. I don’t see it. I think we are very much focused on climbing the rankings of public and private universities. I think we are very much focused on research and the advancement of research departments. [Student affairs director, UNC]

At UVA, competing ideologies radiated from the actions of the students and included a student party culture and a lack of respect for diversity. What this also means is that criticisms are inclined towards the central actor in each of these approaches. Participants at
UVA were more likely to cite examples of irresponsible actions that criticized the students rather than the institution. The opposite occurred at UNC.

Swidler’s (1986) third argument, also validated in this analysis, is that the cultural equipment available to institutions or individuals will influence their belief systems (hence the double arrow between ideology and culture in the figures depicting her framework). An obvious connection can be made between these cultural tools and the dominant ideologies of civic responsibility at UVA as shown in Figure 9. These cultural tools help to explain UVA’s focus on democratic values, systems and processes and on personal accountability as the characteristic ways to consider responsible citizenship. Again, the cultural tools present at UNC help to explain the focus on the desire to act beneficially on community and for its members and also on democratic values, systems and processes (Figure 9).

The lack of attention to specific dimensions of civic responsibility does not mean that they are not valued at these institutions. Two possible explanations exist for the inattention to the use and knowledge of skills for societal benefit. Over half of the pool of interview participants between sites were from student affairs, a group of professionals arguably more concerned with aspects of civic responsibility development outside of the applied use of academic knowledge and skills. If more faculty were included as interview participants, this dimension may have received increased attention. The other explanation stems from a closer look at Swidler’s (1986) discussion of ideology. She suggests that a continuum exists, moving from ideology to tradition to common sense. Common sense assumptions are “so unselconscious as to seem a natural, transparent, undeniable part” of the institution (p. 279). It could be argued that from its beginnings, American higher education was intended to serve a public good in creating leaders for society (Rudolph, 1962), with the two institutions in this
study as historical examples. This notion of higher education for society’s good may have moved on the continuum towards common sense as centuries have passed. If this is the case, recent attention to higher education’s private benefits may force institutions to revive this ideological conversation on the purposes of higher education for society and indeed already seems to be doing so (Institute for Higher Education Policy, 1998, 2005).

Swidler (1986) argues that the differences we see between groups are not caused by distinctive cultural values but rather by different culturally-shaped skills, habits and styles. There are surely many higher education institutions across the country that value personal accountability, but perhaps what makes UVA distinct and “synonymous with honor” is its culturally-shaped habits and styles which places the power of the honor system in the hands of the students and keeps its story alive. Similarly, this notion may help to explain that the somewhat absent civic responsibility dimension of “appreciation for and interest in others unlike oneself” is not devalued at UVA, but rather that habits and skills around student civic responsibility developed differently because of the available cultural equipment.

Hypothetically, an institution that opened its doors to women and minorities well before UVA may have different cultural equipment which emphasizes that particular dimension of civic responsibility but may pay little attention to personal accountability.

The cross-site analysis is helpful in showing that patterns of ideological similarities exist between institutions and their employees and in revealing some distinct ways that culture shapes the college student experience related to responsible citizenship. The framework is not helpful, however, in considering the role of the students themselves in acquiring those culturally shaped habits and skills related to civic responsibility. Participants at both institutions indicated not only that they select students with similar ideologies but also
that students are attracted to the institutions because of congruence in civic responsibility ideologies.

Honor is a big part of the culture, and culture does factor into their decisions. Is it the whole piece of the puzzle? No, certainly not. I think academic rigor is up there, ranking is definitely up there. But I’ve talked to a lot of students, though, that had some great places to choose from and they came here…I think honor plays a part in that. [Student affairs administrator, UVA]

Nevertheless, nothing can be said from this framework about the causal link between culture and student outcomes although the framework does imply that there may be greater developmental emphases in certain of the five dimensions of civic responsibility at each institution because of the greater attention paid to these areas. The evidence garnered in this study is mixed: at UNC, students are highly involved in community and volunteer efforts through the Campus Y, Center for Public Service and service-learning courses, which follows the campus ideological focus on service. On the other hand, the campus also purports to be a place open and welcoming of all ideas, and several interviewees offered accounts of students not finding their ideas welcome.

One of the larger issues that surfaced through the course of this past year at UNC has been the conservative versus liberal viewpoint and how there’s a sense that conservatives have been hit over the head in the classroom, particularly with a liberal viewpoint. I’m an administrator here, so I can’t say, but I did hear a couple of horror stories and was astonished that
something like that would happen in a classroom. [Assistant Director of
Student Activities, UNC]

Similarly at UVA, participants stated that they regard their approach to student selfgovernment as developmentally powerful, yet student participation in the honor system is low. The presence of cultural tools is no guarantee that student participation and
development will take place.

