

2-20-2014

Engaging Engagement: Framing the Civic Education Movement In Higher Education

Chad Woolard

Illinois State University, cewoola@ilstu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Education Commons](#), [Rhetoric Commons](#), and the [Sociology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Woolard, Chad, "Engaging Engagement: Framing the Civic Education Movement In Higher Education" (2014). *Theses and Dissertations*. 383.

<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/etd/383>

This Thesis and Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by ISU ReD: Research and eData. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ISU ReD: Research and eData. For more information, please contact ISURed@ilstu.edu.

ENGAGING ENGAGEMENT: FRAMING THE CIVIC EDUCATION
MOVEMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Chad Woolard

144 Pages

August 2015

Civic education in higher education is housed in various types of institutions (i.e., community colleges, four year universities, public and private institutions), institutional offices, academic departments, and larger, cross-campus initiatives and organizations. Civic education programs promote numerous activities to foster student engagement both inside and outside the classroom. Many in higher education have embraced the civic education movement; however, as with other social movements, the civic education movement is still a contested area. Defining civic education (i.e., civic engagement, service learning, political engagement, community engagement, etc.) becomes problematic because there seems to be as many terms for civic education as there are civic education scholars. This dissertation provides a comparative analysis of major approaches to civic education in the civic education moment, including implications for higher education

ENGAGING ENGAGEMENT: FRAMING THE CIVIC EDUCATION
MOVEMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION

CHAD WOOLARD

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Educational Administration and Foundations

ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY

2015

Copyright 2015 Chad Woolard

ENGAGING ENGAGEMENT: FRAMING THE CIVIC EDUCATION
MOVEMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION

CHAD WOOLARD

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Elizabeth Lugg, Chair

Stephen Hunt

John W. Presley

Diane Dean

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Elizabeth Lugg, my dissertation chair, and the rest of my committee for helping me through the dissertation process. I would like to thank John Presley for his help with writing and navigating the civic education literature. I would also like to thank Steve Hunt for his expertise in civic education and his valuable mentorship.

C.E.W.

CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	i
CONTENTS	ii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Civic Education as a Site of Contestation	3
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	8
Rationale and Theory for Civic Education in Higher Education	8
The Challenge of Defining Civic Education	12
Conceptualizing Civic Education	13
Service Learning	16
Civic Engagement	21
Political Engagement	24
Democratic Engagement	25
Social Justice	26
Antifoundational Engagement	28
Civic Education Initiatives in Higher Education	30
Campus Compact	30
Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU)	31
American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU)	31
American Democracy Project	31
Political Engagement Project (PEP)	32
eCitizenship	32
The Democracy Commitment	32
Civic Agency	32
Global Engagement	33

	America's Future	33
	Civic Health	33
	Deliberative Polling	34
	Economic Inequality	34
	American Association of Community Colleges (AACC)	34
	Community College National Center for Community Engagement (CCNCCE)	35
	National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (NAICU)	35
	Project Pericles	35
	Associated New American Colleges	35
	National Forum on Higher Education and the Public Good	36
	Kettering Foundation	36
	Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching	36
	Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement (CIRCLE)	37
	New England Resource Center for Higher Education (NERCHE)	37
	Soba Center for Democracy and Citizenship (SCDC)	38
	National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA)	38
	Research Questions	39
III.	METHOD	40
	Connecting Methods with the Research Questions	42
	Ideological Criticism	43
	Framing and Frames Analysis	49
	Frames Analysis in Sociology	52
	Frames Analysis in Communication and Media Studies	57
	Close Textual Analysis and the Rhetorical Situation	60
IV.	ANALYSIS	66
	Ideological Foundations of Civic Engagement: John Dewey's Pragmatic Liberalism	66
	The Ideology of Pragmatic Liberalism	67

The Influence of Pragmatic Liberalism in Civic Education	70
Civic Education Frames	72
The Service Learning Frame	73
Cultural producers	74
Ideological orientation	74
Diagnostic framing	75
Prognostic framing	77
Motivational framing	78
Pedagogical framing	78
The Civic Engagement Frame	80
Cultural producers	80
Ideological orientation	81
Diagnostic framing	81
Prognostic framing	82
Motivational framing	82
Pedagogical framing	83
The Political Engagement Frame	84
Cultural producers	85
Ideological orientation	85
Diagnostic framing	85
Prognostic framing	86
Motivational framing	86
Pedagogical framing	86
The Democratic Engagement Frame	86
Cultural producers	87
Ideological orientation	87
Diagnostic framing	87
Prognostic framing	89
Motivational framing	90
Pedagogical framing	90
The Critical Engagement Frame	91
Cultural producers	91
Ideological orientation	91

	Democratic empowerment	91
	Threatening neoliberalism	93
	Diagnostic framing	94
	Prognostic framing	96
	Motivational framing	96
	Pedagogical framing	97
	The Social Justice Frame	97
	Cultural producers	97
	Ideological orientation	98
	Diagnostic framing	98
	Prognostic framing	99
	Motivational framing	100
	Pedagogical framing	101
	The Antifoundational Engagement Frame	101
	Cultural producers	101
	Ideological orientation	102
	Diagnostic framing	103
	Prognostic framing	104
	Motivational framing	105
	Pedagogical framing	105
V.	DISCUSSION	107
	Addressing Research Questions	109
	Implications for Higher Education	113
	Research Implications	113
	Pedagogical Implications	114
	Citizenship Implications	117
	Developing a Civic Education Pedagogy	120
	Defining Civic Education	121
	Pedagogical Development	122
	Research Limitations and Future Research	123
	Conclusion	125
	REFERENCES	127
	APPENDIX A: Analysis Process Overview	138

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Preparing citizens to participate in a democracy and civic education has long been a cornerstone of American education (Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont, & Stephens, 2003; Ehrlich & Jacoby, 2009; Goldfinger & Presley, 2010). "Higher education associations of all sizes and membership bases have embraced civic engagement and included it in their missions, as have foundations, research organizations, and individual institutions" (Jacoby, 2009, p. 15). Civic education in higher education is housed in various types of institutions (i.e., community colleges, four year universities, public and private institutions), institutional offices, academic departments, and larger, cross-campus initiatives and organizations. Civic education programs promote numerous activities to foster student engagement both inside and outside the classroom. Many in higher education have embraced the civic education movement; however, as with other social movements, the civic education movement is still a contested area (Hartley, 2011). Defining civic education (which is a term I am using to represent multiple terms and ideas concerning some form of civic activity, including civic engagement, service learning, political engagement, community engagement, etc.) becomes problematic because there seem to be as many terms for civic education as there are civic education scholars (Jacoby, 2009). As the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) (2002) rightly notes:

If public engagement¹ is to be such a significant part of the daily lives of colleges and universities, it is extremely important to be clear on just what that entails. Such clarity is made even more essential by the fact that public engagement is a very broad term. While that breadth fosters great diversity of activity, it also presents the risk that the term can say everything and nothing at the same time. Additionally, the lack of a clear definition can leave some campuses and their leaders with the impression that they are “doing engagement,” when in fact they are not. (p. 8)

The current state of civic education is one of great support; however, it is understood that the ambiguity of the concept makes it difficult to articulate and implement a civic education agenda (Presley, 2011; Saltmarsh, 2005; Saltmarsh & Hartley, 2011). As Saltmarsh (2005) explains:

[T]his fragmentation of intention has resulted in a civic engagement agenda that does not have clear goals or outcomes [...] A lack of clarity about what is meant by the term “civic engagement” is evident when, at almost any gathering convened for the purpose of furthering civic engagement in higher education, questions inevitably arise about what is meant by civic engagement and about how it relates to civic education, service learning, democratic education, political engagement, civics, education for citizenship, or moral education. Moreover, the lack of clarity fuels a latent confusion about how to operationalize a civic engagement agenda on campus. In particular, with the ascendancy of civic engagement, there has been a diminished focus on the relationship between civic

¹ Yet another term for civic education.

engagement and improved student civic learning. As a curricular outcome in courses across the disciplines, civic learning remains largely unaddressed. (p. 52)

With this in mind, this project seeks to clarify the concept of civic education and how civic education is operationalized within higher education. Civic engagement, political engagement, democratic engagement, service learning, community engagement scholars and practitioners have shared values, worldviews, and goals along with points of contention and fragmentation. The goal here is not to advocate one conceptualization of civic education over another, but rather to understand the points of agreement and disagreement across perspectives. Likewise, given the recent expansion of civic education literature and the latent fragmentation surrounding civic education definitions, I do not intend to explore every single definition or organizations involved in civic education, but rather identify the major concepts, ideas, and authors who carry weight in the movement.

Civic Education as a Site of Contestation

Idealistically, higher education in the United States has been viewed as a site of open inquiry and free speech, a place that is accepting of diversity and new ideas. In reality, institutions of higher education have always been political. As Ehrlich and Colby (2004) state:

Leaders at every university agree that educating students in the practice of open-minded inquiry is a key component of undergraduate education, but creating a classroom and wider campus climate that is truly open to multiple perspectives on hot-button political issues is extremely difficult to accomplish. This is true whether the majority opinion on campus is conservative [...] or liberal. (p. 36)

Higher education is not void of politics; in fact, some supporters of civic education initiatives believe that it is the controversial nature of politics that has moved us away from political discussion in the classroom; however, there is a need to engage these issues to facilitate meaningful civic instruction (Hess, 2004, 2009).

If we are to educate our students for responsible citizenship, we and they can't steer clear of controversy. Liberal education and the values of the academy are all about the need to seek and consider alternative conceptions, stances, and views and to consider them respectfully. This is the case whether the controversy concerns theoretical and other issues within academic disciplines or positions on public policy, most of which cannot be arrayed along a simple Conservative-Liberal fault line. [...] In many domains, students must learn to think clearly about controversial issues, to form opinions and make a strong case for them, to evaluate the evidence for competing positions, to understand alternative perspectives in their own terms, and to engage with opposing views with civility and a sincerely open mind. This is difficult to accomplish, perhaps especially when it comes to politics. Unfortunately, in most settings, people with strong political opinions talk almost exclusively to those who agree with them.

Campuses should be an exception but generally they are not, so neither students nor faculty are accustomed to communicating across ideological divisions.

(Ehrlich & Colby, 2004, p. 36)

With such a strong commitment to contestation and debate, it is no surprise that the civic education movement is fragmented.

Civic education is a social movement within higher education. Civic education seeks to win support, funding, recruit members, and push for change—all activities other social movements undergo. Butin (2010), drawing from Frickel and Gross's (2005) six characteristics of intellectual movements (a subset of social movement theory), argues that service learning functions as an intellectual movement. Service learning as a movement: 1) has a "coherent intellectual program" (Butin, 2010, p. 79), 2) that is outside the dominant academic expectations and norms; 3) undergoes political struggle for institutional resources, 4) works through collective action within and across institutions; 5) is episodic² and offers a "bold new intellectual program" (Frickel & Gross, 2005, p. 208); and perhaps most important for this project, 6) has various scopes and goals, which contributes to movement fragmentation. As Jacoby (2009) notes, civic education has been a goal of higher education since the founding of Harvard in 1636, not to mention the founding of the United States as a nation; however, civic education as a movement continues to have periods of enthusiastic mobilization and decline. The latest iteration of the movement began in the 1960s and 1970s with service learning (Jacoby, 2009). While the civic education movement tends to be housed more within academic institutions, it also comes up against the dominant institutional culture.

As it grows and develops, the civic education movement in higher education bumps up against a set of long-standing cultural practices that are so persuasive and deep-seated that they can hardly be named; they are taken for granted as part of the dominant culture³. A consumerists, hypercompetitive, and privatized

² Social movement mobilizations are cyclical, meaning that they have episodes of mobilization, maintenance, and decline, which sometimes makes it difficult to track a specific movement over time (Snow & Benford, 1992; Stewart, Smith, & Denton, 2007).

³ What Gramsci (1971) would describe as "common sense."

philosophy governs higher education as it does much of American culture and institutional life. (Boyte & Fretz, 2011, p. 90)

Social movements face the challenge of fragmentation and contestation within the movement—competing ideologies, cultures, discourse, and organizations (Benford & Snow, 2000; Gamson, 1995; Gamson, Croteau, Hoynes, & Sasson, 1992; Hunt, Benford, & Snow, 1994; Snow & Benford, 1988, 1992; Snow, Corrigan-Brown, & Vliegenthart, 2008; Stewart, Smith, & Denton, 2001; Zoch, Collins, Sisco, & Supa, 2008). Like many other social movements, the civic education movement faces the challenge of fragmentation and contestation within the movement (Hartley, 2011; Jacoby, 2009; Saltmarsh & Hartley, 2011).

Ideological criticism, framing theory, and rhetorical analysis are established methods used to analyze the discourse of social movements and social movement organizations (SMOs) as well as discourse surrounding specific social and political issues. These methods provide an effective framework to better understand the discourse of civic education—as presented in academic and organizational discourse. This is not to say that I will explore every instance that civic education is discussed, this area of literature is vast; however, I will look at organizations and scholars who are the major players in the movement. As Kwan and Graves (2013) note, it is impossible to explore every facet of public discourse surrounding a single issue—public discourse has too many actors and is too complex. Also, I must admit my own institutional bias here, in my personal teaching and research I have primarily been involved with programs and initiatives stemming from the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), specifically the American Democracy Project (ADP) and Political

Engagement Project (PEP). Not to say that other perspective and approaches to civic education are not valid, or that my omission of perspectives devalues the work of others; rather I am proposing a framework to better understand the complex civic education discourse. This framework can open up the much needed dialogue across ideological, institutional, and organizational divisions across the civic education movement

CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Rationale and Theory for Civic Education in Higher Education

Since the earliest inception of the American educational system there has been a commitment to preparing students to effectively participate in democracy; however, many argue that higher education as of late has strayed away from this mission (Beaumont, Colby, Ehrlich, & Torney-Purta, 2006 & Torney-Purta, 2006; Bennion, 2006; Campbell, 2009; Comstock-Gay & Goldman, 2009; Dahlgren, 2009; Dey, 2009; Donahue & Cress, 2010; Ehrlich & Colby, 2004; Ehrlich & Jacoby, 2009; Gibson, 2004; H. A. Giroux, 2009; S. Hillygus, 2005; Jacoby, 2009; Prentice, 2007a, 2007b; Rice & Redlawsk, 2009; Saltmarsh, 2005; Simmons & Lilly, 2010; Spiezio, Baker, & Boland, 2005 2005; Sylvester, 2010).

Simmons and Lilly (2010) examine the student experience with university academics and ancillary programs to determine which of these, if any, motivate increased student engagement. Various student characteristics were evaluated to determine their impact on student engagement. Data were obtained from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and the Current Population Survey (CPS). Results indicated that engagement is related positively to some student college experiences, unrelated to some experiences, and even negatively related to other experiences. Few individual

characteristics relate to engagement; however, ACT scores, and gender both impact engagement. Surprisingly, engagement was higher among men than womyn⁴. This source is useful in determining possible population targets with civic engagement and developing programs that are geared toward different populations (i.e., men or womyn; minorities, etc.). Given the overarching goal of civic engagement (i.e., critical thinking skills and civic participation) and the diversity of student populations, many factors need to be considered.

While many argue there has been a turn away from civic engagement in higher education, Arum and Roksa (2011) argue that higher education has also turned away from its core mission—to develop students academically. In a study of undergraduates at twenty-four institutions, forty-five percent of these students demonstrate no significant improvement in a range of skills—including critical thinking, complex reasoning, and writing, during their first two years of college. This study utilizes a standardize-testing approach, which measures students’ written ability to construct and critique arguments. The measure was administered to first year college students, and later administered a second time at the end of their second year. The sample size was 2,362 undergraduates at 24 four-year institutions. Of the 2,362 students in the sample, 45% saw no significant improvement in CLA scores, while the average student only gained seven percentage

⁴ One may notice that I spell woman/women as “womyn”. By and large I support the argument made by many scholars about the power that language holds in constructing reality. Cheris Kramarae (2004) argues that language is controlled and created by men—excluding womyn’s perspective from language. Language restricts and frames how we interpret symbolic reality. Many feminists pointed to definition and redefinition of language as an important in understanding the patriarchal nature of language (Kramarae, 2004). Also, scholars have also pointed to “womyn” and other alternate spelling of words as creating a distinct culture among womyn’s movement groups (Taylor & Whittier, 1995). Mary Daly (2004) speaks of using language to foster “spooking” and “sparking” to challenge patriarchy. Spooking refers to using language to draw attention to the language and sparking refers to using discourse to talk about language.

points. In terms of race, white students on average gained 41 percentage points, while black students on average only gained seven points. Men and women, who tend to differ significantly in other measures, had no significant variation in terms of base score or change in scores. The authors assert a lack of engagement between students and faculty, and more focus on entertainment than academic rigor. They argue that this is a result of student evaluations being used for instructor evaluation—instructors are more concerned with fostering good evaluation through easy, entertaining courses. Overall, they call for more academic rigor in class, with increased reading material (i.e., more readings) and writing requirements. Due to changing college culture, changes in higher education, and the focus upon increasing college access, college has become easier. While there has not been a significant decrease in student GPAs in the first two years of college, there has been a general decrease in the critical thinking skills. What needs to be understood with this study is that it looks at first and second year college students only despite the “doomsday” claims that the American higher education system as a whole is in danger. While Arum and Roksa argue there is a lack of critical thinking skills among first and second year college students, they do not take into consideration critical thinking skills associated with actual disciplinary knowledge. Since many students take general education courses in their first two years, Arum and Roksa's argument is much more of an indictment of general education rather than of the whole college system. There also have been numerous critiques of the CLA measure this study uses. It is a generic measure that does not take into account discipline-specific critical thinking skills, and some question whether it truly measures critical thinking effectively. The test measures student ability to make and critique an argument, but those skills can be memorized and may not

reflect actual critical thinking skills. What is significant from Arum and Roksa's study is the lack of engagement with faculty reported by students; many students report they do not engage instructors outside of class (Arum & Roksa, 2011).

Although there are problems with Arum and Roksa's (2011) study, they argue that there is a clear problem with students' learning, critical thinking skills, and a lack of engagement between students and instructors. Hu and Kuh (2002) argue that the level of engagement (i.e., a student's involvement with academics) is a determining factor in the success of college students, and that there is an alarming amount of disengagement among college students. Hu and Kuh (2002) look at the individual and institutional characteristics that may predict the level of disengagement. What they found is a positive relationship between engagement and academic success. Arum and Roksa (2011) suggest that student engagement is connected to improvement of critical thinking skills. Students who had little to no engagement with faculty showed little to no improvement in critical thinking skills. Beyond academic success, Sax and Austin (1998) found that student engagement also has a profound positive influence upon development of students' "civic virtue."