Another limitation of this study is in the two sites chosen for analysis. Both are
public research universities with liberal arts core curricula for undergraduates. Inclusion of a
different type of institution in the study may have provided additional insights into the
application of this analytical framework. And certainly, with only two sites in the analysis, a
relatively small number of interview participants, and the particularities of culture studies,
results cannot be generalized to the field of higher education. Nonetheless, the framework
poses interesting questions for other institutions to investigate their own ideologies, cultural
equipment and strategies of action around civic responsibility.

Implications

The results of this multi-site study have several implications for higher education
institutions and for other research universities in particular. Most of these implications
follow the line of reasoning that an increased understanding of civic responsibility
ideologies, cultural equipment and strategies of action at an institution will result in increased
power to act in ways that will benefit the institution and its students. Institutions can benefit
from an examination of one or all of the components of the framework.

First, an understanding of the congruence between institutional ideologies and those
of its employees may give an indication of the strength of culture. An institution with a
strong culture is thought to have a high level of congruence between organizational and individual values and goals which in turn enhances motivation and identification (Sporn, 1996). The strength of culture as related to the civic responsibility dimensions may also have similar implications for student learning and development. Further research should be directed at uncovering any connections between cultural emphases and practices and student development.

Second, most colleges and universities likely have some cultural tool(s) focused on one or more dimensions of civic responsibility. With or without any harnessing power from the institution, these symbols, stories, special language and daily rituals are probably already communicating messages to the public and to prospective and current students. In using this framework to understand what those cultural tools and messages are regarding civic responsibility, institutional members may understand the successes and failures of certain initiatives, certain patterns in courses of action on campus, and the roles of students, faculty and administration in the approach to civic responsibility development. As a result, institutions may be more efficient, resourceful and successful in addressing and achieving goals related to the dimensions of civic responsibility.

The cultural equipment at each of the study sites did encourage a focus on one or two dominant civic responsibility dimensions at each site. Other research universities may similarly be focusing on certain of the five dimensions of civic responsibility and neglecting the others while they actually aspire to a more holistic approach to civic responsibility. Additional research could help illuminate if the cultural preference for one of the dimensions of civic responsibility at an institution has an effect on student learning.
Cultural tools are also related to distinctiveness in the field of higher education (Toma, Dubrow & Hartley, 2005). As institutions move towards becoming more like one another (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983), they try to assimilate the structures, funding practices and certain cultural norms of the large research universities. This focus occurs to the neglect of areas outside of market interests, such as civic responsibility, that could serve to enhance their institutional distinctiveness. Both of the study sites are examples of well-regarded research universities that maintain a strong focus on one or more dimensions of civic responsibility. This fact should encourage other institutions to pay attention to this area, especially considering the presumed benefits to individual students and to society at large (Bowen, 1997).

Institutions may be able to leverage their culturally-informed strategies of action once understood. Swidler (1986) suggests that particular cultural patterns will imbue institutions with certain capacities, be they political, social or otherwise. In higher education, a culturally-supported focus on certain dimensions of civic responsibility may enhance relationships with legislatures, alumni, and the public in ways that benefit the institution. UNC may in fact enjoy certain political capacities because of their focus on serving the citizens of the state. UVA may similarly enjoy certain social capacities because the institution is perceived synonymously with honor and integrity. Institutions that understand this synergy may be able to harness their unique qualities in areas such as building brand equity and institutional identification (Toma, Dubrow & Hartley, 2005).

Finally, the culturally-informed strategy of action, once known, should be examined critically for any potentially undesirable effects. For example, a chemistry professor at UNC raised an interesting point that students are often pushed into “molds,” or available options
for service opportunities, and hence their creativity in determining how they might serve the community and world is limited. Similarly at UVA, the student-led approaches to most problems may deter students from seeking wisdom and resources among campus leaders and staff. The power of understanding strategies of actions thus lies not only in understanding what we do but also what we do not do.