There seems to be a relationship between student development (both in terms of academic and personal growth) and civic engagement. Hunt, Simonds, and Simonds (2009) argue that critical thinking instruction needs to be housed in a specific disciplinary course and they state that the basic course in communication is the ideal method of course delivery. There is a strong connection between verbal skills and critical thinking, making courses that focus upon verbal skills as effective avenues to critical thinking instruction. Furthermore, this study inadvertently found a strong connection between

civic engagement and critical thinking skills—sections of the course that infused Political Engagement Project (PEP) pedagogy saw greater gains in critical thinking skills compared to non-PEP courses. Unlike Arum and Roksa (2011) who focus upon general education, Hunt, Simonds, and Simonds suggest that critical thinking is connected to disciplinary knowledge, which is not measured by the CLA. Furthermore, PEP courses necessitate faculty engagement and student engagement through a variety of activities in and outside the classroom. Civic education has the potential to address many problems in higher education. Not only can universities fulfill their commitment to civic education, but develop students both academically and as human beings.

The Challenge of Defining Civic Education

Civic education encompasses a wide variety of ideas, behaviors, labels, and programs. Some scholars talk about service learning while others use the term *civic engagement*. As Jacoby (2009) explains:

There is widespread recognition that defining civic engagement presents formidable challenges. In fact, there are probably as many definitions of civic engagement as there are scholars and practitioners who are concerned with it. Civic engagement is a complex and polyonymous concept. In addition, scholars and practitioners use a multiplicity of terms to name it, including social capital, citizenship, democratic participation/citizenship/practice, public work/public problem solving, political engagement, community engagement, social responsibility, social justice, civic professionalism, public agency, community building, civic or public leadership, development of public intellectuals, and preservation and expansion of the commons (p. 6)

In fact, Presley (2011) and Saltmarsh (2005, 2011) articulate that one of the barriers to promoting civic education is the fact it has multiple definitions—it is difficult to explain and implement. In exploring definitions of civic education, I will begin with a basic conceptualization of civic education, and then I will focus upon the major divisions within the movement: service learning, civic engagement, political engagement, democratic engagement, social justice, and antifoundational engagement.

Conceptualizing Civic Education

Civic education is generally concerned with the political development of young people from a liberal political philosophy perspective—teaching people how to be good and productive citizens in a democracy (Carr, 2008). Crick (2008) argues that the modern usage of democracy is:

found in the American constitution and in many of the new constitutions in Europe in the 19th century and in the new West German and Japanese constitutions following the Second World War, also in the writings of John Stuart Mill and Alexis de Tocqueville: that all can be active citizens if they care, but must mutually respect the equal rights of fellow citizens within a regulatory legal order that defines, protects and limits those rights. So what is generally meant by “democracy” today, especially in the US, Europe and countries influenced by their political ideas, is the fusion of the idea of the power of the people and the idea of legally guaranteed individual rights. (p. 15)

Ever since the founding of the United States, many scholars, policy makers, and citizens have emphasized the need to for civic education, although, there is significant debate as to what that education should look like. Due to the decentralized nature of the American

educational system, the policies and practices of civic education vary from state to state and institution to institution (Hahn, 2008).

As Crick (2008) argues, democracy “is more a matter of recognizable behaviour over time than of definitive definition for a precise curricular moment” (p. 13). Our ideas of citizenship have been strongly influenced by the Aristotelian tradition. “Politics is an activity among free citizens living in a state or *polis*, how they govern themselves by public debate” (Crick, 2008, p. 13).

The “civic” in civic education is related to the concept of citizen and citizenship within a democracy (Maguire, 1982). The civic is closely related to the functions of higher education; colleges and universities are often mediating structures between the individual and the state. A fundamental aspect of the civic in higher education is “power and justice are as fundamental objects of inquiry and concern as are truth, goodness, and beauty. The questions of how power is to be defined, transmitted, distributed, rendered just and humane, become as basic as the questions of how one knows the truth, does the good, or experiences the beautiful” (Maguire, 1982, p. 281). Maguire (1982) argues that higher education’s commitment to the civic requires three entailments. 1) The university must be both critical of and a companion to society. 2) The university has civic responsibility—it cannot deny “the social practices of other institutions with which it is related by ties of service, money, and personnel; [...] the political and social practices of institutions and countries in which it invests; [...] [it cannot deny its] responsibility to identify and promote particular values beyond inquiry into and analysis of them; its disavowal of responsibility for the so-called private lives of our students or the communal support of our scholars as persons” (p. 282). 3) Social concern and political commitment

must be cultivated in the university—simply encouraging civic action is not enough—the university must instill a “civic imagination,” which can craft a new social order.

Knowledge of the forms and functions of political systems (e.g., the branches of government, checks and balances, and the Constitution) is only one aspect of civic education (Morrill, 1982; Musil, 2009). Morrill (1982) argues that:

The problem of exactly what to teach about democracy is no greater, however, than the question of how and to what end to teach it. Even if one could agree that, at the very least, liberal education should provide all college students with basic information about the theory and operation of their own political system, other issues immediately present themselves. In the nature of the case, education for democratic citizenship involves human capacities relating to judgment, to choice, and, above all, to action. To be literate as a citizen requires more than knowledge and information; it includes the exercise of personal responsibility, active participation, and personal commitment to a set of values. Democratic literacy is a literacy of doing, not simply of knowing. Knowledge is a necessary but not sufficient condition of democratic responsibility. (p. 365)

Values are not just based upon individual preferences, but rather “are the immanent patterns and standards of choice that guide individuals and groups toward meaningful and desirable ends” (Morrill, 1982, p. 367). Values are not bits of information that can be memorized, but rather patterns of human behavior. “Democracy floats in a sea of values like participation, responsibility, respect for self and others, equality, freedom, justice, tolerance, and trust” (Morrill, 1982, p. 368). However, since values must be oriented towards action, civic education “involves a disposition to relevant action, a form of life

and pattern of choice, and not simply the acceptance of various abstract propositions about democracy or the passive endorsement of a set of ideals” (Morrill, 1982, p. 367). Civic education involves critical analysis of values, and “bringing value issues and conflicts to the surface, one would both understand more about the roots of the problem and give students an opportunity to become explicitly and critically aware of their own and others' values” (Morrill, 1982, p. 371).

Political knowledge and democratic values are the foundation of civic education; however, there are multiple ways in which this content can be taught. Now that the basic conceptualization of civic education has been explored, we move to defining the basic perspectives on civic education, starting with service learning.

Service Learning

Service learning, which focuses upon volunteerism and community service, is generally understood as the first programs of the most recent civic education movement (Hartley, 2011; Jacoby, 2009). Service learning ideologically and pedagogically stems from John Dewey’s (1910, 1997) writings on experience and learning (Butin, 2010; Giles & Eyler, 1994; Hildreth, 2012; Saltmarsh, 1996). To simplify, service learning can be defined as a “form of experiential education in which students engage in activities that address human and community needs together with structured opportunities intentionally designed to promote student learning and development. Reflection and reciprocity are key concepts of service-learning” (Jacoby, 1996, p. 5). As Butin (2010) explains:

[S]ervice-learning advocates point to research demonstrating that service-learning enhances student outcomes (cognitive, affective, and ethical), fosters a more active citizenry, promotes a "scholarship of engagement" among teachers and

institutions, supports a more equitable society, and reconnects colleges and universities with their local and regional communities. (pp. 3-4)

Service learning programs have expanded within the last 30 years to become a major aspect of higher education (Hollander, 2010).

Sigmon (1990) is credited as the first person to use the term service learning in the late 1970s; however, Sigmon argues that the concept cannot really be traced to a single author, the concept organically appeared. Sigmon (1990) draws from Greenleaf's (2002) original concept of service from his writings on servant leadership. Sigmon, quoting Greenleaf, views service as:

“[Making] sure that other people's highest priority needs are being served. The best test, and difficult to administer, is this: Do those served grow as persons? Do they, while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants? And, what is the effect on the least privileged in society? Will they benefit or at least not be further deprived?
(Greenleaf, 2002, p. 27)

Sigmon (1990) argues that learning stems from the service activity, and that service learning should be guided by three principles: 1) “Those being served control the service(s) provided.” 2) “Those being served become better able to serve and be served by their own actions.” 3) “Those who serve also are learners and have significant control over what is expected to be learned” (Sigmon, 1990, p. 57).

Stanton (1990) suggests that Sigmon's three principles foster reciprocal learning between those who serve, and those who are served. Service learning is a “program emphasis, representative of a set of educational, social and sometimes political values,

rather than a discrete type of experiential education (Stanton, 1990, p. 65). Stanton argues that the principle difference between other examples of experiential learning (e.g., an internship that is focused upon career development or academic knowledge) and service learning is the emphasis on service over other objectives.

Like other conceptualizations of civic education, service learning also has a problem of definition. Kendall (1990) came across approximately 150 different terms for service learning in her review of literature. Some focus upon the “civic,” such as citizen involvement, citizenship, civic awareness, and civic literacy; while other terms focus upon the community or social connections, such as community education, community service, or education for social responsibility. Kendall (1990) argues that the language used to describe service learning might be different; however, every conceptualization acknowledges “that there is something uniquely powerful about the combination of service and learning, that there is something fundamentally more dynamic in the integration of the two than in either alone” (p. 19).

Kendall (1990) suggests that there are two basic ways to understand service learning: 1) as a type of program, and 2) as an overall philosophy of education. Service learning as a type of program promotes community service, but differs from other community service programs due to the emphasis upon students learning about larger social or cultural problems in combination with service. A charity, for example, might provide service opportunities; however, it may not promote learning about the larger context—the social, cultural, or public policy issues—surrounding the need for service. Reciprocity is also a key feature in service learning that may not be emphasized in other community service programs. As a philosophy of education, “service-learning is thus a

philosophy of reciprocal learning, a dynamic and interactive approach which suggests mutuality in learning between the student and the community with whom he or she is actively engaged” (Kendall, 1990, p. 21). Palmer (1990) argues that service learning challenges and complements the dominant individualistic, objectivist epistemology of education by introducing a relational, subjective way of knowing into education. Service learning as a philosophy of education stands in contrast to the traditional mode of education.

Service learning as a concept is difficult to narrow to a single definition because it is a combination of program type, pedagogical approach, and idiosyncratic sites of learning. As Furco (2003) states:

One of the greatest challenges in the study of service-learning is the absence of a common, universally accepted definition for the term. The overarching educational goals of service-learning are subject to numerous interpretations. The programmatic features [...] of service-learning vary widely among classrooms, and sometimes across service-learning experiences within classrooms. All service-learning activities, regardless of their overall design and programmatic goals, involve a complex interaction of students, service activities, curricular content, and learning outcomes. (p. 13)

Beyond the complex nature of service learning, Butin (2010) argues that service learning can be divided into four basic perspectives: the technical, cultural, political, and antifoundational; however, Butin notes that these perspectives can overlap.

The technical perspective of service learning focuses upon the learning outcomes, program structure, and administration of service learning programs. This perspective is

considered to be apolitical and not inherently connected to civic education; however, one can incorporate technical questions with civic education. This perspective answers the basic question of program effectiveness and administration. For the purpose of this dissertation, the technical perspective will not be a major focus, unless a service learning author directly connects it to civic education.

The cultural perspective views service learning as a vehicle to mend frayed social networks and foster civic and/or political engagement. This perspective shares the same ideological assumptions as civic and political engagement; however, this perspective views service learning as a path to democratic renewal. This perspective will be explored through the service learning, civic engagement, and political engagement frames.

The political perspective views service justice as a means to achieve social justice objectives. The political perspective draws ideologically from social justice and critical theory and uses service learning as a method to address power (im)balances and silenced perspectives in society. This perspective will be explored through the service learning, social justice, and critical frame.

The antifoundational perspective views service learning as a way to disrupt students' cultural preconceptions and binaries, rather than to achieve a specific learning objective or outcome. This draws from pragmatic antifoundationalism (which argues that it is impossible to have objective truth or achieve some sort of end goal) and postmodernism (which views knowledge as incomplete and fragmented). This perspective also argues that neutrality is impossible, that every knowledge claim is political and contested. Rather than using service learning to achieve a learning outcome, service learning is viewed as a method to open discussion about an issue, not to arrive at

a set understanding or “truth.” This perspective will briefly be discussed with the service learning frame; however, the philosophical and ideological foundation will be discussed with the antifoundational frame.

Service learning marks the beginning of the most recent civic education movement; however, not all service learning focuses upon civic education or engagement. As Watson (2004) explains, “Service-learning and civic engagement are conceptually similar and conceptually distinct ideas; however, not all service-learning pedagogies incorporate civic engagement and not all civic engagement initiatives involve service-learning” (p. 74). Although many would argue that service learning and civic engagement stem from the same assumptions and values, there are some key difference that need to be explored. Now that we have discussed the basic definition of service learning, we move to the concept of civic engagement.

Civic Engagement

The service learning movement began the latest discussion of civic education; however, the term civic engagement was coined as a way to differentiate between service learning and more traditional, classroom based civic education. Civic engagement is by far the most common term used in civic education; however, as Jacoby (2009) suggests, its widespread use does not suggests agreement as to what the term means. Butin (2010) argues that service learning is a limited civic engagement pedagogy. Hollander (2010) shares this sentiment, and argues for the need to “evaluate how far the civic engagement ‘movement’ in higher education has come and what strategies should be considered next. [Butin (2010)] lays bare the difficulties in relying on service-learning as the standard

bearer for a revolutionary redefinition [through civic engagement] of the nature of scholarship and institutional transformation” (p. ix).

While service learning focuses upon service, “[t]he civic engagement approach is thus concerned with training students with skills needed to build a civil society, including an understanding of democratic citizenship, democratic leadership skills, and the value of a lifelong service ethic (e.g., commitment to volunteering and civic leadership)”(Watson, 2004, p. 79). Service learning can be a mechanism of civic engagement only if civic engagement is an expressed goal and outcome. As the term “civic engagement” became popular, many service learning programs adopted the term—but failed to change their programs or pedagogy associated with the term (Jacoby, 2009). As Saltmarsh and Hartley (2011) argue:

[M]ere activity in a community does not constitute civic engagement. Civic engagement defined by purpose and processes has a particular meaning in higher education and is associated with implications for institutional change. Purpose refers specifically to enhancing a public culture of democracy on and off campus and alleviating public problems through democratic means. The processes of engagement refer to the way in which those on campus—administrators, academics, staff, and students—relate to those outside the campus. Purpose and processes are inextricably linked—the means must be consistent with the ends, and the ends are defined by democratic culture. (p. 17)

Jacoby (2009) notes, there is no agreement on a definition of civic engagement because it is value-laden. To simplify:

Civic engagement is defined as "acting upon a heightened sense of responsibility to one's communities. This includes a wide range of activities, including developing civic sensitivity, participation in building civil society, and benefiting the common good. Civic engagement encompasses the notions of global citizenship and interdependence. Through civic engagement, individuals—as citizens of their communities, their nations, and the world—are empowered as agents of positive social change for a more democratic world." Civic engagement involves one or more of the following: Learning from others, self, and environment to develop informed perspectives on social issues; Valuing diversity and building bridges across difference; Behaving, and working through controversy, with civility; Taking an active role in the political process; Participating actively in public life, public problem solving, and community service; Assuming leadership and membership roles in organizations; Developing empathy, ethics, values, and sense of social responsibility; Promoting social justice locally and globally. (Jacoby, 2009, p. 9)

Civic engagement moves beyond volunteerism and community service—it is not just asking students to volunteer at a soup kitchen, it is asking them to think about why there is a need to have a soup kitchen and developing skills (both in the classroom and community) to address the issues and advocate change⁵. Civic engagement involves a more holistic way to think about community and advocating political action. Now that we have discussed the term civic engagement, we move to a conceptually linked perspective of political engagement.

⁵ The “soup kitchen” example has become so ubiquitous to the civic engagement literature that is difficult to trace the original author.

Political Engagement

The definition of political engagement, like civic engagement, is also contested. Some argue that there is no difference between civic and political engagement and/or use either term interchangeably. However, Colby, Beaumont, Ehrlich, and Corngold (2007) argue there is a difference between political and civic engagement. Political engagement includes direct participation in electoral politics, such as “voting, participating in campaigns or political parties, contacting elected officials, running for office, and the like” (p. 29). Beyond the traditional understanding of political participation, Colby et al. (2007) argue that:

[P]olitical participation can include working informally with others to solve a community problem; serving in many types of neighborhood organizations and groups that have a stake in political policies or outcomes; supporting political causes or candidates financially; participating in public forums on social issues; discussing political issues with family and friends or trying to influence coworkers' political opinions; working on a campaign for a candidate or issue; writing letters or politically oriented electronic journals (blogs); signing petitions and participating in various forms of policy advocacy and lobbying; raising public awareness about social issues or mobilizing others to get involved or take action through rallies, protests, sit-ins, street theater, or public awareness campaigns; participating in collective consumer efforts intended to achieve political goals, such as purchasing or boycotting particular products or making investment decisions in support of social-political causes; and of course, voting in local or national elections or perhaps even running for public office. (pp. 30-31)

Colby et al. (2007) note that civic and political engagement are interrelated; however, civic engagement is apolitical—one can be civically engaged—working with community organizations, doing volunteer work, etc.—yet refrain from participating in electoral politics or pursuing changes in public policy. Both civic and political engagement draw from many of the same skills and motivation; however, political engagement focuses upon political action and participation. Now that we have discussed political engagement, we move to the democratic engagement perspective of civic engagement.

Democratic Engagement

The distinction between civic and political engagement in many ways is artificial. Under most circumstances civic and political engagement draw from the same skills and motivations. Saltmarsh and Hartley (2011) recently introduced the concept of "democratic engagement," arguing that:

The norms of democratic education are determined by the values of inclusiveness, participation, task sharing and reciprocity in public problem solving, and an equality of respect for the knowledge and experience that everyone involved contributes to education and community building. Democratic processes and purposes reorient civic engagement to what we are calling "democratic engagement" engagement that has significant implications for transforming higher education such that democratic values are part of the leadership of administrators, the scholarly work of faculty, the educational work of staff, and the leadership development and learning outcomes of students. Democratic engagement has epistemological, curricular, pedagogical, research, policy, and culture implications. It adheres to the shared understanding that the only way to learn the

norms and develop the values of democracy is to practice democracy as part of one's education. Without a democratic purpose, engagement efforts are often pursued as ends in themselves, and engagement becomes reduced to a public relations function of making known what the campus is doing in and/or for the community and providing opportunities for students to have experiences in the community. (pp. 17-18)

Saltmarsh and Hartley (2011) attempt to mediate between different conceptualizations of civic education (i.e., service learning and civic engagement), claiming that civic engagement has yet to achieve the democratic ideal. In a field wrought with overlapping and competing terms, Saltmarsh and Hartley (2011) introduce yet another term. Civic, political, and democratic engagement are perhaps the most universally use terms to describe civic education in the movement. Now that we have discussed democratic engagement, we move to social justice perspective.