The framework employed in this study allowed for an instructive look at the way culture shapes institutional approaches to civic responsibility. The next and important steps in this line of research are to make more concrete connections to student experiences and outcomes and to expand these implications from areas of institutional effectiveness further into areas of student development.
CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSIONS

This study employed ethnographic research methods at and cross-site analysis between the University of Virginia and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill to examine three areas: (a) dominant individual and institutional ideologies related to civic responsibility, (b) cultural tools related to civic responsibility and (c) the culturally-informed strategies of action for responsible citizenship at each campus. The theoretically-based understanding of these culturally-informed strategies that students experience, namely the test bed approach at UVA and the role model approach at UNC, are the most significant findings of this research. Swidler’s (1986) conceptual framework proved useful in understanding culture and civic responsibility at the two research universities, which implies that other higher education institutions can use the same framework and methods to gain a deeper understanding of civic responsibility ideologies and practices on their campuses. In examining responsible citizenship, the framework may help illuminate why some campus initiatives fail while others thrive and survive or why certain events and actions cause disturbance while others go virtually unnoticed. For example, student self-governance at UVA led participants there to believe that initiatives born out of the student body stand a greater chance for success or implementation than those originating from the staff. Furthermore, the framework can help campuses understand how culture contributes to their strengths and emphases with regard to civic responsibility and can also highlight any dimensions of civic responsibility for which cultural tools do not exist. The citizenship-related cultural tools at UVA, for example, clearly emphasize personal accountability and democratic ideals, perhaps to the neglect of the appreciation and interest in diverse peoples. This interpretation does not suggest that these dimensions of civic responsibility are not
valued at UVA, but rather that the institution lacks cultural tools that emphasize these
dimensions.

The findings are also significant for research universities and other institutions
aspiring to become research universities. Many institutions may be spending an inordinate
amount of time trying to become more like the few prestigious and leading research
universities, which in turn causes these striving higher education institutions to look more
and more like each other (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). Yet, people want to associate with
universities that have a distinctive and enduring nature (Toma, Dubrow & Hartley, 2005).
Therefore, aspects of these institutions’ cultures that are unrelated to the research enterprise
can benefit the campus and should not be neglected. Certainly, UVA and UNC have
maintained their statuses as respected research universities while embracing the unique
aspects of their cultures that are related to civic responsibility. Interview participants
indicated that in doing so, these institutions attract and engage faculty, staff, prospective and
current students and alumni who also value these institutional qualities. Hence, a culturally-
informed emphasis on civic responsibility can serve to make an institution special, distinctive
and perhaps more competitive in a time of mission conformation.

Limitations of the Study

Several limitations existed in this research study. Only two institutions were
investigated using relatively small numbers of interview participants, primarily from student
affairs, at each site. Additionally, both sites were public research universities with liberal
arts core curricula. Scholars indicate that the ideals and values advanced through a liberal
arts core curriculum are related to citizenship (Keat & White, 2002); differences between
civic responsibility at public and private institutions with liberal arts core curricula are
assumed but not discussed in the literature. This research contributes to findings for public institutions, but more can be done to understand these same concepts at private institutions.

Several limitations exist as a result of the framework used (Swidler, 1986). The conceptual framework works well for institutions that have strong cultures (Sporn, 1996) where institutional and individual values and goals are widely known and shared. Strength in institutional culture has been related to effectiveness (Sporn, 1996), but the homogenous thought and cohesion that results from strong cultures should be criticized for their potentially negative effects for organizational members. Relatedly, the use of this framework encourages the attention to the cohesive elements of institutional culture that will appear in multiple and public sources of data to the neglect of the competing ideologies and actions that occur at other more hidden levels of the organization. The framework should be updated to acknowledge the postmodern understandings of institutions as ambiguous and contradictory (Bloland, 2000). Additionally, the framework would be enhanced through a more conscious consideration of the influence of history on an institution’s ideologies, cultural tools and actions. This consideration could potentially make the framework more useful in discussing institutional change instead of presenting a static snapshot of the institution at a certain time. Figure 11 displays an updated representation of the framework as a sphere of influence. This version reflects the effect of each component of the framework on the other components. Specifically, the relationship between action and ideology is an addition in this representation. Ideologies are reinforced as persistent strategies of action are deemed and continue to be regarded as successful or beneficial. The permeable membrane that surrounds the three components in the updated framework reflects the influence of the historical context on the ideologies, cultural tools and actions that are present or absent. This
feature also suggests the potential influence of competing ideologies. Several of these “culture spheres” related to civic responsibility can exist within an organization, and research beyond the scope of this study could serve to map the connections between these spheres within institutions (that is, do different spheres exist among disciplines or lines of authority or responsibility).

![Diagram of ideology, culture, and action relationships](image)

**Figure 11.** Reconceptualization of relationship between ideology, culture and action in institutional context

Finally, the findings support the suppositions of Swidler’s (1986) framework but do not extend further into the connection between these new understandings and the student civic responsibility outcomes at each institution. To some extent, these limitations may be addressed through future research, particularly in combination with survey methods that would include larger numbers of staff and students.
Future Research

The following discussion suggests future strands of related research based on the findings of this study. Areas of potential future investigations are numerous, including organizational behavior and change, student and alumni behavior, and institutional assessment.