Social Justice

Those who advocate for social justice in civic education argue for the need address social and economic inequalities in education. Westheimer and Kahne (2008) state that “education for social justice is simply to say that one supports the idea of preparing students to use the knowledge and analytic skills they develop in school to identify ways in which society and societal institutions can treat people more fairly and more humanely” (p. vii). Bell (1997) argues that the “process for attaining the goal of social justice [...] should also be democratic and participatory, inclusive and affirming of human agency and human capacities for working collaboratively to create change” (p. 5-6).

Westheimer and Kahne (2004) describe the social justice perspective in relation to civic education as the justice-oriented citizen, which they argue is a less common perspective in civic education. While other perspectives of civic education focus upon service or civic participation, the social justice perspective would argue that service and civic participation may overlook the root cause of inequality.

One of the critiques that Butin (2010) makes in relation the civic education movement is that those who advocate for social justice assume that there is one “correct” interpretation of justice. Chambers and Gopaul (2010) note that social justice has been defined differently through philosophy, political science, and other disciplines. “Social justice is interpreted and practiced in different ways depending on the principles or criteria used to define what is ‘just’” (Chambers & Gopaul, 2010, p. 59) Chambers and Gopaul (2010) outline four perspectives on justice: distributive, competitive, recognitive, and the capabilities perspective. Distributive views of social justice are based upon two principles “(1) liberty or individual freedom and (2) equal distribution of material and social goods” (Chambers & Gopaul, 2010, p. 59). While distributive justice is concerned with fair distribution of social goods, the competitive perspective is concerned with the fairness of competition for social goods—it is not the equalization of possessions, but rather the fairness of the market. The recognitive perspective stems from the discussion of liberty and individual freedom; but rather than exclusively focusing upon the individual, recognizes the place of social groups in relation to liberty and individual freedom. The final perspective of social justice is the capabilities perspective, which focuses upon an individual’s ability to have a fulfilling life within the “spheres of the economic, personal, social, and environmental” (Chambers & Gopaul, 2010, p. 60).

Lisman (1998) argues that critical pedagogy, drawing from Marxist and neo-Marxist theory, also informs social justice by providing “a comprehensive analysis of the ways in which education, rather than serving as an approach to help achieve greater equality, serves to reinforce inequality by reproducing a class-divided society” (p. 77). Those who advocate social justice from a critical perspective oftentimes view traditional notions of justice to be excessively market oriented. As a perspective on social justice, Lisman (1998) suggests that:

The critical pedagogy approach provides, at minimum, a correction to noncritical pedagogy advocates of social justice. Many justice advocates in the service-learning movement tend to believe that drawing students into justice issues [...] is sufficient to motivate students to work in behalf of the elimination of social injustice. This approach simply underestimates the hegemonic power of education. (p. 77)

Now that we have discussed the perspectives that advocate for civic education, we move to the antifoundational perspective.

Antifoundational Engagement

The antifoundational perspective on civic education stems from Stanley Fish, who argues that students’ moral and civic development should not be a concern for higher education. As Butin (2008a) explains, “Higher education, claims Fish, should not be in the business of enhancing or expanding students’ moral, civic, or social characters; nor to inveigh on current social, cultural, and political issues such as war, poverty, or racism; nor to revitalize, transform, or collaborate with local and regional communities” (p. 63).

Fish (2003) argues that civic education is simply unworkable. “There are just too many intervening variables, too many uncontrolled factors that mediate the relationship between what goes on in a classroom or even in a succession of classrooms and the shape of what is finally a life” (Fish, 2003, para. 19). So he argues that higher education should not even try to foster civic and moral development. Fish (2008) offers a very narrow view of the “job” of a college teacher.

College and university teachers can (legitimately) do two things: (1) introduce students to bodies of knowledge and traditions of inquiry that had not previously been part of their experience; and (2) equip those same students with the analytical skills—of argument, statistical modeling, laboratory procedure—that will enable them to move confidently within those traditions and to engage in independent research after a course is over. (p. 12-13)

While Fish (2008) acknowledges that there are other “contingent” effects as a result of college instruction that may broach civic and moral development, but “[i]t's not a good use of your time to aim at results you have only a random chance of producing” (p. 13).

Fish (2008) does not advocate that controversial political issues should not be discussed in the classroom, but instead advocates that these topics need to be approached in a narrow way.

Analyzing ethical issues is one thing; deciding them is another, and only the first is an appropriate academic activity. Again, I do not mean to exclude political topics from the classroom, but to insist that when political topics are introduced, they not be taught politically, that is, with a view to either affirming or rejecting a particular political position. The name I give to this process whereby politically

explosive issues are made into subjects of intellectual inquiry is "academicizing." To academicize a topic is to detach it from the context of its real world urgency, where there is a vote to be taken or an agenda to be embraced, and insert it into a context of academic urgency, where there is an account to be offered or an analysis to be performed. (Fish, 2008, pp. 26-27)

Fish argues for a narrow, politically neutral approach to education that focuses upon exposing students to new domains of knowledge and different perspectives, while teaching students critical and analytical skills; however, students' moral and civic development should not be a focus.

Now that we have explored the various terms and perspectives on civic education, we move to the various regional and national initiatives and organizations who promote civic education in the United States.

Civic Education Initiatives in Higher Education

There are various initiatives designed to promote civic education in higher education; however, for the purpose of this section, I will only address the regional and national initiatives. This is not to say that the various institutional schools and centers do not do good civic work on their respective campus, rather I am interested in the greater civic education movement.

Campus Compact

Campus Compact was founded in 1985 and is a national coalition comprised of over 1,100 college and university presidents. The organization was founded to highlight and promote community service activities in higher education. Their mission statement reads: "Campus Compact advances the public purpose of colleges and universities by

deepening their ability to improve community life and to educate students for civic and social responsibility” (Campus Compact, para. 3). They argue that “colleges and universities [are] vital agents and architects of a diverse democracy, committed to educating students for responsible citizenship in ways that both deepen their education and improve the quality of community life” (Campus Compact, 2015b, para. 4).

Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU)

The Association of American College and Universities (AACU) supports numerous research projects and publications regarding higher education, including civic education. “Through projects and publications, AAC&U builds national awareness of civic and democratic learning and supports campus capacity for those outcomes that are essential for life, work, and citizenship in the 21st century” (Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2015, para. 1).

American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU)

The American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) supports research and advocacy on a number of higher education issues, including civic education through various initiatives.

American Democracy Project. “AASCU’s American Democracy Project (ADP) is a multi-campus initiative focused on higher education’s role in preparing the next generation of informed, engaged citizens for our democracy” (American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 2015b, p. para. 1). ADP was established in 2003 by AASCU and the New York Times. ADP is comprised of 250 AASCU member colleges and universities (American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 2015b).

Political Engagement Project (PEP). The Political Engagement Project (PEP) is an initiative of ADP specifically to address political engagement and is comprised of 10 campus (S. Hunt, personal communication, December 7, 2012). “The Political Engagement Project has the goal of developing a sense of political efficacy and duty on the part of undergraduates as well as a set of political skills that students will need as they engage with the political world. To do this, PEP campuses have infused political education and engagement tactics into a variety of disciplines and courses on campus and have made the tenants of political engagement central to the institutional framework of their campuses [sic]” (American Association of State Colleges and Universities 2015, p. para. 1).

eCitizenship. The eCitizenship initiative is a partnership between AASCU and the Center for the Study of Citizenship at Wayne State University with the expressed goal of exploring “how emerging technologies, particularly social networks, support and facilitate civic and political engagement” (American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 2015h).

The Democracy Commitment. The Democracy Commitment is comprised of over 50 two-year institutions that mirrors the ADP model. “The goal of the project is for every graduate of an American community college to have an education in democracy” (American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 2015g, p. para. 1).

Civic Agency. The Civic Agency initiative is a partnership between ADP and the Sabo Center for Democracy and Citizenship (SCDC) to promote the concept of civic agency. “Civic agency involves the capacities of citizens to work collaboratively across differences” (American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 2015e, p. para. 1)

“The project seeks to further develop and operationalize the concept of civic agency. The goal of this initiative is to produce a series of national models for developing civic agency among undergraduates and to disseminate those models broadly throughout American higher education” (American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 2015e, p. para. 2)

Global Engagement. The Global Engagement initiative is a partnership between ADP and The Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) and is the only ADP initiative focused internationally, although some individual campus incorporate global engagement within their broader ADP initiative. The goal is to develop “strategies, materials, and programs to educate globally-competent citizens” (American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 2015j, p. para. 2).

America’s Future. The America’s Future initiative is specifically focused upon the fiscal health of the United States. “The goal of the America’s Future initiative is to educate AASCU students about our looming national debt and deficits, while exploring ways in which they can interact with policy makers to end this era of financial irresponsibility” (American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 2015a, p. para. 2).

Civic Health. The Civic Health initiative is a partnership between ADP and the National Conference on Citizenship (NCoC) to “identify and develop campus and community civic health assessments and tools, as well as action plans that respond to the findings” (American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 2015c, p. para. 2). Civic health is “based on a variety of civic indicators – including how often citizens report discussing politics, involvement in community groups, addressing local issues with

neighbors, participation in volunteer and service activities, political action and other measures of social connection and community engagement.(American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 2015d, p. 1).

Deliberative Polling. The Deliberative Polling initiative seeks to develop and assess polling and learning strategies involving deliberative democracy. “Deliberative Polling employs social science to determine what people would think about an issue if they became more engaged and informed” (American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 2015f, p. para. 1).

Economic Inequality. The Economic Inequality initiative is a partnership between ADP and TCD to address the growing issue of income inequality in the United States. “We believe that those of us in higher education have the responsibility to engage our students and communities in assembling the knowledge and skills to effectively enact change related to the complex issue of growing economic inequality” (American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 2015i, p. para. 2).

American Association of Community Colleges (AACC)

The American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) represents 1,200 two-year institutions and community colleges. The AACC advocates for numerous issues, but primarily approaches civic education through service learning, which they define as “the combination of community service and classroom instruction, with a focus on critical, reflective thinking as well as personal and civic responsibility (Gottlieb & Robinson, 2006, p. 5).

Community College National Center for Community Engagement (CCNCCE)

The Community College National Center for Community Engagement (CCNCCE) represents more than 1,200 community colleges and promotes civic engagement through service learning (Community College National Center for Community Engagement, 2015). This organization sponsors the Journal for Civic Commitment, which publishes research on service learning and civic engagement.

National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (NAICU)

The National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (NAICU) represent 1,000 private nonprofit institutions (National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, 2014a). NAICU's National Campus Voter Registration Project has worked towards increasing voter registration nationwide and provides information to help institutions design and implement voter registration drives on campus (National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, 2014b, 2014c)

Project Pericles

Project Pericles is a not-for-profit organization founded in 2001 that “encourages and facilitates commitments by colleges and universities to include social responsibility and participatory citizenship as essential elements of their educational programs (Project Pericles, 2015, p. para. 1). Project Pericles provides numerous grants and publishes research on civic education.

Associated New American Colleges

The Associated New American Colleges represents 23 small to mid-sized independent colleges and universities “dedicated to the purposeful integration of liberal

education, professional studies, and civic engagement” (Associated New American Colleges, 2015, p. para. 1).

National Forum on Higher Education and the Public Good

The National Forum on Higher Education and the Public Good was founded in 2000 to “increase awareness, understanding, commitment, and action in support of higher education’s public service mission” (National Forum on Higher Education and the Public Good, 2013, p. para. 1) They argue that one of the central goals of the university is the public good. “[U]niversities and four and two-year colleges are some of the most valuable laboratories for democratic experimentation in contemporary America” (National Forum on Higher Education and the Public Good, 2013, p. para. 3)

Kettering Foundation

The Kettering Foundation, founded in 1927, is a nonprofit organization that promotes and conducts research on civic education. “The foundation seeks to identify and address the challenges to making democracy work as it should through interrelated program areas that focus on citizens, communities, and institutions” (Kettering Foundation, 2015).

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching is “committed to developing networks of ideas, individuals, and institutions to advance teaching and learning” (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 2015, p. para. 1). As part of their mission, the Carnegie Foundation publishes research on civic education. One initiative is the Community Engagement Elective Classification.

The elective classification involves data collection and documentation of important aspects of institutional mission, identity and commitments, and requires substantial effort invested by participating institutions. [...] The purpose of community engagement is the partnership of college and university knowledge and resources with those of the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity; enhance curriculum, teaching and learning; prepare educated, engaged citizens; strengthen democratic values and civic responsibility; address critical societal issues; and contribute to the public good (New England Resource Center for Higher Education, 2015a).

Currently, 361 campuses have received the Community Engagement Elective Classification.

Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement (CIRCLE)

The Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning & Engagement (CIRCLE) is based out of the Jonathan M. Tisch College of Citizenship and Public Service at Tufts University. CIRCLE provides numerous resources and publications, specifically on student and youth civic education, that “informs policy and practice for healthier youth development and a better democracy” (Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement, 2015, p. para. 1).

New England Resource Center for Higher Education (NERCHE)

The New England Resource Center for Higher Education (NERCHE) is based out of the College of Education and Human development at the University of Massachusetts. NERCHE provides numerous resources and publication promoting civic education. They

are “committed to collaborative change processes in higher education to address social justice in a diverse democracy” (New England Resource Center for Higher Education, 2015b, p. para. 1).

Soba Center for Democracy and Citizenship (SCDC)

The Soba Center for Democracy and Citizenship (SCDC) is housed at Augsburg College. Their mission is to:

Create a culture of civic agency and engagement among students, faculty, staff, and our broader community so that graduates are architects of change and pioneers in work of public significance. [...] Revitalize the democratic and public purposes of higher education, in a time when strengthening colleges’ visible contributions to the common good, not simply to private benefit. (Soba Center for Democracy and Citizenship, 2015)

SCDS promotes civic education and also partners with other organizations on various projects.

National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA)

The National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) is one of the largest organizations representing student affairs professionals. NASPA advocates on a number of issues, including civic education. “Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement (CLDE) means promoting the education of students for engaged citizenship through democratic participation in their communities, respect and appreciation of diversity, applied learning and social responsibility” (National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, 2015).

Now that we have discussed some of the major conceptualizations of civic education along with the various regional and national organizations, which promote civic education in higher education, we move into the research questions to be explored in the following chapters.

Research Questions

RQ 1: How do those in higher education ideologically construct civic education?

RQ 2: How do those in higher education frame civic education?

RQ 3: What are the major implications of these civic education frames for higher education?

In this project, I seek to understand how civic education is conceptualized by different groups within the movement—not to find the "right" conceptualization or definition, but to identify commonalities and differences between different groups. The challenge of defining civic education is one that many scholars have recognized, yet very few have attempted to address. Speaking about social movement theory, Zald (1996) explains that "modes of analysis of culture, of frames and scripts, of rhetoric and dramaturgy, and of cultural repertoires and tool kits [has] substantially enhance[d] our ability to analyze the role of culture, ideology, and frames in social movements" (p. 262). I propose that these same methods can provide a systematic and effective way to address the fragmentation of the civic education movement and provide a better understanding of the different approaches to civic education that remain disconnected in the current literature.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

Zald (1996) argues that the study of social movements is complex—numerous factors contribute to the success or failure of a given movement. To deal with the complexity, Zald (1996) advocates three interconnected frameworks:

Culture, ideology, and strategic framing is our broadest and loosest conceptual cluster. They are linked because they are the topics that deal with the content and processes by which meaning is attached to objects and actions. Roughly speaking, as we use the terms, culture is the shared beliefs and understandings, mediated by and constituted by symbols and language of a group or society; ideology is the set of beliefs that are used to justify or challenge a given social-political order and are used to interpret the political world; frames are the specific metaphors, symbolic representations, and cognitive cues used to render or cast behavior and events in an evaluative mode and to suggest alternative modes of action. Although it has been common to see culture as a long-enduring set of symbols and beliefs, it is also possible to treat the emergence and creation of culture. Ideologies tend to be more complex and logical systems of beliefs than frames, though frames may be embedded in ideologies. Moreover symbols, frames, and ideologies are created and changed in the process of contestation.

(p. 262)

Culture, ideology, and framing are the broadest frameworks; however, Zald (1996) argues that these basic frameworks are also connected to rhetorical analysis as a method of identifying what cultural, ideological, and framing influences are present in a single text or event. With this in mind, there are four interconnected methods that can help to systematically analyze and critique the civic education movement. The first method is ideological criticism, which deals with the ways in which one's belief structure and worldview manifests itself within a text or texts. The second method is frames analysis, which can provide an ideological (macro) level and textual (micro) level of analysis and provides a holistic way to think about civic education discourse. The third method is close textual analysis, which provides a systematic way to analyze individual texts. The fourth method is Bitzer's (1992) rhetorical situation, which offers a systematic way to analyze the context of each text. Ideological criticism and frames analysis provides a mechanism to understand the larger cultural and rhetorical processes (macro processes) related to multiple texts—these methods provide a framework to connect multiple texts. Close textual analysis and the rhetorical situation provide a framework to understand single texts—these methods allow for a deep analysis of each text. Taken together these methods provide a more complete analysis. While these concepts seem abstract, Appendix A outlines the basic process and questions that is used to analyze each text. Texts in the context of this project refers to the academic literature surrounding civic education (i.e., journal articles, books, and research reports), organizational websites (e.g., websites of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Campus Compact, the Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement, etc.), news stories and press releases, and other artifacts related to civic education (e.g.,

video, film, presentations, etc.). Not every text will be significant, but using Sillars and Gronbeck's (2001) concept of textualization provides a framework to justify why certain texts are more important than others. Since this project includes a study of the civic education literature, the process of textualization is similar to an academic review of literature.

Connecting Methods with the Research Questions

Zald (1996) argues that theories of culture, ideology, and framing are important and interconnect methods to analyze the basic discourse of movements. The civic education movement has gained support and momentum; however, the movement remains conceptually and ideologically fragmented.

Ideological analysis, master framing, and rhetorical analysis will help to answer my first research question, RQ 1: How do those in higher education ideologically construct civic education?

Framing analysis and rhetorical analysis provide a method to evaluate ideological discourse, but also to understand how civic education is framed—the problems that civic education addresses, the various approaches to civic education, and the motivation and justification for civic education in higher education; framing theory and rhetorical analysis answer my second research question, RQ 2: How do those in higher education frame civic education?

The entire analysis will answer my third research question, RQ 3: What are the major implications of these civic education frames for higher education? Competing perspectives on civic education affect policy, funding, pedagogy, and research scholarship for higher education. Some of the implications are apparent within the

literature and some are not. Ideological criticism, framing analysis, and rhetorical analysis provide the framework by which implications can be identified and critiqued.

Ideological Criticism

As Battistoni (2002) notes, one "barrier to using the language of citizenship is ideological. Faculty on the left complain that citizenship education tends to convey images of patriotic flag-waving. More conservative faculty sees civic engagement masking a leftist, activist agenda" (p. 10). Ideological criticism deals with cultural values, beliefs, and assumptions—a worldview—and the ways in which these concepts manifest themselves into discourse. Ideology is a term that is used loosely in everyday discourse—in the political realm and in the media, ideology is a buzzword more than a useful concept. It is for this reason that a deeper conceptual framework is needed to understand ideology and its relationship to discourse.

Beyond ideological divisions between the left and the right and partisan politics, civic education also faces competing ideological divisions related to the role of education in public life, perspectives on teaching and learning, and courses of action to promote civic education. These divisions can be healthy. Ehrlich and Colby (2004) argue that civic education should not avoid controversy concerning "theoretical and other issues within academic disciplines or positions on public policy, most of which cannot be arrayed along a simple Conservative-Liberal fault line" (p. 36). However, as Saltmarsh (2005, 2011) notes, fragmentation concerning civic education has created a "latent confusion" about what civic education is and how to operationalize the concept. This confusion prevents supporters of civic education from effectively articulating policy and curricular changes to higher education faculty and administration—all barriers to

promoting civic education. Comparing the civic education movement to other instances of cultural change, this problem of ideological divisions is a common one—every group seeking cultural change must build coalitions across divisions in order to gain support and actualize cultural change. Ideological criticism, particularly the ideas advanced by Gramsci (1971), provides a framework to analyze and compare ideologies—this process can uncover possible commonalities between groups. These commonalities can be used to bridge differences and build coalitions across ideological division seen in the civic education movement.

Marx theorized that the dominant economic class uses ideology to maintain and reproduce the capitalist mode of production. Religion, nationalism, and other forms of ideology only serve the dominant class. Marx saw all ideology as creating false consciousness that hides the true material conditions of the proletariat. For Marx, everything is determined by class and economics (Hawkes, 2003).

Unlike Marx, Gramsci (1971) takes the position that culture plays a heavy role in class relations rather than class relations being dictated solely by the economic system. For Gramsci, economic power and political power are the results of a cultural change in the society. Groups do not achieve economic or political powers then achieve cultural power, but rather groups achieve cultural power that enables them to achieve economic and political power. There are two types of social groups that Gramsci identifies: hegemony and the subaltern.

Hegemony represents the dominant cultural group within a society, which Germino (1990) describes as the "core." In terms of Marx, the dominant cultural group represents the bourgeoisie. Not only does this group hold political and economic power,

but it also holds cultural power (the combined power of the civil society and the state or political society). The subaltern represents the cultural groups that exist outside the hegemony (i.e., the "periphery"). There are various groups in the subaltern, but all have been disenfranchised by the dominant culture. Due to the fact that these represent different cultural and/or political groups, the subaltern tends to be fragmented and unable to successfully counter the hegemony (Gramsci, 1971). Relating this to civic education, Boyte and Fretz (2011) argue "the civic education movement in higher education bumps up against a set of long-standing cultural practices that are so persuasive and deep-seated that they can hardly be named; they are taken for granted as part of the dominant culture" (Boyte & Fretz, 2011, p. 90). In this instance, the civic education movement (although marginally institutionalized) lies at the periphery of the dominant culture in higher education. The current fragmented state of civic education prevents a unified front needed to challenge the dominant culture of higher education (what Gramsci would call a counter-hegemony).

Gramsci's (1971) developed a concept called common sense, which is the uncritically absorbed customs or ideas imposed by the dominant culture as manifested in a particular ideology. Laclau (1977) states, "[c]ommon sense discourse, doxa, is presented as a system of misleading articulations in which concepts do not appear linked by inherent logical relations, but are bound together simply by connotative or evocative links which custom and opinion have established between them" (p. 7). Common sense is disjointed and fragmented in nature and often is justified simply as this is just how things are done or simply as a cultural expectation (Hall, 1996). Ideology can be broadly be defined as a system of ideas, belief and values, and often there are multiple ideologies

that can exist within a given society or group (Hawkes, 2003). Common sense may be true or false but is generally accepted by society.

Gramsci (1971) argues that this division and social structure is not set, and it is possible to change the structure. The core remains in power because it has the power of the culture behind it. Through common sense, or the uncritically accepted norms of the core culture, the core receives consent from the both the groups inside the core and outside from the periphery. As an example, we are generally taught that when people give us something that we should give something back in return (Cialdini, 2001, calls this persuasive principle reciprocity); it is common sense. As Cialdini (2001) notes, this cultural norm is intentionally used to persuade people, when people are often unaware of the strategy. Unlike Marx, Gramsci (1971) maintains that any person has the potential to become an intellectual. Marx believed that the masses were unable to break out of domination, but rather it was the intellectual class who had the power to inform the masses of their lot, which would then inspire the masses to revolt. Gramsci called these people organic intellectuals. Gramsci, contrary to Marx, believed that ideology could have both positive and negative effects. On the one hand, ideology can create false consciousness and can be a tool for the core culture to remain dominant. On the other hand, it can provide a way for the subaltern to be liberated through the creation of a counter-hegemony. Good sense is common sense after being evaluated and rearticulated in a way that it becomes a good, useful practice or idea. In the above example of reciprocity, an organic intellectual may evaluate the norm and conclude that it is good societal practice that benefits most people; or rearticulate (i.e., change) the norm to benefit most people (e.g., when someone gives you something you should give something

back, but you should seek an equitable exchange). Ideology can be a tool used by both the core and the subaltern (Gramsci, 1971; Zompetti, 1997). Gramsci argues that there is the potential for the subaltern to change the hegemony in ways that make the subaltern less disenfranchised. While hegemony can never be destroyed (which Marx suggested), it can be altered and a counter-hegemony can rise up to compete with the dominant culture. Gramsci's concept of ideology and hegemony are particularly useful because it provides insight into the role that the ideology plays in both the hegemony's ideological construction as well as the counter-hegemony's use of ideology to counter the dominant ideology. The fragmentation of civic education and the inability of civic education advocates to articulate and gain support for civic education (a problem cited by Saltmarsh, 2005; Saltmarsh & Hartley, 2011; and Presley, 2010) is readily explained by Gramscian cultural theory.

The task, as articulated by Gramsci, is to take common sense and turn it into good sense through critical textual analysis (e.g., making logical connections where they can be made as manifests in cultural artifacts or texts). Common sense can become good sense if, after analysis, it still holds true and useful for the majority of the society. For Gramsci, it is those who are outside of the dominant culture, described as the subaltern, who are best equipped to decipher through the multitude of common sense to find the good sense. As Landy (1994) explains:

The notion of contestation suggests that the pastiche of common sense with its various appropriations of bits and pieces from religion, science, proverbs, folklore, magic, and history is potentially dynamic and accessible to analysis. It is clear too that the study of common sense need not be confined to literary texts [or

academic literature] but can be, and has been, extended to other popular forms—music, cinema, and television. Not only do the different contexts for these articulations, their different modes of reception, their specific audiences, and especially their relations to the minority culture need to be studied, but these media issues need to be related to broader developments within the larger culture and the various groups composing that culture. Most particularly, the practice of isolating texts for study from the contexts in which they are produced and consumed inhibits an understanding of the meaning or possibilities of "contested space." Cultural politics in the Gramscian sense would remain aloof from narrowly construed conceptions of textual study, as it would from the strategy of polarizing political positions around notions of pure liberation and pure domination. This cultural politics would pay attention to locating and analyzing those moments of "good sense" embedded in common-sense discourses as a sounder basis for understanding the limits and possibilities of social transformation. (p. 98)

Academic literature, websites, news and press releases, and other public documents are the primary texts in which civic education is discussed and debated, which influences the ways in which civic education is articulated in higher education both within and outside the movement. Ideological criticism provides a systematic method to analyze civic education discourse to uncover the latent assumptions and points of departure within the civic education movement.

For example, those in civic education who advocate for deliberative democracy (i.e., teaching students to effectively deliberate and creating spaces for deliberation inside

and outside of the university) latent ideological assumption is that people can and should make political choices rationally (this is common sense). However, political research suggests that affect (emotions) greatly effects people's political decisions. Under most situations, it is impossible to separate affect from political decisions—the ability to rationalize is not the only thing at play (Neuman, Marcus, Crigler, & Mackuen, 2007 & Mackuen, 2007). Rather than simply teach students to think rationally, an effective pedagogy should address the role of affect in political decisions (this is common sense turned into good sense). Although deliberative democracy has merit, there are still ideological assumptions that present challenges and opportunities (what Bitzer, 1992 would call a "constraint")—this is the case for every pedagogy and ideology. Ideological criticism provides a basic framework to analyze and evaluate the latent assumptions within the civic education movement. While ideological criticism is concerned with the larger cultural influences, frames analysis provides a method to understand specific discourse as it is used and its relationship to a larger ideological perspective. Ideology is the broadest concept, while framing is a method to focus upon a smaller, more specific level of discourse.

Framing and Frames Analysis

Zald (1996) describes frames as the "specific metaphors, symbolic representations, and cognitive cues used to render or cast behavior and events in an evaluative mode and to suggest alternative modes of action" (p. 262). Most framing analysis research stems from sociology and news media studies, not necessarily from rhetorical theory. While this is true, many scholars from sociology have noted the importance of textual analysis. Tarrow, who has done extensive work with collective

action frames in sociology, notes “[texts] can be important indicators of social consensus” (Tarrow, 1992, p. 177). Entman (1993) claims that the method of content analysis of textual meaning is necessary in identifying and understanding framing activities. While few scholars have explicitly connected master frames analysis and rhetorical theory, the concepts and metatheoretical underpinnings are very similar.

Frames analysis has been used to analyze social movement rhetoric, such as the nuclear disarmament movement (Snow & Benford, 1988), the American farm movement (Mooney & Hunt, 1996), the Sierra Club (Reber, 2005), and the French race riots in 2005 (Snow et al., 2007). Frames analysis has also been used to analyze discourse and public opinion on a variety of complex issues, such as welfare policy (Gamson & Lasch, 1983), affirmative action (Gamson & Modigliani, 1987), nuclear power (Gamson & Modigliani, 1989), poverty (Iyengar, 1990), family farming (Woolard, 2009), fat and public health (Kwan & Graves, 2013), and stage magic performance (Landman, 2013). Frames analysis is useful for analyzing the civic education movement because it offers a method that looks at movements as well as discourse.

Many scholars have pointed to the need for a unified and cross-disciplinary approach to framing analysis. Entman (1993) states we “should identify our mission as to bring together insights and theories that would otherwise remain scattered in other fields [...] Potential research paradigms remain fractured with pieces here and there but no comprehensive statement to guide research” (p. 51). He argues that framing is one of those fragmented theories “[d]espite the omnipresence across the social sciences and the humanities, nowhere is there a general statement of framing theory that shows exactly how frames become embedded within and make themselves manifest into text, or how

framing influences thinking” (p. 51). Although the language of framing may be different across disciplines, the underlying concept remain the same—framing provides a better understanding and a useful tool in analyzing discourse. Many have expounded the value of frames analysis (Benford & Snow, 2000; Bensimon, 1989, 1990; Bruns & Bruns, 2007; Carragee & Roefs, 2004; D'Angelo, 2002; Dunford & Palmer, 1995; Durham, 2001; Eddy, 2010; Entman, 1993, 2007; Gamson & Modigliani, 1989; Goffman, 1974; Ihlen & Nitz, 2008; Kane & Goldgehn, 2010; Palmer & Dunford, 1996; Retallick & Fink, 2002; Scherff, Prado, & Singer, 2009 2009; Snow & Benford, 1988; Spillane, 2004; Spillane, Reiser, & Reimer, 2002; Van Gorp, 2007).

Reese (2007) notes that “framing’s value, however, does not hinge on its potential as a unified research domain but, [...] as a provocative model that bridges parts of the field that need to be in touch with each other: quantitative and qualitative, empirical and interpretative, psychological and sociological, and academic and professional” (p. 148). Due to its omnipresence throughout disciplines, framing theory provides a unified set of terms and concepts that are useful across disciplines or and paradigms (Ihlen & Nitz, 2008). Framing “may encourage empiricists to consider more interpretive aspects of their questions. For more interpretive critical research, it opens up opportunities to more explicitly examine ideological concepts of ‘definition of the situation’ and ‘naturalizing’ not just assuming that the powerful are able to set and naturalize those definitions unproblematically [sic]” (Reese, 2007, p. 149).

Framing theory offers a unique perspective on leadership, organizational theory, and understanding the link between culture, language, ideology, and meaning. Bolman and Deal (2008) argue that organizations are complex entities, and multiple perspectives

are useful and needed to understand these complexities. Frames analysis as a theory begins in sociology and is the first area of discussion.

Frames Analysis in Sociology

In order to understand frames analysis as a theoretical framework, we must first start with the concept of frames analysis. The concept of framing comes very naturally because human communication involves framing on some level. Individuals identify what information is important and what is not important in their interactions—framing is a way to organize experience (Goffman, 1974). The use of frames analysis as a method was first proposed by Goffman (1974). He believed that the idea of frames analysis is not new—many authors had alluded to frames analysis, but fell short of proposing a unifying theory. His theory is useful in understanding the general nature of frames and framing, but his theory is difficult to apply to specific instances, because it has such a large scope. Goffman (1974) advocated that frames exist and we should recognize them, but did little work to categorize or explain how they work.

Snow and Benford are considered to be the foremost authorities in frames analysis in social movement research. Snow and Benford (1988) provide a more complete and detailed theory of frames analysis specifically for social movements compared to Goffman (1974). They outline three primary types of framing activities: diagnostic, prognostic, and motivational framing. Diagnostic framing refers to framing activities that identify problems and who is culpable for those problems. Prognostic framing refers to activities that “identify tactics, strategies, and targets” (Snow & Benford, 1988, p. 201). Motivational framing is connected to diagnostic and prognostic framing but also is concerned with who is affected by the problem and why that group should act.

Benford and Snow (2000) provide more information as to how frames are constructed. The first major way that movements construct frames is through discursive process, which is simply the talk, conversations, speech acts, and written communications of movement members that are engaged in the “context of, or in relation to, movement activities.” There are basically two interactive processes that deal with frames. The first is “frame articulation,” which involves the “connection and alignment of events and experiences so that they hang together in a relatively unified and compelling fashion” (p. 623). Next is “frame amplification or punctuation.” This involves the selective highlighting of events, issues, values, or beliefs as being more important or salient than others. Frame amplification can be used to link different events or issues together.

The second major way frames are constructed is through strategic processes. These are framing activities that are deliberate, utilitarian, and goal-directed. As Benford and Snow (2000) put it, “[frames] are developed and deployed to achieve a specific purpose—to recruit new members, to mobilize adherents, to acquire resources and so forth” (p. 624). SMOs engage in framing to link their interest and interpretive frame to those of possible members. This idea is called “frame alignment processes.” Benford and Snow point to four basic alignment processes: frame bridging, frame amplification, frame extension, and frame transformation. Frame bridging refers to the process of linking two or more ideologically compatible frames that are structurally unconnected. This can happen between the movement and individuals or between different SMOs. Frame amplification is the “idealization, embellishment, clarification, or invigoration of the existing values or beliefs” (p. 624). For most movements, this is necessary for the movement to continue to be viable, especially for movements that have been stigmatized

for their beliefs by the dominant culture. Frame extension is the process by which an SMO portrays its interests and frames as extending beyond the primary interests of the SMO to the issues and concerns of possible members. The goal of this portrayal is to recruit more members, but in itself is dangerous. In most cases it is the constituents who engage in this process, not the leadership. This can cause a split. Framing transformation involves either revamping the old understanding or the creation of a new understanding in terms of the movement. Benford and Snow also note that the process of framing is a contested process in which there are competing frames and competing interpretation of those frames.

In the frames analysis literature, there are three terms that in some instances are used interchangeably: frames, collective action frames, and master frames. Frames refer to Goffman's (1974) concept of framing, which is a more general term. Collective action frames are "action-oriented sets of beliefs and meanings that inspire and legitimate social movement activities and campaigns" (Snow & Benford, 1992, pp. 136-137). Master frames refer to the larger framing tasks in terms of the ideology. Snow and Benford maintain that a movement-specific collective action frame can function on the same level as a master frame, but that under most circumstances, collective action frames do not affect the ideology.

Frames within sociology are primarily used to look at individual interpretations of reality or to look at social movement organizations. In relation to SMOs, the focus is how frames are used to understand reality and to recruit and motivate members. Culture and ideology play a major role in the (re)creation of master frames. In addition, there is an understanding of the difference between ideological framing and strategic framing as it

relates to the organization. Snow and Bedford's theory of frames focuses upon the ideological level of movements as manifested in social movement organizations (SMOs). These theories have primarily been used to look at a number of organizations across a single movement. This method will be useful for analyzing the role that organizations have played in the civic education movement (e.g., American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), American Democracy Project (ADP), and Campus Compact).

Gamson approaches framing in a slightly different way than Snow and Benford. Rather than focusing solely upon the organizational level, Gamson focuses upon public discourse surrounding an issue, such as welfare or affirmative action. For example, Gamson and Lasch (1983) introduces the concept of "issue culture," which is the public discourse surrounding a single issue. "The idea elements in a culture do not exist in isolation but are grouped into more or less harmonious clusters or interpretive packages. The different idea elements in a given package mutually support and reinforce each other" (Gamson & Lasch, 1983, p. 398). These interpretive packages can be broken down into two elements: the frame and the reasoning device. "The frame suggests a central organizing idea for understanding events related to the issue in question" (Gamson & Lasch, 1983, p. 398). While the frame suggests a worldview or ideology, the reasoning device provides "discrete causes and consequences in temporal sequence" related to the frame—linking an event or cause to the frame. Every package has a signature or "a set of elements that suggest its core frame and position in a shorthand fashion" (Gamson & Lasch, 1983, p. 399). Signatures can also be broken down into framing and reasoning devices. Framing signatures are the metaphors, exemplars, catchphrases, depictions, and

visual images used to invoke a particular frame. Reasoning device signatures are roots, consequences, and appeals to principle (i.e., appeal to value or morality). Gamson and Lasch (1983) use a frame matrix to identify and compare the use of signature frames. This method allows complex discourse to be broken down into understandable terms; however, it is difficult to completely understand the discourse that surrounds issue cultures. As Kwan and Graves (2013) note:

[C]omplex cultural discourses cannot be neatly dissected and broken down into component parts. Despite this, we nevertheless rely on the divisions of frame analysis as they enable a thorough and thoughtful analysis, particularly for the sake of comparison. (p. 150)

Kwan and Graves (2013), drawing from Gamson's framing matrix, identifies cultural producers as the groups that add to the discourse surrounding an issue. For the sake of civic education, the cultural producers would be the organizations and scholars who are promoting civic education. Drawing from Benford and Snow (1988), Kwan and Graves (2013) argues that frame resonance (i.e., how well frames are supported by the audience) is important when looking at discourse—not every message or frame is accepted by the audience. "Framing is ultimately about framing competitions, that is, attempts by cultural producers to convince cultural consumers of their version of reality" (Kwan & Graves, 2013, p. 17). Relating this back to civic education, some authors and ideas are cited by others and advance a particular line of argument. Kwan and Graves (2013) refer to cultural artifacts—what rhetoric would call a text—where frames exist. For civic education, these texts include academic literature, websites (e.g., AASCU or ADP's

website), press releases, news stories, and other artifacts (e.g., videos, lesson plans, advertisements, etc.).