A simple extension of this research is to examine additional schools in a similar fashion in order to understand and identify other models of institutional approaches to civic responsibility development. In addition, the strong liberal arts core curricula at both UVA and UNC means that these two institutions cannot be considered as representative of all research universities. Special insights may be gained from colleges and universities with explicit missions related to citizenship, such as land grant or religiously affiliated institutions. Other settings to consider as rich information sources are the Historically Black Colleges and Universities, as students there exhibit higher levels of community participation than their counterparts at Predominantly White Institutions (National Survey of Student Engagement, 2005).

Swidler’s framework may be paired with case study methods to analyze the changing conversations and actions around citizenship development at colleges and universities. Tierney (1991) advocates for clearer analysis of “what occurs when cultural practices diverge from institutional ideologies” (p. 56). Swidler’s framework provides a new way to understand or interpret motivations, actions and reactions in historical or recent incidents where university students, administrators, or entire institutions were perceived to have acted as irresponsible citizens. Additionally, this framework may be useful in examining institutions as they attempt to alter their dominant ideologies around civic responsibility.
For example, in the time since data were collected at UVA for this study, the institution has appointed William B. Harvey as the first Vice President for Diversity and Equity (Jacobson, 2005). This present study showed that diversity appreciation was not a strong component of either the institutional or individual civic responsibility ideologies at UVA. Serious racial incidents in the last few years have prompted a new focus on this aspect of citizenship. Swidler’s framework may offer insights into decisions, challenges and successes as the institution strives for change.

Several strands of research on student and alumni behaviors could also be initiated based on the findings of this study. First, mixed methods, secondary survey or other survey data could be used to further understand the relationship between dominant institutional ideologies and post-college civic behavior. Institutions may come to recognize that they need to increase efforts in certain dimensions of civic responsibility development, and the knowledge of their cultural tools may help them accomplish this in a resourceful way. Survey information is also useful in culture studies where it can provide information on the strength and level of consensus and clarity around predetermined cultural elements (Peterson & Spencer, 1993).

Furthermore, post-college analyses may illuminate if one institutional approach to citizenship development (that is, test bed or role modeling) is more effective than another. It is also known from a study using the Higher Education Research Institute’s College Student Survey that when students perceive their colleges are dedicated to teaching them to influence social values, they are more likely to report that they do intend to influence social values (Guzman, Stephenson, & Lindsay, 2005). Their research implies that institutions should be intentional about preparing responsible citizens and that institutional culture is a vital part of
that preparation. If any connections between post-college behavior and culturally-informed approaches to citizenship become known, then institutions may seek to emulate those colleges and universities whose cultural equipment for civic responsibility can be linked to desired student learning outcomes. These predicted isomorphic efforts are unlikely to occur, however, since a focus on civic responsibility generally does not generally attract resources or prestige for a research university. Furthermore, any such attempts by a university to adopt another institution’s culturally-informed practices will likely not meet the same success; as Kezar and Eckel (2002) explain, change initiatives are more successful when they are culturally coherent.

Second, both institutions emphasized the importance of the students in the institutions’ efforts at responsible citizenship. UNC admissions officers expressly discussed their desire to admit students who have demonstrated leadership in and a commitment to improving their communities. Participants at UVA often stated that students want to come to UVA because of its reputation as a campus that values honor and integrity. These campuses are seeking and admitting students who are primed to be receptive to messages about responsible citizenship, which implies that campuses that want to increase their attention to this area of development should look closely at their admissions practices and student profiles. Additionally, the data obtained from the student questionnaires were only used at a surface level to help confirm the study findings, but these responses include rich information that deserves more than a cursory glance. For example, at both UVA and UNC, students indicated that their definition of responsible citizenship had changed upon attending the institution while other students indicated no change in their definition of responsible
citizenship. Additional research may illuminate why this change happens with some students and not with others.

Third, the cultural context is an interesting frame in which to consider student motives for involvement or under-involvement with initiatives associated with responsible citizenship. For example, many students at UVA participate in volunteer service activities, but little support exists on the campus for traditional course-based service-learning. One participant there suggested that service-learning does not thrive at UVA because students did not want to participate in something that they did not initiate. Contrarily, students at UNC are significantly involved in both service-learning and volunteerism; there, citizenship is often defined in terms of service. A cultural perspective may suggest that at UVA volunteer service is preferred to service-learning because it provides a leadership opportunity for the students, which directly aligns with UVA’s dominant cultural ideology of responsible citizens as leaders. Additional research could also delve further into the ideological differentiation that often causes the development of subgroups within organizations (Van Maanen & Barley, 1985). Student development literature would be enriched by ethnographic studies of student subcultures that may be considered extreme to most citizens or that may hold radically different ideas about responsible citizenship than the colleges that they attend (for example, organizations for student anarchists).