The framing matrix is a useful way to graphically organize complex discourse. Using Gamson and Lasch (1983) and Kwan and Graves (2013) basic format and drawing from Snow and Bedford (1988, 2000) master framing theory, the framing matrix for civic education, will have the following elements: cultural producer(s), supporting producer(s), ideological/master frame orientation/appeals to principle, roots and consequences/ diagnostic frame, prognostic frame, motivational frame, signature element(s), and pedagogical frame (See Appendix B for the graphic). All of these elements are drawn from the literature except for the pedagogical frame, which I include because civic education is about education, so the pedagogical frame refers to the methods, skills and student learning outcomes that each approach to civic education advocates. The pedagogical frame is connected to other elements; however, providing a specific statement of pedagogy will aid in comparison.

Frames Analysis in Communication and Media Studies

Frames analysis in communication also has its origins in Goffman (1974) but much of the discussion involves media framing and its effects. Entman is one of several leading communication scholars who advocate the use of framing analysis. Entman (1993) argues that there needs to be a “coherent theory” of frames analysis. For him, framing involves two concepts: selection and salience. “To frame is to select aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation for the item described” (p. 52). This is essentially prognostic,

diagnostic, and motivational framing as outlined by Snow and Benford (1988). Saliency can include a number of rhetorical devices, including repetition and connection to culturally significant symbols or ideas. Overall, the idea of framing implies that the frame has a common effect on large portions of the audience (Entman, 1993).

While there are noticeable differences between framing theory in terms of sociology and communication (along with similarities), there are also differences within news framing theory. Carragee and Roefs (2004) note there is no single recognized definition of frame and framing within media framing theory. Some scholars use frames as more of a metaphor, while others limit frames to the topic of news stories. Carragee and Roefs (2004) also argue that there has been a “neglect of power” in media framing research, meaning that many scholars ignore the influence of the cultural elite who sponsor media frames. For Carragee and Roefs (2004), much of media framing scholarship has ignored the implication of frames in terms of hegemony as articulated by Antonio Gramsci. News media are a major way in which power and hegemony are projected and/or maintained by elites. Carragee and Roefs (2004) provide a justification for evaluating how frames relate to ideology and culture.

Entman (2007) offers a method to evaluate some of the objections raised by Carragee and Roefs (2004) by arguing that framing analysis combined with priming and agenda-setting can provide a systematic way of identifying and understanding bias.

Entman (2007) states:

Elites presumably care about what people think because they want them to behave in certain ways, supporting or at least tolerating elite activities. Given limitations of time, attention, and rationality, getting people to think (and behave) in a certain

way requires selecting some thing to tell them about and efficiently cueing them on how these elements mesh with their own schema system. (p. 165)

This is ultimately the goal of any public address, performance, or campaign: to select what one wants the audience to think or take from the message.

Van Gorp (2007) argues that the traditional method of studying media framing has focused more upon the relationship between the text and the individual receiver and pays little attention to the influence of culture on the framing process. For Van Gorp (2007), the media does not “frame,” but they use frames that exist within the culture. Frames change very little over time, which also suggests that media framing *enacts* frames more than it *creates* them. This interpretation fits well within the framework of master frames analysis and ideology.

Organizations are complex and as we investigate organizations, we find more complexities. Entman (1993) and Reese (2007) advocate a unification of perspectives on framing theory that can provide a greater understanding of the wide range of human activities. Framing is used in numerous ways and in multiple disciplines, making the field fragmented; however, all framing theory is conceptually related.

The argument may be made that any one of these methods listed above would suffice in analyzing texts. As Entman (1993, 2007) has argued in reference to framing analysis, there needs to be a more comprehensive theory of framing from both media studies and sociology. Carragee and Roefs (2004) have argued that analysis of ideology and power also needs to be incorporated into framing as well. Van Gorp (2007) suggests that attention needs to be paid to the cultural implications of framing. Gramsci's (1971) concept of hegemony and culture effectively links and addresses the arguments made by

Carragee and Roefs (2004) and Van Gorp (2007). Framing theory also can provide Gramscian cultural theory with an effective method of identifying ideology. Entman (2007) further argues that developing a cross-discipline theory of framing addresses both the ideological, cultural, and strategic implications of framing and provides a greater understanding of the theory and the phenomenon of frames analysis.

Close Textual Analysis and the Rhetorical Situation

Rhetorical analysis is a broad term that includes multiple methods of analysis of texts. A text can be almost anything that communicates an idea, including documents, films, speeches, or symbols—any instance where a person or group attempts to persuade others (Campbell, 2009).

Inherently, all frames analysis involves close textual rhetorical analysis, but few framing scholars provide a specific method for conducting this analysis. Sillars and Gronbeck (2001) provide a useful method for close textual analysis. The basic process of close textual analysis is textualization (which includes selecting a text to analyze and what aspects of the text to analyze), interpretation (what meaning the text provides), and evaluation (which involves making judgments as to the value of the text). Sillars and Gronbeck note that what a rhetorical critic chooses to analyze depends upon the specific text; however, rhetorical critics identify “themes” (which can be equated with frames), personal or cultural values, political aspect, and stylistic features.

Closely related to close textual analysis is Bitzer's (1992) concept of the rhetorical situation, which provides a systematic approach to understanding the context of a rhetorical text. Gamson and Lasch (1983) notes the importance of context when they

state, "[c]learly, an issue culture is rooted in time and space" (p. 398). The rhetorical situation consists of three parts: 1) exigence, 2) audience, and 3) constraints.

First, Bitzer (1992) argues, "[a]ny exigence is an imperfection marked by urgency; it is a defect, an obstacle, something waiting to be done, a thing which is other than it should be (p. 6). Exigence is the reason why a "rhetor" (i.e., a speaker or writer) is attempting to persuade an audience to take action or hold a value or belief. Relating this back to master framing, exigence and diagnostic framing are closely linked.

Second, all rhetorical acts or texts require an audience. Bitzer (1992) states, "[s]ince rhetorical discourse produces change by influencing the decision and action of persons who function as mediators of change, it follows that rhetoric always requires an audience—even in those cases when a person engages himself or [his] ideal [audience's] mind as [an] audience [sic] (p. 7). A rhetor constructs persuasive messages with an actual or an imagined audience in mind—a speaker is always attempting to persuade someone else.

Third, Bitzer (1992) argues that there are always constraints in a rhetorical situation, which can either help or hinder the rhetor. Constraints are,

made up of persons, events, objects, and relations which are parts of the situation because they have the power to constrain decision and action needed to modify the Exigence. Standard sources of constraint include beliefs, attitudes, documents, facts, traditions, images, interests, motives and the like; and when the orator enters the situation, his discourse not only harnesses constraints given by situation but provides additional important constraints—for example his personal character, his logical proofs, and his style [sic]. (p. 6)

Constraints either are linked to the qualities of the rhetor or are linked to the cultural/ideological dimensions or other constraints outside of the rhetor. Constraints linked to the rhetor are what Aristotle (1991) describes as artistic proofs (i.e., *ethos*, *logos*, and *pathos*) which is connected to qualities of the rhetor—his or her credibility and character, logical reasoning, and use of emotional appeals. These artistic proofs define the expectations an audience may have of a rhetor.

Ideological criticism, frames analysis, and rhetorical criticism provides an effective way to identify and evaluate themes in discourse and provides a systematic method of analysis for complex discourse.

Rhetoric inherently deals with persuasion, and persuasion connects with every facet of higher education. Knowledge is created and shared through rhetorical processes; therefore, developing an understanding of rhetoric enhances knowledge creation and the sharing of meaning.

The goal of education is to prepare individuals to critically engage their life-worlds, and to mediate between the material conditions (i.e., the physical world) and the symbolic reality that is socially constructed. As Smudde (2010) argues, one cannot separate the text from social reality, because the ways we understand the social reality is through symbolic action—through communication. Educators are constantly simulating realistic experience in to the classroom using case studies, examples, and course readings (what Smudde, 2010 calls "educational objects"). "We instructors invoke kinds of virtual experiences based on [educational] objects (including related discussion and assignments) require students to actively solve complex and realistic problems using multiple perspectives and be aware of their own stake in knowledge-creation process"

(Smudde, 2010, p. 100). The rhetorical method outlined above provides a well-established framework to create, analyze, and evaluate civic education pedagogy.

Although pedagogy and curriculum are intrinsically linked to rhetorical processes, the disciplinary language appropriated to these processes varies. Presley (2011) notes that one of the difficulties related to civic education is mediating between overlapping and competing interpretations of the concept. Hikins and Cherwitz (2010) argue that communication, specifically rhetoric, can help in the mediation of civic education.

Colleges and universities in the twenty-first century are increasingly committed to “engagement.” Engagement initiatives seek a productive coupling of the academy’s intellectual resources with the enterprise of generating solutions to current real world challenges. Yet, despite widespread agreement on their nobility, convincing faculty and administrators to fully implement engagement programs has proven to be difficult. The paradox of engagement initiatives’ disappointing record leaves us to consider how intellectual capital produced by the academy might be better invested to promote effective civic action, and how the discipline of communication might serve that cause.

(Hikins & Cherwitz, 2010, p. 115).

Rhetorical criticism offers civic education pedagogy a unified set of terms and methods that explore the fundamental process associated with education and civic action, and can help both faculty and students develop democratic skill.

Beyond the classroom and civic education pedagogy, rhetorical criticism can provide the tools to fulfill the vision of the democratically engaged university. Cherwitz and Hartelius (2007) argue that a deeper understanding of rhetoric in higher education

and its relationship to engagement is desperately needed to overcome the current civic education malaise most programs are facing. As Plater (2011) argues, civic and political engagement has yet to move beyond the initial breakthrough. Leadership has implemented civic education initiatives, but these programs have been unsuccessful in recruiting new leadership and encouraging innovation. Cherwitz and Hartelius (2007) assert that the communication and rhetoric discipline can bridge this gap.

What research in the discipline of rhetoric reveals, then, is that institutional and cultural changes require deliberate and strategically crafted language. Just as in politics, an academic institution's rhetoric is far more than a vehicle for transmitting and publicizing its core values, policies, and day-to-day operations—what rhetoricians term disposition. Institutional rhetoric also, and perhaps ultimately, serves as the engine for discovering, defining, and shaping the values of its constituents and determining the manner in which those values are brought to fruition—what rhetoricians call invention. Additionally, whether intended or not, a university's rhetoric ultimately chooses who will design programs and address the mechanics of implementation. Our success or failure at creating an engaged university, therefore, may be as simple, yet challenging, as devising and implementing the appropriate rhetorical vocabulary. From this perspective, faculty and university administrators must begin to recognize that the discourses of engagement translate into more than a public relations campaign. There is nothing more pragmatic and concrete than a rhetorical choice. Institutional discourses have enormous policy implications, all of which bear on how engagement is understood, valued, and implemented. Rhetoric, after all, is a

critical tool by which an institution discovers its brand and the best methods available to maximize fulfillment of its objectives. [...] An institution's rhetoric directly determines whether the challenge of implementation is met, for it impacts how professors understand the role of the engaged university and influences whether they take ownership and responsibility for it. (pp. 271-272)

Rhetorical analysis also provides a framework to understand and critique the current state of civic education. A rhetorical perspective opens up space for new "epistemological, curricular, pedagogical, research, policy, and culture implications," which is needed in the civic education movement (Saltmarsh & Hartley, 2011, p. 17). As Kwan and Graves (2013) argue, the discourse surrounding any public issue is complex; however, ideological criticism, framing analysis, close textual analysis, and the rhetorical situation provides a basic framework to understand the discourse surrounding civic education. Within the literature, it is understood that there is a lack of agreement on what civic education should look like in higher education, and this lack of agreement prevents effective implementation. This project seeks to provide more clarity and understanding related to different interpretations of civic education in order to understand the pedagogical and policy implications for higher education. Saltmarsh (2005) and Saltmarsh and Hartley (2011) argue that the lack of agreement on civic education has prevented the advancement of a civic education agenda in higher education. It is difficult to gain campus support for civic education pedagogy when supporters are unable to articulate the concepts and skills required.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS

Civic education has a long history within the United States. Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin, during the Revolutionary period and the founding of the United States, advocated the need for civic education in order to prepare new leaders and citizens. Since the founding of the nation, every generation has advocated for some form of civic education (Jacoby, 2009). Snow and Benford (1992), in relation to cycles of social protest, note that movements are marked by cycles of mass mobilization and subsequent decline—the civic education movement is no different. For the purpose of analysis, I am focusing upon the latest cycle starting in the late 1970s and early 1980s. Although I am focusing on the contemporary movement, the ideological roots of civic education began with the writings of John Dewey in the 1900s (Jacoby, 2009; Saltmarsh, 2011). With this in mind, I will begin with the foundational work of John Dewey, and then I will focus upon the major divisions, or signature frames, within the civic education movement: service learning, civic engagement, political engagement, democratic engagement, critical engagement, social justice, and antifoundational engagement.

Ideological Foundations of Civic Engagement: John Dewey’s Pragmatic Liberalism

In my analysis, every perspective on civic education begins with Dewey’s basic framework. In terms of master frames, the modern civic engagement movement has only one, which I am calling “pragmatic liberalism.” In comparing the civic education

movement with other social movements, it is not unusual for a movement to have only one or two ideological master frames. For example, Mooney and Hunt (1996) investigated the farm movement in the United States, starting with the Colonial period and ending in the middle 1990s (over 200 years), and only identified three master frames for the entire movement. In order to understand Dewey's contributions to civic education we will begin with a discussion of his general ideological and philosophical work, followed by a discussion of his influence on the civic education movement.

The Ideology of Pragmatic Liberalism

West (1989) argues that “American pragmatism reaches its highest level of sophisticated articulation and engaged elaboration in the works and life of John Dewey” (p. 69). As a philosophy:

The pragmatists' preoccupation with power, provocation, and personality—in contrast, say, to grounding knowledge, regulating instruction, and promoting tradition—signifies an intellectual calling to administer to a confused populace caught in the whirlwinds of societal crisis, the crossfires of ideological polemics, and the storms of class, racial, and gender conflicts. (West, 1989, p. 5)

John Dewey's articulation of pragmatism offers “a mode of historical consciousness that highlights the conditioned and circumstantial character of human existence in terms of changing societies, cultures, and communities” (West, 1989, pp. 69-70).

The foundation of Dewey's ideology lies in his rejection of “dualism” in modern philosophy. Dualism, in the Western tradition, begins with the assumption that all things can be categorized into the mental (or spiritual) and the material. In the modern terminology, dualism manifests itself in the subject-object division—wherein the subject

is the perceiving, conscious being and the object is everything external to that being (Childers & Hentzi, 1995). Dewey (1980) argues:

The origin of these [dualistic] divisions we have found in the hard and fast walls which mark off social groups and classes within a group: like those between rich and poor, men and women, noble and baseborn, ruler and ruled. These barriers mean absence of fluent and free [interaction]. This absence is equivalent to the setting up of different types of life-experience, each with isolated subject matter, aim, and standard of values. (p. 343)

Dewey argues “[a]ll of these [dualistic] separations culminate in one between knowing and doing, theory and practice, between mind as the end and spirit of action and the body as its organ and means” (Dewey, 1980, p. 346). Dewey rejects these basic dualistic assumptions, arguing instead that dualism is fragmented knowledge that assumes “an isolation of mind from activity involving physical conditions, bodily organs, material appliances, and natural objects” (Dewey, 1980, p. 333). Dewey argues that human knowledge is derived through the mingling of material experience and cognition. Dewey’s philosophy recognizes the “origin, place and function of mind in an activity which controls the environment” (Dewey, 1980, p. 332). Dewey’s philosophy “sees intelligence to be the purposive reorganization, through action, of the material of experience” (Dewey, 1980, p. 333).

Learning from experience is central to Dewey’s educational philosophy, but simply experiencing does not necessarily lead to learning.

Blind and capricious impulses hurry us on heedlessly from one thing to another.

So far as this happens, everything is writ in water [impermanent]. There is none of

that cumulative growth which makes an experience in any vital sense of that term. [...] There is no before or after to such experience; no retrospect nor outlook, and consequently no meaning. We get nothing which may be carried over to foresee what is likely to happen next, and no gain in ability to adjust ourselves to what is coming—no added control. [...] To "learn from experience" is to make a backward and forward connection between what we do to things and what we enjoy or suffer from things in consequence. (Dewey, 2008, p. 124)

Reflecting upon experience is the basis of learning. "Without fostering reflective thinking, learning cannot move beyond conditioning, beyond the classroom, beyond formal education" (Saltmarsh, 2011, p. 50).

Dewey (1980) argues that education and philosophy are one in the same, and that the American educational system was developed to advance a democratic vision of society. "[B]ased upon the democratic criterion, [...] the ideal of a continuous reconstruction or reorganizing of experience, [...] to increase its recognized meaning or social content, and as to increase the capacity of individuals to act as directive guardians of this reorganization" (Dewey, 1980, p. 344). Dewey notes two reasons why education is directly connected to democracy: 1) democracy needs an educated electorate, and 2) a "democracy is more than a form of government; it is primarily a mode of associated living, of conjoint communicated experience" (Dewey, 2008, p. 78)

The purpose of democratic education is to foster "not only more numerous and more varied points of shared common interest, but greater reliance upon the recognition of mutual interests as a factor in social control" (Dewey, 2008, p. 79). Furthermore education for democracy must foster "freer interaction between social groups (once

isolated so far as intention could keep up a separation) but change in social habit—its continuous readjustment through meeting the new situations produced by varied [interaction]” (Dewey, 2008, p. 79). Under this model of education, students’ lived experience becomes a source of knowledge, opposed to the “objective” knowledge stemming from the teachers’ authority. "Unless education has some frame of reference it is bound to be aimless, lacking a unified objective. The necessity for a frame of reference must be admitted. There exists in this country such a unified frame. It is called democracy" (Dewey, 1987, p. 415).