Several implications for practice also exist based on this research. The findings of this research suggest that institutions that understand their cultural tools, dominant ideologies and consistent strategies of action around responsible citizenship may be able to use their cultural tools effectively and resourcefully to advance student citizenship development. Potential exists for the development of tools to help institutions use this same framework to
determine their cultural equipment, dominant ideologies, and also climates for civic responsibility development.

Clearly, significant opportunities exist in the continuing consideration of the relationship between higher education and civic responsibility. Not all would agree that this area needs more attention, however. One academic administrator who participated in the study suggested that additional conversation around civic responsibility may be detrimental to the advancement of this and other areas of student development.

The risk of talking about civic responsibility is that it urges students even further in the direction of practical mindedness. ‘What is this for? What am I going to do with that? Surely I should not study the Aeneid because how will my studying the Aeneid serve humanity? There is no direct connection in studying the classics and feeding the hungry and therefore I shouldn’t do it,’ and I think that’s the wrong message to send to students. … The risk for us in the “University of the people” is the same. “Why is it that you have an English professor that is studying cross-dressing in the Renaissance era? How is that helping the tobacco farmer?”

The risk of students applying a practical citizenship “litmus test” across their college experiences is likely low, however, since students do not recognize citizenship development as an important outcome of the college experience (Schneider & Humphreys, 2005). Hence, in considering that there may be little to lose by continuing this conversation and much to gain, the researcher hopes to see this study as a springboard for further understanding of culture and civic responsibility in higher education.
If the implications of this research are explored further, a better understanding of the relationship between strength of culture and student development outcomes in civic responsibility can be achieved. Additional examples can illuminate the use cultural equipment in developing creative and resourceful initiatives in student civic responsibility development, the ways emphases of cultural tools affect student civic responsibility development, and the enhanced institutional distinctiveness and political, social or other capacities that result from a focus on civic responsibility. Additional research will assist in understanding how students learn responsible citizenship through their new roles as citizens of a campus and how on-campus as opposed to off-campus initiatives compare in developing responsible citizens. Finally, lessons can be learned from campuses successful at refocusing on civic responsibility, specifically how cultural tools were identified (including their shortcomings), citizenship expectations were articulated as part of the student experience, and all campus constituencies were involved in the developmental process.
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A.  INTRODUCTION

1.  In lay language, please briefly describe your research, its purpose, procedures, and expected contribution to its field or to the general population.

   This proposed pilot study at the University of Virginia (UVA) and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC) aims to describe how ideology, culture and action intersect in public and enculturating events that promote civic responsibility at public research universities. This pilot study will occur over the summer of 2004, and the most concentrated efforts will occur during a five-week stay at UVA (May 10 - June 12, 2004). The pilot study will serve to hone the interview protocol, field observation techniques, and data management systems to be used in the dissertation research. If the interview protocol and research direction do not change significantly as a result of the pilot study, then this data may be used in the final dissertation analysis as well.

   Dissertation Proposal:
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Additionally, the significance of this study in practice is two-fold for research universities. First, leaders who “understand the power of symbols are much better equipped to understand and influence their organizations” (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p.231). This study will benefit other research universities that want to develop a sense of civic responsibility in undergraduates by describing the use of culture to promote these ideals. Leaders are in particular able to control the content of ritual, ceremony and symbol on campuses, but little is known about how research institutions are shaping these aspects of culture to convey the importance of civic responsibility. Second, leaders of research universities that develop civic-minded students through effective use of culture have an important message to convey to public audiences about their nature as an indispensable public good.

2. **If this is student research, indicate whether it’s for a course, thesis, or dissertation.**
   The proposed research is a pilot study aimed to contribute to a dissertation in the Adult and Community College Education Department. During the five-week visit at UVA through the IAC Traveling Scholar Program, the researcher will be under the supervision and direction of Dr. Brian Pusser and will receive 3 hours of graduate credit for this effort.

B. **SUBJECT POPULATION**

1. **How many subjects will be involved in the research?**
   Although the number of subjects has not been determined for the pilot study, a generous estimate would be 10 faculty/staff members between UVA and UNC. Additionally, students may be opportunistically sampled while observing events on the campuses.

2. **Describe how subjects will be recruited. If flyers, advertisements, or recruitment letters will be used, please attach copies of those documents.**
   Staff members at UVA who direct units that are pertinent to this study will be contacted by email to request interviews; three initial contacts have been identified at this time (Directors of Madison House, Orientation and New Student Programs, and the Office of Major Events). Similar contacts will be made at UNC later in the summer. The attached letter will be slightly modified for each contact. Additional interviewees will be contacted in the fall based on snowball sampling from these initial interviewees, hence the estimate of 10 faculty/staff interviews during the pilot study. Students may be approached as opportunistic samples in order to identify relevant events or while the researcher observes an event or ceremony during the pilot study.

3. **List specific eligibility requirements for subjects, describe screening procedures, and justify criteria that will exclude otherwise acceptable subjects.**
   Faculty and staff interviewed in the study must be employees of UVA or UNC who are involved in programs that promote civic responsibility in students (e.g. orientation) or who are involved in planning major public events (e.g. graduation). There are no eligibility requirements for opportunistic student interviews beyond presence at the event or on the campus.
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6. **Check any vulnerable populations that you will intentionally include in the study:**
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   - Persons with physical disabilities
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   - Students from a class taught by the Principal Investigator
   - Prisoners
   - Other vulnerable populations:
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C. **PROCEDURES TO BE FOLLOWED**

1. In lay language, describe completely and with good detail all the procedures involving human subjects that will be followed during the course of the study. Provide sufficient detail so the committee is able to adequately review the research.
   - Individuals may volunteer to participate in this study as an interview subject.
   - Faculty/staff interviewees at UVA and UNC will agree to a 1-1.5 hour interview to be held at the site of their choosing. Interviewees will sign an informed consent form prior to the interview. Students who are asked for comments during a campus event will also be asked to sign an informed consent form.

2. **How much time will be required of each subject?**
   - Interviews will last from 1-1.5 hours. Follow-up contact with interviewees may be required for clarification.

D. **POTENTIAL RISKS**

1. State the potential risks from the research (psychological, social, financial, legal, physical, or otherwise). State how you plan to minimize these risks.
   - Minimal to no risks are anticipated in this research. Interviewees identified by snowball or opportunistic sampling methods may feel anxious about a one-on-one interview. Any interviewee or student will be able to withdraw from the study if feeling any anxieties.

2. Will there be a request for information that if accidentally made public could embarrass the subjects or reasonably place them at risk of criminal, social, or professional harm?
   - The questions asked in interviews should not produce any highly sensitive information.

3. Could any of the study procedures or information collected produce stress, anxiety, or psychological harm? If yes, please justify the need for such procedures or information, and describe methods you will take to minimize the harm a subject encounters (e.g. you will provide or arrange for psychological counseling for those subjects who experience distress due to your study).
   - The researcher does not anticipate that any study procedures or information will produce stress or anxiety.
4. Describe methods for protecting your subjects’ confidentiality. How will data be recorded and stored? Will any identifiers be collected? If so, how and why? If you will collect identifiers, will you destroy the link between subject identity and data at some point? If you are collecting audio or video recordings, do you plan to destroy the recordings after the research is complete?

Interviews will be tape recorded, and the tapes will be stored in a locked and fireproof safe in the home of the researcher until no further analysis or publication is generated from this data (at which point the tapes will be destroyed). Participants, both students and staff, will not be identified in the final write-up by name but may be referenced by a more vague description of programmatic affiliation. Using a code number system, names of interviewees and some students (who are not graduating before 12/2005) will be kept on a master list and separate from the study materials and data sheets until the write-up is complete in case of the need for follow-up. After the dissertation writing is complete, any hard copy of the master code list will be shredded and its associated electronic file deleted.

5. If your research will be reported in a case study format, how will you protect individual subjects’ responses/information?

The research will be reported in a case study format, but the units of analyses are the institution and the public and enculturating events that go on there. Although information will be solicited from individuals, it will only be used to create a more robust case about an institution.

6. Is there any deception of subjects in this study? If yes, please describe the deception, justify it, and provide a debriefing procedure.

There is no deception of subjects in the study, beyond general non-participant observation of public and enculturating events.

E. POTENTIAL BENEFITS

Please address benefits expected from the research. Please note that this does not include compensation for participation, in any form. Specifically, what, if any, direct benefit is to be gained by the subject? If no direct benefit is expected, but indirect benefit may be expected (i.e. to general society), please explain.

The staff and faculty participants in this study, as well as students interviewed opportunistically, will receive no specific benefit, though they may appreciate the opportunity to share their ideas and experiences in an interview format.