Dewey’s pragmatic liberalism offers civic education a different tool kit compared to more traditional approaches to education.

There is change in pedagogy and epistemology; the relations of teaching and learning shift from procedural knowing to the collective construction of knowledge; the teacher is de-centered, facilitating problem-posing education as a model for a dialogic search for knowledge; students become self-directed and reflective learners; and teacher and student engage in a relationship of reciprocity where both are equally committed to creating a context for learning. (Saltmarsh, 2011, p. 45).

Now that we have discussed John Dewey’s ideological and pedagogical approach, we move to a discussion of the influence of Dewey’s pragmatic liberalism in civic education.

The Influence of Pragmatic Liberalism in Civic Education

John Dewey’s influence is widespread in civic education, although most do not directly cite Dewey. As Saltmarsh (2011) argues, “the influence of American

pragmatism, particularly the thread connecting to John Dewey, is ever apparent, but rarely is it directly formulated or attributed” (p. 44).

Civic education scholars are drawn to Dewey’s work because he “grappled with a conundrum that remains timely today—how to reconcile modern, large-scale, technologically advanced society with the exigencies of democracy” (Robert D. Putnam, 2000, p. 337). As Boyte (2003) argues in regard to the current state of civic education:

[W]e need bold, savvy, and above all political citizens and civic institutions if we are to tame a technological, manipulative state, to transform an increasingly materialistic and competitive culture, and to address effectively the mounting practical challenges of a turbulent and interconnected world [...] The work of John Dewey, a pioneering theorist of knowledge and democracy, is useful as a takeoff point for thinking about citizenship and politics, both for its strengths and for its limits. (p. 1)

Dewey’s ideology represents a sort of Renaissance within the civic education movement—a philosophy and pedagogy that was ahead of its time. Dewey’s call to action—ensuring education for democracy—was widely ignored when originally written (Jacoby, 2009).

Dewey is admired by those working for civic engagement in higher education in part because his educational philosophy provides the foundation for community-based experiential learning linked to public problem-solving. There is widespread reliance on Dewey’s “general theories, propositions, and orientation” to make the case for how higher education can change to better fulfill its academic and civic missions. (Saltmarsh, 2011, p. 64)

Dewey's philosophy informs each area of civic education. For service learning, Dewey discusses five basic areas that are relevant: "(1) linking education to experience, (2) democratic community, (3) social service, (4) reflective inquiry, and (5) education for social transformation" (Saltmarsh, 2011, pp. 42-43). For civic, political, and democratic engagement, Dewey extensively discusses the role of education, experience, and communication in democracy. For critical engagement and social justice, Dewey discusses the role of justice in democracy and influenced major critical theorist, such as Paulo Freire (Saltmarsh, 2011) and Henry Giroux (2004). Even the antifoundational perspective of Stanley Fish is connected to Dewey—although Fish advocates against civic education, he does so from a Deweyian pragmatic perspective (Fish, 1999).

Now that we have discussed the ideological master frame of pragmatic liberalism, and its influence on civic education, we explore the prominent frames in civic education.

Civic Education Frames

The following sections explore the ways in which civic education is framed; however, it should be noted that there is significant overlap between perspectives. Most authors write across multiple civic education perspectives. For example, John Saltmarsh writes articles about service learning, civic engagement, political engagement, democratic engagement, critical engagement, and social justice. When discussing the cultural producers, I identify the major organizations and authors, including the authors' public organizational affiliations. Although, it is difficult to completely map each author's affiliation, I highlight the major affiliations in regard to civic education. Authors were selected based upon their perceived influence (i.e., authors that were cited multiple times) in the literature. Considering that there is a single master frame, pragmatic liberalism, that

influences all of the perspectives of civic education, it is not surprising that multiple organizations and authors cross borders. When a movement is ideologically consistent, as the civic education movement is, it is easier to perform frame bridging (Benford & Snow, 2000). In the case of civic education, frame bridging is primarily used to connect to a different pedagogy. For example, service learning is the starting point for civic education pedagogy; however, the same ideological justification has been expanded to non-service learning pedagogy.

As Kwan and Graves (2013) note, it is difficult to fit complex discourse into neat categories, but the benefit of frames analysis is not to create clean categories, but to allow for comparison between different discourses. In my analysis, I identify seven distinct civic education signature frames: 1) the service learning frame, 2) the civic engagement frame, 3) the political engagement frame, 4) the democratic engagement frame, 5) the critical engagement frame, 6) the social justice frame, and 7) the antifoundational frame. For each signature frame, I explore the cultural producers, the ideological orientation (as it relates to the pragmatic liberalism master frame), the diagnostic frame, the prognostic frame, the motivational frame, and the pedagogical frame for each of the seven signature frames (see Appendix B for the framing matrix). Now that we have discussed a few notes on the analysis, we begin with the service learning frame.

The Service Learning Frame

As explained before, service learning involves traditional classroom based experience coupled with out-of-class service projects. The modern civic education movement, starts with service learning.

Cultural producers. The main organizations who promote service learning are the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACCC), Campus Compact, the Carnegie Foundation of the Advancement of Teaching, Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement (CIRCLE), the Community College National Center for Community Engagement (CCNCCE), and the New England Resource Center for Higher Education (NERCHE). This is not to say that many other civic education organizations do not support service learning, but the organizations listed here are the major supporters of civic education through service learning.

The major authors include: Dan W. Butin, Barry Checkoway, Christine M. Cress, David M. Donahue, Andrew Furco (Campus Compact), Barbara A. Holland (Campus Compact), Amy Driscoll (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching), Karla Gottlieb (AACCC), Ariane Hoy, Barbara Jacoby (Campus Compact), Joseph Kahne (Campus Compact), C. David Lisman, Mary Prentice, David P. Redlawsk, Tom W. Rice, Robert A. Rhoads, Lori Vogelgesang, Gail Robinson (AACCC), John A. Saltmarsh (Campus Compact, NERCHE, ADP, and AASCU), Timothy K. Stanton, Dari E. Sylvester, Marshall Welch, Joel Westheimer, and Edward A. Zlotkowski (Campus Compact).

Ideological orientation. Service learning draws heavily from the pragmatic liberalism master frame, but many scholars also draw heavily from the critical engagement and social justice frames (both frames will be explained in more detail later in Chapter IV) as ideological justification for service learning.

Diagnostic framing. For service learning (and other civic education frames), there are three interconnected civic problems: 1) there is a lack of social connectedness and community, 2) there is a lack of visibility of the service college students do, and 3) higher education has strayed away for its civic mission and the public good.

In regard to the lack of social connectedness, Putnam's (2000) *Bowling Alone* is the most often cited source. Butin (2010) notes that the cultural perspective on service learning is most concerned with mending frayed community ties. Most communitarian scholars, including Putnam (2000), argue that there has been significant civic and political decline in American culture since the 1960s. As Saltmarsh (2009) explains:

[Communitarians] express alarm about the fraying of what they see as the underlying moral fabric of the nation that is essential to a well-functioning democracy. They argue that America suffers from excessive individualism, an overemphasis on rights and an under-emphasis on responsibilities, and an increasingly litigious culture where citizens seek resolution of conflicts through the courts. [...] Communitarians strike a chord by decrying a decline in America's community involvement and voluntary spirit in a world that seems increasing depersonalized and fragmented. (p. 10)

Putnam's (2000) central argument is widely cited as the problem that civic education can solve.

Connected to the lack of social connectedness, is the lack of visibility of service. As Campus Compact (2015a) explains in their history:

In the mid-1980s, the media portrayed college students as materialistic and self-absorbed, more interested in making money than in helping their neighbors. The

founding presidents [of Campus Compact] believed this public image was false; they noted many students on their campuses who were involved in community service and believed many others would follow suit with the proper encouragement and supportive structures. (para. 4)

Historically, college students have generally been seen as materialistic, self-absorbed and generally uninterested in learning in American higher education (Cohen & Kisker, 2010; Rudolph, 1977, 1990; Thelin, 2004). This reoccurring argument can still be seen, and many scholars (see Arum & Roksa, 2011) have made a career bemoaning “today’s disengaged youth.”

Almost universally in the civic education movement, scholars argue that higher education has turned away from its civic mission. Many argue that rather than being a source of public discussion, academic institutions are increasing isolated and detached from the public.

The academic culture at many of today's colleges and universities has produced a widespread sense of powerlessness in their faculties, disappointment in their students, and dismissiveness from the public at large. American democracy has never been in more need of the best values of higher education—open discussion, careful attention to evidence, intellectual exploration, and freewheeling debate that aims at developing a larger truth. Yet, with important exceptions, higher education has been remote from the public debate in recent years. (Boyte, 2004, p. 5)

The shift in academic culture is attributed to a number of factors, such as the focus upon publication of professors, shifts from liberal knowledge to more technical, specialized

knowledge, and the influence of neoliberalism on higher education (which is discussed in more detail in the critical engagement frame).

Prognostic framing. The prognostic framing for service learning is closely aligned with the master frame of pragmatic liberalism and the diagnostic framing. As stated previously, Saltmarsh (2011) argues that Dewey's pragmatic liberalism offers service learning; "(1) linking education to experience, (2) democratic community, (3) social service, (4) reflective inquiry, and (5) education for social transformation" (p. 42-43). Service learning promotes civic education/engagement by exposing students to community issues, requiring face-to-face interaction with community members, and through service partnerships, connects the academic institution back to the community (Kenny, Sigmon, Kiley-Brabeck, & Lerner, 2002).

Advocates suggest that service-learning is an ideal means by which to support and extend civic engagement, foster democratic renewal, and enhance individuals' sense of community and belongingness to something greater than themselves.

From a micro perspective, service-learning can be seen as a means of fostering in the individual a respect for and increased tolerance of diversity, gaining a greater awareness of societal concerns, developing a stronger moral and ethical sense, and encouraging volunteerism and civic engagement. These two levels are linked to the extent that we come to know about ourselves by engaging with those who are different from us. Such greater knowledge, in turn, affects how we think about and engage with the world we live in. (Butin, 2010, p. 9-10)

If the diagnosis is that there is a lack of social connectedness, and a lack of engagement between academic institution and their respective communities; then the solution is to repair those connections through service learning.

Motivational framing. Motivational framing for service learning, as with many of the other civic education frames, aligns closely to the diagnostic framing of a lack of social connectedness and frayed social networks. Putman (2000) argues that there has been a steady decline in civic and political participation. Boyte (2004) argues, “One of the most elemental motivations for the civic engagement movement developing in higher education today is to rebuild political ties to citizenry that have seriously weakened in recent years” (p. 6). Ideologically, pragmatic liberalism also provides motivation for educators to take action because one of the core functions of education is to shape the future society. If one wants to increase civic and political participation, education is the mechanism to achieve that goal.

Pedagogical framing. Service learning is the pedagogical frame for the service learning frame. As discussed in Chapter II, service learning also has a problem of definition. As Jacoby (2009) explains, service learning is “form of experiential education in which students engage in activities that address human and community needs together with structured opportunities intentionally designed to promote student learning and development. Reflection and reciprocity are key concepts of service-learning” (p. 5).

Dan Butin advocates for service learning, but he is also critical of the service learning movement, arguing that service learning simply lacks the theoretical rigor of other disciplines. Butin (2010) argues that service learning lack conceptual clarity and consistency, making it difficult to articulate best practices. Those who advocate service learning (Butin directly cites Campus Compact’s “Wingspread” statement) argue

“service-learning should become an overarching framework for higher education. This framework, moreover, should be embedded both horizontally across departments and vertically throughout all levels of an institution's pronouncements, policies, and practices” (Butin, 2010, p. 27). Butin (2010) argues directly against this vision, based upon the lack of conceptual clarity. “This is nothing less than a grand narrative for higher-education as service-learning, for it thinks about service-learning as a politics to transform higher education and society. [...] Such a perspective presumes that service-learning is a universal, coherent, cohesive, amelioratory, and liberatory practice” (p. 27). From an ideological perspective, service learning is caught by its own pedagogy—trying to navigate between both the political Left and the Right.

If it attempts to be a truly radical and transformative (liberal) practice, it faces potential censure and sanction. If it attempts to be politically balanced to avoid such an attack, it risks losing any power to make a difference [...] Seemingly neutral principles are thus used strategically to promote one's specific ideological agenda, irrespective of political orientation. (Butin, 2010, p. 36).

Furthermore, most faculty follow normative, non-service learning models of teaching and learning that do not conform to service learning. Taken with the increase number of non-tenure teaching staff, there is “a very low upper limit to the use of service-learning across numerous disciplines and amongst faculty in higher education” (Butin, 2010, p. 31).

Service learning programs have been embraced by many institutions in order to reclaim the civic mission of higher education; however, scholars (both within and outside of service learning) recognize the limits of service learning as the standard bearer for civic education (Butin, 2010; Hollander, 2010; Saltmarsh & Hartley, 2011; Saltmarsh,

Hartley, & Clayton, 2009). Now that we have discussed the service learning frame in civic education, we move to the civic engagement frame.

The Civic Engagement Frame

Civic engagement represents the largest area of literature in the civic education movement, primarily because the term has been used to describe multiple civic education pedagogies. As Jacoby (2009) and Saltmarsh and Hartley (2011) have noted, the term “civic engagement” has also been misappropriated within the field, particularly in service learning. As Watson (2004) states, “[t]he civic engagement approach is thus concerned with training students with skills needed to build a civil society, including an understanding of democratic citizenship, democratic leadership skills, and the value of a lifelong service ethic (e.g., commitment to volunteering and civic leadership)” (p. 79).

Cultural producers. The organizations who promote civic engagement include: the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU), the American Democracy Project (ADP), the Political Engagement Project (PEP), the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, the Sabo Center for Democracy and Citizenship (SCDC), the Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement (CIRCLE), Campus Compact, the New England Resource Center for Higher Education (NERCHE), the Kettering Foundation, and Project Pericles.

The major authors include: Richard M. Battistoni, Elizabeth A. Bennion (ADP), Kathleen Boland, Ernest L. Boyer (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching), Harry C. Boyte (SCDC), David E. Campbell, Anne Colby (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching), Stuart Comstock-Gay, Eric L. Dey

(AACU), James P. Dillard, Constance Flanagan (CIRCLE), William A. Galston, Diana E. Hess, Elizabeth Hollander (Campus Compact), Mary Stuart Hunter, Barbara Jacoby (Campus Compact), Martha J. LaBare (ADP and AASCU), Peter Levine (CIRCLE) Sarah E. Long (Campus Compact) Caryn McTighe Musil (AACU, AASCU, ADP, and PEP), Susan A. Ostrander, William M. Plater (AASCU, ADP, and PEP), John W. Presley (AASCU, ADP, and PEP), Robert D. Putnam, John A. Saltmarsh (Campus Compact, AASCU, ADP, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, and NERCHE), David Scobey (Campus Compact), Theda Skocpol, Kim Spiezio, Timothy K. Stanton, and Jason Stephens (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching).

Ideological orientation. The pragmatic liberalism master frame is central to the civic engagement frame. Some civic engagement perspectives also incorporate elements from the critical engagement and social justice frame.

Diagnostic framing. As with the service learning frame, the lack of social connectedness and decline in civic and political participation, drawing from Putnam (2000), is widely cited within civic engagement. Putnam's (1995, 2000) work sparked alarm about the decline in civic and political participation at the same time that many civic engagement initiatives (The American Democracy Project, to name one) were founded (Jacoby, 2009). Putnam's work is part of the exigence of the civic engagement movement.

Many civic engagement scholars also argue that higher education has turned away from its civic mission.

Civic engagement is essential to a democratic society, but far too many Americans have withdrawn from participation in public affairs. Higher education

can contribute to civic engagement, but most research universities do not perceive themselves as part of the problem or of its solution. Whereas universities were once centrally concerned with “education for democracy” and “knowledge for society,” today’s institutions have often drifted away from their civic mission. (Boyte, 2004, p. 7)

As Boyte (2004) argues, academic culture has moved away from civic and moral development of students, to more technical and career-oriented skills.

Prognostic framing. The civic engagement frame seeks to repair the lost connections between the individual and the community. Contrary to the service learning frame, the civic engagement frame views service learning is only one method to repair this connection. As Sanders and Putnam (2010) explain with *Bowling Alone*, “America could be civically restored in two ways: by encouraging adults to socialize more, join more groups, or volunteer more; and by teaching the young, whose habits are more malleable, to be increasingly socially connected” (p. 10); civic engagement practitioners focus upon the latter method.

The civic engagement frame also advocated for institutionalization of civic engagement in higher education, including incorporation of civic engagement into curricular and co-curricular activities. As Presley (2011) argues, without the support of the institution and administration, faculty are less likely to promote civic engagement if that work is not recognized or rewarded.

Motivational framing. Motivational framing for the civic engagement frame is also connected to Putnam (2000) and the master frame of pragmatic liberalism (as discussed previously), as is the service learning frame.

Pedagogical framing. The pedagogical framing in the civic engagement frame falls into two interrelated levels; the classroom and the institution. At the classroom level, the focus is upon teaching students civic values, skills, and motivation. Colby et al. (2007) suggest instructors should teach political knowledge, democratic participation skills, and political motivation. Colby et al. (2007) (a publication from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching) suggest this can be done through discussion and deliberation; research and action projects; speakers and mentors; student placement, internships, and service learning. Musil (2009) advocates the use of the civic engagement spiral, which focuses upon six components: 1) self, 2) communities and cultures, 3) knowledge, 4) skills, 5) values, and 6) public action.

A series of assumptions undergirds the Civic Learning Spiral and therefore should influence the pedagogies, the nature of assignments, and the intellectual architecture of a given course or program: [1] We all learn and live within an intricate web of interdependencies that are with us from childhood to old age; [2] Being a learner and being a responsible citizen are continuous, lifelong, and intricately dependent upon cultivating and recognizing relationships; [3] At the heart of education for civic engagement is the notion of the self in ongoing relationship with others; [4] Civic engagement is dependent upon collaborative inquiry, dialogic pluralism, and negotiated collective action; [5] Civic engagement needs to be informed by knowledge, rooted in values, tied to democratic aspirations, and embodied through practice; [6] Given that U.S. democracy is marked as much by its failures as its aspirations, engagement in such a context implies both a promise and an undertaking. (Musil, 2009, p. 61)

McCartney, Rios, Bennion, and Simpson (2013) identify many civic engagement pedagogical strategies tailored to political science; however, provide pedagogical strategies that can be adapted to any discipline. “There is no one best way to implement civic engagement pedagogy. Instead, [...] educators need a wide range of options and tools to fit diverse teaching styles, course subjects, intellectual interests, students, and institutions” (McCartney, Rios, Bennion, & Simpson, 2013, p. 101)

At the institutional level, AASCU has published a series of publication that explore developing curriculum, programs, initiatives for civic engagement (see American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 2002, 2005, 2006a, 2006b, 2015h). Also, Jacoby (2009) also provides suggestions for incorporating civic engagement at the institutional level.

Compared to the service learning frame, the civic engagement frame is much more conceptually and pedagogically clear, although the literature is vast. Now that we have discussed the civic engagement, we move to conceptually linked political engagement frame.

The Political Engagement Frame

Political engagement is often seen as a subset of civic engagement and shares many characteristics as the civic engagement frame. The key difference is the political engagement frame focuses on direct political participation. Promoting activities such as “voting, participating in campaigns or political parties, contacting elected officials, running for office, and the like” are included in political engagement (p. 29)

Cultural producers. The organizations that promote political engagement include: the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), the American Democracy Project (ADP), the Political Engagement Project (PEP), and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

The authors who promote political engagement include: Anne Colby (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching), Peter Dahlgren, Thomas Ehrlich (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching), Josh Corngold (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching), Elizabeth Beaumont (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, ADP, and AASCU), Johnny Goldfinger (ADP), Sunshine Hillygus, Bryan Lilly, and James R. Simmons.

Ideological orientation. The political engagement frame has the same ideological orientation as the civic engagement frame, the master frame of pragmatic liberalism.

Diagnostic framing. The diagnostic framing of the political engagement frame is the same as that of civic engagement; however, the key difference is the difference between apolitical civic engagement and political engagement. Colby et al. (2007) argue that one can be civically engaged through volunteering and community engagement, but not participate in any form of government activity—they may not vote or interact with any political system. Putnam (2000) and Sander and Putnam (2010) note that the level of volunteerism is on the rise, but at the same time, political participation remains low. Rather than focusing upon other elements of civic engagement, the political engagement frame narrowly focuses upon the political participation element. This is by no means a devaluing of civic engagement, in fact Colby et al. (2007) suggest that the same pedagogical tactics can be used for both civic and political engagement. Many civic

engagement practitioners directly avoid politics, which ignores the central decision making function of democracy (Ehrlich & Colby, 2004; Hess, 2004, 2009; Hess & Avery, 2008).

Prognostic framing. The political engagement frame shares the same prognostic framing as the civic engagement frame. Civic and political engagement needs to be promoted by faculty, and institutions need to implement programs that promote civic and political engagement.

Motivational framing. The political engagement frame, as with civic engagement, draws upon Putnam (2000) and Dewey's pragmatic liberalism as motivation to promote political engagement. Sander and Putnam (2010) argue that there has been a steady increase in volunteering and a spike in political participation during Barack Obama's 2008 election; however, political engagement still remains low.

Pedagogical framing. The political engagement shares the same pedagogical framing as the civic engagement frame; however, political engagement is the explicit focus upon politics and political participation.

Now that we have discussed the political engagement frame, we move to the democratic engagement frame, which is also conceptually linked to the civic engagement frame.

The Democratic Engagement Frame

The democratic engagement frame stems from the civic engagement frame; however, democratic engagement was coined to try to curb the misuse of the term "civic engagement," and to critique the civic engagement movement. (Saltmarsh & Hartley, 2011).

Cultural producers. The organizations who promote democratic engagement include: the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU), the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), the American Democracy Project (ADP), the New England Resource Center for Higher Education (NERCHE).

There are primarily two authors who advocate for democratic engagement, John A. Saltmarsh (Campus Compact, AASCU, ADP, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, and NERCHE), and Mathew Hartley.

Ideological orientation. The democratic engagement frame draws heavily from the pragmatic liberalism master frame, John Saltmarsh has written extensively on the role that Dewey's work plays in the civic education movement.

Diagnostic framing. The democratic engagement frame draws from the work of Putnam (2000), and the lack of connectedness between individuals and the community. Saltmarsh and Hartley (2011) argue the ways in which civic engagement has been operationalized is "is largely devoid of both long-term democracy-building values and higher education's contribution to the public culture of democracy" (p. 23). The university is privileged as the sole knowledge producers and the community is at a knowledge deficit. The university provides a service to the community, and the community should be grateful. Saltmarsh and Hartley (2011) argues that this relationship is not reciprocal. The Carnegie Community Engagement Classification, which John Saltmarsh and NERCHE has lend support, specifically focuses upon reciprocity as a major considerations for the classification. "Community engagement describes collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge

and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity” (New England Resource Center for Higher Education, 2015a, para. 14). Butin (2010) critiques this mentality as it relates to service learning:

From such a perspective, service-learning becomes yet another means for those in the "culture of power" to maintain inequitable power relations under the guise of benevolent volunteerism. It reinforces conservative assumptions that relatively isolated actions of caring individuals can overcome societal problems, that it is the servers who bring the solutions, and that such solutions are assimilationist by nature. Tutoring students or working in a soup kitchen maintains the position of privilege for those doing the serving, and presumes that the enactment of such service in and of itself substantiates the worthiness and legitimacy of the servers' perspective. (pp. 11-12)

Civic engagement “efforts are often pursued as ends in themselves, and engagement becomes reduced to a public relations function of making known what the campus is doing in and/or for the community and providing opportunities for students to have experiences in the community” (p. 18). As Saltmarsh and Hartley (2011) explain, “What has emerged on many campuses are remarkably apolitical "civic" engagement efforts” (p. 19).

While Saltmarsh and Hartley (2011) note that civic engagement has been wildly successful in creating new programs; however, “the civic engagement movement seems to have hit a wall: innovative practices that shift epistemology, reshape the curriculum, alter pedagogy, and redefine scholarship are not being supported through academic norms

and institutional reward policies that shape the academic cultures of the academy” (p. 23).

Prognostic framing. Democratic engagement is the proposed solution to the issues of civic engagement culture. The democratic engagement frame shares the same ideological, diagnostic, and prognostic perspectives; however, the democratic engagement frame attempts to make civic engagement more purposeful and democratic.

Drawing these distinctions is intended to assist academic leaders and practitioners in the design and implementation of engagement efforts on campus with an intentionality of democratic purpose and an awareness of the kind of change in institutional culture needed to make civic democratic engagement a part of the institution's identity. (Saltmarsh & Hartley, 2011, p. 18)

It is unclear, or at least under articulated, what democratic engagement looks like. Few have taken Saltmarsh’s critique to task and articulated the changes needed to accomplish true democratic engagement. So far, NASPA is the only organization who has adopted Saltmarsh’s term, but it is still unclear how democratic engagement might work.

Democratic engagement locates the university within an ecosystem of knowledge production, requiring interaction with other knowledge producers outside the university for the creation of new problem-solving knowledge through a multidirectional flow of knowledge and expertise. In this paradigm, students learn cooperative and creative problem solving within learning environments in which faculty, students, and individuals from the community work and deliberate together. (Saltmarsh & Hartley, 2011, p. 21)

This is the intended goal of the democratic engagement frame, but it has yet to be articulated into practice.

Motivational framing. The democratic engagement frame draws from the ideological master frame of pragmatic liberalism; however, Saltmarsh and Hartely (2011) argue that civic engagement has not achieved the true cultural change Dewey called for. Just as Dewey (2008) argues that activity is not the same as experience, which requires reflection and cognition, Saltmarsh and Hartley (2011) argues that “mere activity in a community does not constitute civic engagement” (p. 17). Saltmarsh and Hartley (2011) suggests that most civic engagement programs are active in the community, but lack the required reflection upon and commitment to democratic purposes and practices—they do not live up to their own ideological orientation.

Pedagogical framing. Democratic engagement draws directly from the civic engagement frame’s pedagogical framing—service learning, traditional classroom experience, speakers and mentorship, research and action projects; however, Saltmarsh and Hartley (2011) argue for a change in the institutional and programmatic approach to community engagement. They very clearly state the issue is not a matter of more programs, but of better programs.

The service learning, civic engagement, political engagement, and democratic engagement frame share similar perspectives on civic education and represent the majority of civic education. The critical engagement, social justice, and antifoundational frames represent the outlier perspectives, although these three frames do influence civic education. Now what we have discussed the democratic frame, we move to the critical engagement frame.

The Critical Engagement Frame

The critical engagement frame is heavily influenced by critical and ideological theory. This frame can be divided into two basic, overlapping perspectives on civic education: democratic empowerment and threatening neoliberalism. The difference between the two perspectives will be discussed under the ideological orientation for the frame.

Cultural producers. There are no civic education organization who directly advocate for critical engagement, primarily because of its theoretical nature; however, many civic engagement scholars draw ideologically from this frame. The main authors include Michael W. Apple, Henry Giroux, Paulo Freire, and Maxine Greene.

Ideological orientation. As stated previously in the discussion of the pragmatic liberalism master frame, John Dewey is considered to be a critical theorist, he looked as issues of race and ideology in education and pedagogy. The critical authors listed above all were extensive influenced by Dewey. Related to civic education, there are two basic critical perspectives to consider: democratic empowerment and threatening neoliberalism.

Democratic empowerment. Democratic empowerment closely follows Dewey's (2008) argument that education has a transformative function in democratic society. As Greene (1985) explains,

Dewey realized that public interventions are required if the democratic conception of education is to be realized and if democratic values are to be pursued. To leave everyone to his or her own predilections and devices is to provide an unfair advantage for the privileged and energetic. Too frequently they have usurped many of the resources available and "imposed new burdens and subjected to new

modes of oppression the mass of individuals who did not have a privileged economic status [citing Dewey]." (p. 4)

Education, Greene argues, is the best way to promote democracy; however, it must go well beyond the structure and function of government—it must move to empower.

If we are to reawaken concern for democracy as possibility, we can no longer simply refer back to an enlightenment ideal or even to the paradigms of experimental intelligence so long associated with democratic thought. Nor, in a desire to reawaken moral sensitivity, can we rely on traditional pieties or on cognitively apprehended principles or on outmoded notions of utility. Efforts must be undertaken, especially by educators, to bring into being some new in-between that can [...] "relate and bind" people together in novel ways. (Greene, 1985, p. 8)

Paulo Freire's (2010) concept of problem-posing education is also cited as a crucial way to make education transformative. (Freire, 2010)

A deepened consciousness of their situation leads people to apprehend that situation as an historical reality susceptible of transformation. Resignation gives way to the drive for transformation and inquiry, over which men feel themselves to be in control. [...] Any situation in which some individuals prevent others from engaging in the process of inquiry is one of violence. The means used are not important; to alienate human beings from their own decision-making is to change them into objects. (p. 85)

Green (1985) draws from Freire's basic argument and argues that education for many, is an act of violence—it prevent them from considering their own lives and privileges

“objective” knowledge over their lived experience. Democratic empowerment “is a situation that permits dialogue among persons with regard for one another in their diversity, persons empowered to speak in their own voices, to speak for themselves” (Greene, p. 8).

The perspective of democratic empowerment is articulated throughout civic education. Closely related to the democratic empowerment perspective is the threat of neoliberalism perspective.

Threatening neoliberalism. Taking Dewey’s and Greene’s argument into account, Henry Giroux and Michael Apple argue that neoliberalism has reduced education to nothing more than skills training for the economy, which destroys civic education. Harvey (2005) explains, “[n]eoliberalism is in the first instance a theory of political economic practices that proposes that human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade” (p. 3).

Apple (2000) and Giroux (2009) argues that the turn to neoliberalism has transformed education, from a civic and moral development model, to a technical skills model.

Neoliberals are the most powerful element within the conservative restoration.

They are guided by a vision of the weak state. Thus, what is private is necessarily good and what is public is necessarily bad. Public institutions such as schools are "black holes" into which money is poured—and then seemingly disappears—but which do not provide anywhere near adequate results. For neoliberals, there is one

form of rationality more powerful than any other: economic rationality. Efficiency and an "ethic" of cost-benefit analysis are the dominant norms. All people are to act in ways that maximize their own personal benefits. [...] Underpinning this position is a vision of students as human capital. The world is intensely competitive economically, and students—as future workers—must be given the requisite skills and dispositions to compete efficiently and effectively. Further, any money spent on schools that is not directly related to these economic goals is suspect. (Apple, 2000, p. 59-60)

Diagnostic framing. Both the democratic empowerment and threatening neoliberalism perspective argue that the current state of education is not conducive to democracy. Greene (1985) argues that a more technical approach to teaching democracy (i.e., focusing upon the form, function, and history) reduces democracy to static knowledge that is not empowering.

Apple (2004) and Giroux (2009) argue that neoliberalism has changed the culture of education that ignores democratic purpose and practice. Rather than viewing citizenship as a collaborative and social activity, “[c]itizenship is portrayed as an utterly solitary affair whose aim is to produce competitive, self-interested individuals vying for their own material and ideological gain” (Giroux & Giroux, 2004, p. 252).

Giroux and Giroux (2004) further argue that neoliberalism has changed the academic culture of faculty.

Refusing to take positions on controversial issues or to examine the role they might play in lessening human suffering, professionalized academics become models of moral indifference and civic spectatorship, unfortunate examples of

what it means to disconnect learning from public life. On the other hand, many left and liberal academics have done little better, retreating into arcane discourses that offer them mostly the safe ground of the professional recluse. Making almost no connections to audiences outside of the academy or to the issues that bear down on their everyday lives, these academics have become largely irrelevant. This is not to suggest that they do not publish or speak at symposiums, but that they often do so to very limited audiences and in a language that is often overly abstract, highly aestheticized, rarely takes an overt political position, and seems largely indifferent to broader public issues. (Giroux & Giroux, 2004, pp. 277-278)

Giroux & Giroux (2004) focus extensively on the role of academic faculty as both the cause of civic and political disengagement, but at the same time argue that it is up to faculty to resist neoliberalism and “take back higher education.”

Kliewer (2013) argues that civic engagement cannot achieve any justice claim because it has yet to account for the role of neoliberalism. Although Kliewer uses the term “civic engagement,” he is primarily speaking about service learning. Citing Saltmarsh and Hartley (2011), Kliewer (2013) claims that even democratic engagement, which is critical of civic engagement, “failed to consider the ways neoliberal ideology and the context of a market based society are stalling the civic engagement field's potential to transform our democracy” (p. 73). Kliewer (2013) argues that neoliberalism is so deep-seated and “*produces* a very specific governing and organizing regime that makes democratic and justice aims difficult to achieve” (p. 74).

Prognostic framing. The critical engagement frame functions much more ideological than practical in many ways. It tends to diagnose the problem, but remain vague about the solutions. This is one of the reasons that civic education scholars draw from the critical engagement frame and the master frame of pragmatic liberalism as the ideological justification for action, but provide more concrete pedagogical and curricular solutions—teaching civic values and skills, or community experience—to satisfy the ideological commitment.

Giroux and Giroux (2004) maintain it is up to the faculty to change the academic culture.

If the rise of the corporate university is to be challenged, educators and others need to reclaim the meaning and purpose of higher education as an ethical and political response to the demise of democratic public life. They need to insist on the role of the university as a public sphere committed to deepening and expanding the possibilities of democracy. (p. 237)

Giroux and Giroux (2004) advocate that faculty, student and administrators need to create “enclaves of resistance” to question authority and neoliberal practices, and critically evaluate neoliberalism to “prioritize citizen rights over consumer rights” (p. 277)

Motivational framing. The motivational framing for the critical engagement frame is that the university once promoted the common good and had a public purpose, but neoliberalism has changed this purpose. Giroux (2009) describes the “Greatest Generation” (the generation who fought in WWII) as the golden age of civic and political engagement.

Pedagogical framing. The pedagogical framing of the critical engagement frame is not clear. Most scholars who use the critical frame as ideological justification draw upon a service learning, civic or political engagement, or social justice for pedagogical issues. The critical engagement frame is primarily directed at academic faculty to resist neoliberalism and promote democratic culture.

Now that we have discussed the role of the critical engagement frame in civic education, we move to the social justice frame, which often times draws from the critical engagement frame.

The Social Justice Frame

The social justice frame is concerned with addressing social and economic inequalities in education. Westheimer and Kahne (2008) explain that “education for social justice is simply to say that one supports the idea of preparing students to use the knowledge and analytic skills they develop in school to identify ways in which society and societal institutions can treat people more fairly and more humanely” (p. vii). Westheimer and Kahne (2007) argue that “Since the inception of public schooling, educators have frequently sought to offer educational programs that would reduce the gaps between the haves and the have-nots in society by ameliorating poverty, providing broader employment opportunities to underserved populations,[and] ensuring that students care about those with needs” (p. 98).

Cultural producers. There are two organizations that explicitly support social justice, Campus Compact and the New England Resource Center for Higher Education (NERCHE), but social justice can be seen across the civic education movement. The

primary authors who advocated for social justice are Lee Anne Bell, Dan W. Butin, Tony Chambers, Bryan Gopaul, Joseph Kahne, C. David Lisman, and Joel Westheimer.

Ideological orientation. The social justice frame draws from the pragmatic liberalism master frame, but is also strongly influenced by critical and ideological theory. As Chambers and Gopaul (2010) suggests, social justice has been influenced by multiple interpretations of “justice,” stemming from philosophy, political science, and other disciplines. Westheimer and Kahne (2008) argues that Dewey was rightly aware of the role that education can play in improving society, including education for social justice.

Diagnostic framing. The social justice frame argues that social and economic inequality disenfranchises many societal groups and that education can empower individuals to address issues of injustice. In Butin’s (2010) discussion of service learning, he argues:

A political perspective [social justice] is most concerned with issues of competing constituencies and how these issues are manifest through power (im)balances, questions of legitimacy, allowed and/or silenced perspectives, and negotiations over neutrality/objectivity. Whose voices are heard and whose are silenced? Who makes the decisions and by what criteria? Who benefits from such decisions and who loses? To what extent is the innovation a repetition, a reinforcement, or a revocation of the status quo? A political perspective presumes that conflict rather than consensus is an underlying aspect and consequence of the process and product of [education]. (Butin, 2010, pp. 10-11)

Westheimer and Kahne (2007) argue that social justice education has been under attack as of late, as being overly political. Apple (2004) would argue that any claims of

neutrality in education is a product of hegemony—the dominate culture articulates its own ideology and political worldview as the normal, neutral worldview. Butin (2008b) laments:

Social justice, it appears, is something one is either "for" or "against"; and the "against" side appears to be winning. So there is a deeply humbling irony that while many of today's social and economic conditions (e.g., poverty rates, demographics of our incarcerated population, stratification of access to affordable health care) bespeak the dire need for greater equity and equality across historically marginalized populations, the frontline institutions of elementary, secondary, and postsecondary schools are moving ever further away from grappling with such fundamental social and civic dilemmas. (p. 77)

The diagnostic framing for the social justice frame is relatively simple, inequality exists, and social justice is under attack in the current political landscape.