F. COMPENSATION

Explain compensation that subjects will receive for participating in the study, as well as provisions for the withdrawal of a subject prior to completion of the study.

Interviewees will not be compensated for participation in this study and are free to request to withdraw from the study at any point.

1. If class credit will be offered for participation, list the amount given and alternate ways to earn the same amount of credit.

Not applicable.

G. COLLABORATORS
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No additional investigators will be involved in the research.
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Other Restrictions: (indicate other preferences here)

Subject's signature_____________________________ Date ______________

Investigator's signature_________________________ Date _____________
We are asking you to participate in a research study. The purpose of this study is to describe what your institution believes about civic responsibility and how these beliefs are expressed in public events, such as graduation, events that enculturate students, such as orientation, and other student and institutional actions.

INFORMATION
If you agree to participate in this study, you will be asked to participate in a one-on-one interview, approximately 1 hour in length, at the site of your choosing on UNC’s campus. The interview transcript, as well as the interim and final case write-up, will be sent to you for review and comment.

RISKS
We do not foresee any risks beyond minimal anxiety that some individuals may have when participating in a one-on-one interview.

BENEFITS
The information that you share with us is significant for several reasons. First, we will be able to share with other research universities how your institution uses ideology, culture, and action to promote civic responsibility. This connection is important for scholars and leaders of research universities to understand, but little is currently known about this topic. Second, leaders who are able to shape ritual and symbol towards the promotion of civic responsibility may expect positive outcomes in students and for society at large through changes in students. Thank you for contributing to this study, and we hope that you may benefit from sharing your experiences as well. Please note that the researcher is willing to provide a presentation of the findings to an appropriate campus audience and will remind you of this offer upon sending transcripts and case write-ups for your review.

CONFIDENTIALITY
The researcher prefers to secure your permission to use any academic or leadership identifiers alongside any quotations that may be included in final written analyses.

If you wish, the researcher will maintain your anonymity throughout the interview and in the resulting dissertation and publications. In that case, your interview data will be stored securely in a locked safe in the home of the researcher. You will be assigned a code number that will be used on any data forms related to our discussion. This code number will only be associated with your name on a master list that will be destroyed when all data analysis and publication for this study is complete. No reference will be made in oral or written reports which could link you to the study.

If you prefer to remain anonymous in reports about this research, please initial here: _____

CONTACT
If you have questions at any time about the study or the procedures, you may contact the researcher, Courtney H. Thornton, at NC State University, Box 7801, Raleigh, NC 27695-7801, or (919) 233-4830. If you feel you have not been treated according to the descriptions in this form, or your rights as a participant in research have been violated during the course of this project, you may contact Dr. Matthew Zingraff, Chair of the NCSU IRB for the Use of Human Subjects in Research Committee, Box 7514, NCSU Campus (919/513-1834) or Mr. Matthew Ronning, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Research Administration, Box 7514, NCSU Campus (919/513-2148)
PARTICIPATION
Your participation in this study is voluntary; you may decline to participate without penalty. If you decide to participate, you may choose not to answer any question posed in the interview or may end the interview at any time. You may also request that I not use excerpts from your interview in anything publishable, even if you are willing to allow me to use your interview in the general analysis. You may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty and without loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you withdraw from the study before data collection is completed your data will be returned to you or destroyed at your request.

CONSENT
“I have read and understand the above information. I have received a copy of this form. I agree to participate in this study with the understanding that I may withdraw at any time.”

Subject's signature______________________________ Date ________________

Investigator's signature__________________________ Date ________________
Interview Protocol (last updated 6/15/2005)

Introduction to participants:
Many groups are interested in the role of higher education in developing good citizens: Kellogg Forum, Campus Compact, Carnegie. The purpose of this interview is to better understand how research universities develop in students a sense of responsibility towards the greater society. I am interviewing faculty, staff and students to learn more about the beliefs, culture and approach of (UVA/UNC) in this area.

I would like to tape record our conversation in order to save me the task of taking notes and to assure the greatest level of accuracy. Is that okay with you?

As a result of preliminary analysis of interviews and field notes, I may need to contact you by phone or email to either ask additional questions or get clarifications. Do you have any questions before we begin?

Background
(1) In what capacity do you interact with undergraduate students?

Ideology and Culture
(2) What are some of the ways you personally define a good or responsible citizen?

(3) What are the dominant ways that (UVA/UNC), the institution, defines a good or responsible citizen?

Probe: I’m going to name some aspects of civic responsibility and I want you to tell me how you see the institution communicating these values to students.
- Knowledge and support of democratic values, systems, and processes
- Desire to act beneficially in community and for its members
- Use of knowledge and skills for societal benefit
- Appreciation for and interest in those unlike self
- Personal accountability

Probe: -How does UNC’s approach to developing good/responsible citizens compare to other institutions where you have worked?

Probe: How are students at UNC made aware of these dominant institutional definitions of responsible citizenship?

(4) Are there rituals, ceremonies, stories (symbolic vehicles of meaning) that are used here to convey to students the importance of civic responsibility?

- Beliefs
- Ritual practices
- Art forms
- Ceremonies
• Language
• Gossip
• Stories
• Rituals of daily life

Ideology Reflected through Action/Inaction

(5) Research universities are not always thought to be exemplary at undergraduate citizenship development because of competing institutional values, etc. Would you describe (UVA/UNC)’s efforts to develop good and responsible citizens as not effective, somewhat effective, highly effective? On what experiences do you base that assessment?

(6) What are the most common ways you see (UVA/UNC) students acting as responsible citizens?

Listen for examples of:
• Knowledge and support of democratic values, systems, and processes
• Desire to act beneficially in community and for its members
• Use of knowledge and skills for societal benefit
• Appreciation for and interest in those unlike self
• Personal accountability

(7) Why do you think students commonly exhibit these citizenship behaviors versus others?

(8) What are the least common ways you see (UVA/UNC) students acting as responsible citizens?

Wrap-up

I am interested in events that show the public or the larger student body that civic responsibility is important at (UVA/UNC). Can you think of any events or programs I should observe?

Are there any individuals associated with these programs or efforts that I should interview? Are there any individuals who may see things differently than you?

Is there anything else I did not ask about that you would like to comment on?

Thank you for sharing your time and experience.
University of Virginia (UVA) / University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC)  
Student Questionnaire on Responsible Citizenship

The purpose of this short-answer questionnaire is to provide an undergraduate student perspective on the influence of institutional culture on his or her citizenship development. Student feedback is critically needed in this dissertation study to hone the researcher's findings and to complement information obtained through campus observations, interviews, and documents. Provide as much detail as possible in your open-ended responses; approach your answers as if you were talking to someone who knows absolutely nothing about (UVA/UNC).

You should be able to complete the survey in approximately 15 minutes. Maximize your web browser to ensure you are able to see the complete question.

I. Demographic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>[Blank]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>First</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency</td>
<td>In-state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>African American</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Short Answer Prompts

1. How do you personally define responsible citizenship?

   [Blank]

2. Has your definition of responsible citizenship changed since entering (UVA/UNC)?
   - [ ] Yes  
   - [ ] No

   If yes, please describe how.

   [Blank]
3. What are the dominant ways that (UVA/UNC), the institution, defines responsible citizenship?

What experience(s) do you base your above statement on?

4. Does (UVA/UNC) have any of the following cultural elements that are related to responsible citizenship? Check those that apply and provide a detailed description.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Elements</th>
<th>Description of how they relate to civic responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Beliefs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rituals of daily life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art forms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceremonies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special institutional language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gossip</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Some commonly discussed aspects of responsible citizenship are listed below. Please select **Yes** or **No** to indicate if you perceive that these aspects of responsible citizenship are institutional values at (UVA/UNC). If you do believe a certain aspect is an institutional value, use the box to the right to describe how you know that.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Is it an institutional value?</th>
<th>If yes, how do you know?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and support of democratic values, systems, and processes</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to act beneficially in community and for its members</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of knowledge and skills for societal benefit</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation for and interest in those unlike yourself</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal accountability</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. What are the most common ways you see your fellow (UVA/UNC) students acting as responsible citizens? (In other words, areas of strength)

7. What are the least common ways you see your fellow (UVA/UNC) students acting as responsible citizens? (In other words, areas for improvement)

Please enter your email address if the researcher may contact you for additional clarification or follow-up questions as needed.

Thank you for your time and thoughts. Please select the submit button upon completion.
a. Dominant cultural tools at (UVA/UNC) related to civic responsibility, as defined in the study

b. Dominant institutional ideologies around civic responsibility, as defined in the study

c. Dominant individual ideologies around civic responsibility, as defined in the study

d. Conclusions about (UVA’s/UNC’s) culturally-supported approach to student citizenship development

2. Please offer any other general comments here.
Ms. Courtney Thornton  
North Carolina State University  
Raleigh, NC  

March 13, 2006  

Dear Ms. Thornton:  

The American College Personnel Association (ACPA) grants permission to reprint the following article for inclusion in your dissertation:  
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