Prognostic framing. The prognostic framing of the social justice frame relates to advocating social justice in the classroom—through education. This draws from the master frame of pragmatic liberalism, which views education as a major way to foster social change. Bell (1997) explains:

Given the power of systems of domination to saturate both the external world and our individual psyches, how do we challenge and change them? In a context where we are all implicated, where we cannot escape our social positions, how do we find a standpoint from which to act? A commitment to social justice requires a moral and ethical attitude toward equality and possibility and a belief in the capacity of people as agents who can act to transform their world. Hegemony is

never total, it is always open to contestation. The contradictions between espoused social principles and lived experience offer one place to begin. (p. 13-14)

Freire (2010) would describe Bell (1997) statement as a pedagogy of hope. With the social justice frame, conflict and working towards political goals are fundamental to the perspective.

In line with Gramsci (1971), Bell (1997) argues that coalition building is key to achieving social justice outcomes. “Specific skills of perspective taking, empathic listening, and self-examination are useful to this [coalition building] process” (Bell, 1997, p. 14). “Social justice courses are one arena for practicing skills and developing collective strategies for change” (Bell, 1997, p. 14).

Motivational framing. The motivational framing for the social justice frame is closely aligned with the diagnostic and prognostic framing. First, since the social justice is framed as a dynamic undertaking, it is assumed that this is ongoing process.

Westheimer and Kahne (2008) note that the status quo is always suspect and even when progress is achieved, critical reflection is always needed. Compared to the other signature frames, social justice is an old concept, so issues are generally framed within the urgency of the present. For example, racial equality has always been an issue and progress has been made; however, it is still an ongoing problem. Westheimer and Kahne (2007) and Butin (2008b) argue that inequality is still a major problem; however, the age old concept of social justice is under political attack—demanding action. Snow and Benford (1988) argue that motivational framing becomes increasingly important with older movement—if the problem still exists, then movement members may lose motivation and give up.

Compared to the other signature frames, the social justice frame must focus upon motivation, since the other frames are too young and have had relative success in building programs (Saltmarsh & Hartely, 2011).

Pedagogical framing. The social justice frame is open to a number of different pedagogical strategies. Bell (1997) highlights the role that traditional lecture and class structures can play in social justice. Butin (2008b) and Westheimer and Kahne (2008) focus upon service learning for social justice (Butin, 2010, describes this as “justice-learning”). Most civic and democratic pedagogies can be adapted to achieve social justice educational outcomes.

Up until this point, each civic education signature frame has advocated civic education in some way, stemming from a similar ideological position; however, the final signature frame of antifoundational engagement is an articulation of the non-civic education status quo.

The Antifoundational Engagement Frame

The antifoundational engagement frame is really only advocated by Stanley Fish, who bluntly rejects civic and moral education. Much of Fish’s work was inspired by his disdain for the “politicized classroom,” and the publication of Colby et al. (2003), *Educating Citizens: Preparing America’s Undergraduates for Lives of Moral and Civic Responsibility* (Fish, 2005).

Cultural producers. Stanley Fish is the only author who advocates for antifoundational engagement. In fact, the majority of authors who cite Fish, outright disagree with him. Butin (2008a) portrays Fish as an academic curmudgeon, terrorizing undergraduates and coffee shop workers, in a quest to “save the university, on his own

time.” Make no mistake, Fish’s arguments are problematic; however, he articulates the status quo—the disengaged faculty who push back against the civic education movement. As Boyte and Fretz (2011) argue, the civic engagement movement stands contrary to “a set of long-standing cultural practices that are so persuasive and deep-seated that they can hardly be named; they are taken for granted as part of the dominant culture” (p. 90). Fish’s position represents a Gramscian “common sense” of higher education; he promotes a culture of research and teaching, but views higher education as an apolitical ivory tower. Although there are few who openly support Fish’s perspective, many uncritically accept his argument as the cultural norm, or as Giroux and Giroux (2004) would argue, due to the culture of neoliberalism.

Ideological orientation. The antifoundational engagement frame is influenced by pragmatic Antifoundationalism through the work of John Dewey and Richard Rorty. Fish supports Dewey’s basic rejection of dualism—he supports Dewey’s general philosophy, but not the connection to democracy.

Provisionality, openness, and toleration are not what the mechanisms of democracy generate but what they enforce against the inclinations of citizens, who remain as dogmatic, dosed-minded, and bigoted as they were before democracy emerged. These virtues (if they are virtues; there is a powerful antiliberal argument always in the course of being remounted) are the properties of the system, not of those who live under it. If democracy has to some extent worked, it is because certain political structures are firmly in place and not because its citizens have internalized the sayings of Emerson, Dewey, and James. Pragmatism may have emerged under democratic conditions (although its basic

tenets were long ago articulated by Cicero and Machiavelli), but it neither produces nor necessarily accompanies democracy. And if pragmatism has no special affinity for democracy, neither does it have any special relationship to the positions you might take on the issues that tum up in the democratic landscape. Your political allegiances are more likely to be a function of whether repeal of the capital gains tax will benefit you than of your epistemology, should you be a person so odd as to have one. (Fish, 1999, p. 301)

Fish (1999) supports pragmatic antifoundationalism as a method of critique; however, argues against the establishment of foundational principles.

Diagnostic framing. The diagnostic framing of the antifoundational engagement frame is the rise of civic and moral education—the civic education movement in higher education.

You can reasonably set out to put your students in possession of a set of materials and equip them with a set of skills (interpretive, computational, laboratory, archival), and even perhaps (although this one is really iffy) instill in them the same love of the subject that inspires your pedagogical efforts. You won't always succeed in accomplishing these things—even with the best of intentions and lesson plans there will always be inattentive or distracted students, frequently absent students, unprepared students, and on-another planet students—but at least you will have a fighting chance given the fact that you've got them locked in a room with you for a few hours every week for four months. You have little chance however (and that entirely a matter of serendipity) of determining what they will make of what you have offered them once the room is unlocked for the

last time and they escape first into the space of someone else's obsession and then into the space of the wide wide world. And you have no chance at all (short of a discipleship that is itself suspect and dangerous), of determining what their behavior and values will be in those aspects of their lives that are not, in the strict sense of the word, academic. You might just make them into good researchers.

You can't make them into good people, and you shouldn't try. (Fish, 2003, para. 6-8)

Fish (2003) is at best dismissive of civic education and argues that there research cannot be done to measure the outcomes of civic education, which ignores a growing body of research on civic education assessment (see Berinsky & Lenz, 2011; Hillygus, 2005; Simmons & Lilly, 2010; Spiezio et al., 2005) Civic education, according to Fish (2003), is a “mishmash of self-help platitudes, vulgar multiculturalism (is there any other kind?) and a soft-core version of 60s radicalism complete with the injunction (although not in song) to ‘love one another right now’” (para. 13).

Prognostic framing. The prognostic framing of the antifoundational engagement is simply “do your job” as a teachers and as a researcher, and do not attempt civic and moral education, and “save the world on your own time” (Fish, 2008).

Fish (2008) offers a narrow view of teaching and learning—he argues that professor can only do two things well, “introduce students to bodies of knowledge and traditions of inquiry that had not previously been part of their experience; and equip those same students with the analytical skills” (Fish, 2008, p. 13). Political topics can be discussed in the classroom, but “when political topics are introduced, they not be taught

politically, that is, with a view to either affirming or rejecting a particular political position” (Fish, 2008, p. 26)

Motivational framing. The antifoundational engagement frame functions not so much as a call to action, but rather a reaffirmation of the status quo. Fish (2008) does not advocate any sort of change, but rather that moral and civic education is an undue burden on an already overburdened academic. Civic education goes against the core function of higher education—to teach critical thinking.

Pedagogical framing. The antifoundational engagement frame advocates for the teaching of critical thinking, but to do so from an apolitical way. College teachers should “academicize” topics. “To academicize a topic is to detach it from the context of its real world urgency, where there is a vote to be taken or an agenda to be embraced, and insert it into a context of academic urgency, where there is an account to be offered or an analysis to be performed” (Fish, 2008, p. 27).

Fish (2008) is vague about how “academicization” functions in the classroom. From a rhetorical theory position, Landy (1994) would argue that it is impossible to fully understand a text without its context—the immediate political context—the “real world urgency” is needed to understand the text.

Giroux and Giroux (2004) would describe Fish’s pedagogy and an exemplar of the academic culture under neoliberalism—academics who avoid political issues or who’s research is so removed from the public that it has no value outside of the ivory tower.

In this chapter we have discussed the ideological master frame of the civic engagement movement and the major signature frames of the movement. Now we move into Chapter V, discussion.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

In exploring the various perspectives and signature frames associated with the civic education movement, it becomes apparent the amount of success the movement has been able to achieve. Throughout this project I have argued that there is no best definition or approach to civic education—each has its strengths and limitations. As Jacoby (2009) rightly notes, “it is important that each institution choose the term, definition, and approach that best suits its unique mission, culture, and traditions” (p. 10). However, the choice of terminology and approach must be carefully considered, options weighed, and decisions made deliberately and with purpose. The fact that scholars cannot come to consensus with regard to the definition of civic education makes it difficult to identify and compare competing perspectives, making the academic literature difficult to navigate and even more difficult to articulate to constitutes outside of civic education. Indeed, one of the intended outcomes of this project is to provide a systematic and comparative mapping of the entire civic education movement to better inform policy and pedagogy. My analysis is not exhaustive by any means, due to the sheer amount of literature in this area. It is entirely possible for a civic education scholar to work within their institution, national or regional association, and discipline and only be exposed to one or two perspectives on civic education. As Jacoby (2009) suggests, “if, in fact, civic engagement in higher education is part of a broad civic renewal movement, there is hope that it will provide the rising tide that will raise all boats, effectively creating a whole that is greater

than the sum of its parts” (p. 25). My analysis here has attempted to identify the various perspectives, (i.e., the parts), and provide a brief comparison of the perspectives that make up the civic education movement. Given this information, faculty, staff, and administration can make better-informed decisions about civic education.

Civic education is important to higher education and it is important to students, institutions, and ultimately to democracy. The initial breakthrough has been made as there is growing support for civic education and it has become more of a focus in higher education. But, as Saltmarsh and Hartley (2011) suggest, we have reached the point in the movement where we need critical reflection upon how far the movement has come, but also what more needs to be done to continue to advance civic education. We cannot afford to accept a community of civic scholars who are content with the current fragmented state of civic education and who are content to jump on the soapbox to espouse the virtue of civic education, but who are simultaneously unwilling to critically engage in the practices and pedagogies of civic education. In the process of solidifying movement support, the movement has attracted numerous members by ignoring conflicting perspectives. This move helps to build coalitions and gain support, but has resulted in civic engagement meaning everything and nothing at the same time. This is not to say that there is not conflict. Indeed, my analysis is proof that conflict and division exists; however, this conflict is not being discussed in a meaningful and productive way. By identifying the points of commonality and division, my analysis provides that foundation to more meaningful civic education discourse.

Saltmarsh and Hartley (2011) argue that the civic education movement has made the initial breakthrough by gaining support and resources; however, there is a great need

to rearticulate and adjust the current intellectual and programmatic features in order to truly fulfill the civic purpose of higher education. While the diversity of perspectives on civic education creates multiple methods to address the alarming decline in civic and political participation, conceptual fragmentation concerning civic education has created a "latent confusion" about what civic education is and how to operationalize the concept. This confusion prevents civic education advocates from effectively articulating policy and curricular changes to higher education faculty and administration. This confusion creates barriers to promoting civic education. My hope is that this project provides more clarity and collaboration across civic education perspective and starts the conversation about the ties that bind and divide civic education.

Addressing Research Questions

I identified the following three research questions that I hoped to answer through my analysis:

RQ 1: How do those in higher education ideologically construct civic education?

RQ 2: How do those in higher education frame civic education?

RQ 3: What are the major implications of these civic education frames for higher education?

The first and second research questions is address here, and my third research question will be addressed in the following implications section.

RQ 1: How do those in higher education ideologically construct civic education?

There was a surprisingly strong ideological consistency across the various perspectives of civic education. The service learning frame, civic engagement frame, political engagement frame, democratic engagement frame, critical engagement frame, and social

justice frame starts with Dewey's arguments about democracy and education. Even the antifoundational engagement frame, which advocates against civic education as a goal in higher education, draws from Dewey's pragmatic antifoundationalism.

While it is good that civic education shares the same ideological master frame, perhaps it is the ideological consistency that has prevented meaningful discourse to address the problem of definition. I assume that there is more agreement than disagreement, therefore I did not address the points of contention critically. While there is ideological agreement, there is disagreement as to how best to accomplish Dewey's ideal democracy. Service learning scholars argue that this pedagogy is the best way to accomplish democracy. Civic engagement scholars argue that service learning pedagogy is one of many methods to foster a healthy democracy. Political engagement scholars argue that the dominant way civic education is practiced does not address or seriously advocate political action. Democratic engagement scholars argue that civic engagement pedagogy (including service learning) has yet to critically evaluate its own practices, which prevents true democratic engagement (Dewey's democratic ideal). Critical engagement scholars argue that education has moved away from Dewey's ideal and replaced it with more neoliberal practices, which damages democracy. Social justice scholars argue that without social justice, democracy cannot be achieved. Antifoundational engagement scholars argue that democracy is external to higher education and that education can only hope to foster critical thinking, not civic virtues. Each civic education frame starts with pragmatic liberalism; however, interprets and acts upon the ideology in different ways.

RQ 2: How do those in higher education frame civic education? I identify seven distinct signature frames within the civic education movement. There is overlap, but also clear delineations between frames. Diagnostic and prognostic framing was relatively uniform across most frames, except for the critical engagement, social justice, and antifoundational engagement frames.

The service learning frame, civic engagement frame, political engagement frame and democratic engagement frame draw from Putnam's (2000) argument as the diagnostic framing. Putnam (2000) argues that civic and political participation has significantly decreased since the end of World War II. This decrease has resulted in a lack of social connectedness and frayed social networks of an individualistic and narcissistic society. Also, connected to the decrease in civic and political participation, higher education has also moved away from its commitment to civic engagement, which has resulted in disengaged college students. The prognostic framing for the service learning, civic engagement, political engagement, and democratic engagement frame closely follows the diagnostic framing. Since the problem is civic and political disengagement, lost connections need to be renewed between individuals and their communities. Higher education is viewed as the best way to address civic and political disengagement in young adults.

The diagnostic framing for the critical engagement frame attributes cultural hegemony as the problem; either arguing that hegemony prevents democratic participation of disenfranchised groups, or that the culture of neoliberalism has shifted traditional democratic action towards a market based model, which prevents true democratic participation. The prognostic framing for critical engagement is to resist

hegemony through democratic empowerment, or resisting neoliberalism and the corporatization of higher education.

The diagnostic framing for the social justice frame argues social injustice exists and that higher education has moved away from its civic mission. The prognostic framing is to pursue social justice through education and community activism. Unlike the other frames, motivational framing was more evident in the social justice frame, primarily due the longer history of social justice compared to other civic education perspectives. The motivational framing centers of the existence of social justice and the need for higher education to advance social justice, in a period when it is under conservative attack.

The antifoundational engagement frame's diagnostic framing argues civic engagement goes against the core function of higher education, which is to expose students to new perspectives and foster critical thinking. Moral or civic development cannot be accomplished and should not be a learning goal. The prognostic framing is that teachers should focus on teaching and the classroom, not solving social and political issues.

Motivational framing was not as pronounced as I expected as most signature frames relied upon diagnostic and prognostic framing as motivation. With the exception of the service learning and antifoundational engagement frames, the pedagogical framing was open to multiple pedagogies. My analyses revealed that the civic engagement frame was the most pedagogically diverse. Now what I have discussed research question one and two, I move into the implications for higher education, which address research question three.

Implications for Higher Education

RQ 3: What are the major implications of these civic education frames for higher education?

Each civic education frame offers both opportunities and constraints and the perspective taken by an institution will affect the implementation of civic education programs and learning outcomes. In short, this section addresses the major implications of the aforementioned civic education frames for higher education.

Research Implications

There is a need for more empirical research for civic education outcomes. Much of the literature is anecdotal or narrative based, which is motivating, but offers very little comparable data. A lack of concrete assessment is particularly evident in service learning. Saltmarsh (2005) argues that “with the ascendancy of civic engagement, there has been a diminished focus on the relationship between civic engagement and improved student civic learning. As a curricular outcome in courses across the disciplines, civic learning remains largely unaddressed” (p. 52). Saltmarsh’s (2005) assessment is still an issue within the literature. What assessment that has been done has primary been conducted in communication and political science.

The master frame and ideological orientation is widely consistent across the 7 frames. Every perspective draws for John Dewey’s pragmatic liberalism, except for the antifoundational frame, which draws from Dewey’s pragmatic antifoundationalism. Although every frame draws for the same ideological perspective, the fragmentation of terms make it difficult to recognize ideological agreement and disagreement across perspectives.

The civic education literature is vast, yet there is no consensus on the definition of terms. There is agreement on the underlying ideologically assumptions of civic education, but there is disagreement on how to fulfill the ideological commitment, each signature frame offers a different approach. The lack of conceptual articulation also makes assessment difficult, not only when conducting program assessment but when searching for comparable assessment data. The need for assessment is evident in the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification, which requires detailed and longitudinal assessment data. There is a common narrative, as articulated by Fish (2003), that civic education is lacking empirical evidence of effectiveness. Applicable assessment research in civic education does exist; however, more assessment is needed and existing assessment needs to be highlight.

Frames analysis, particularly the framing matrix was instrumental to the analysis as it provided structure and points of comparison. Kwan and Graves (2013) argue that frames analysis is useful for simplifying complex discourse and I found this method ideal for navigating complex academic literature. Now that we have discussed the research implications, we move to the pedagogical implications.

Pedagogical Implications

Service learning is by far the most popular approach to civic education, but the conceptual clarity of service learning is lacking. Butin (2010) makes this argument, but it was quite apparent when surveying the service learning literature. Rarely do service learning scholars define their own terms, assuming that service learning is clear and universal. I argue that much of the fragmentation of civic education originates in service learning. Civic engagement, political engagement, and democratic engagement as

descendants of service learning, offer more conceptual clarity. This does not mean that there is not disagreement within these perspective. Rather there is more conceptual positioning (i.e., defining of terms, positing research in the literature, etc.) outside of service learning.

Butin (2010) notes the tendency for service learning scholars to assume that there are no limitation to service learning. From this perspective, service learning can be done in every course and discipline and it is always civically engaged. There is widespread agreement that service learning should not be the standard bearer for civic education. Service learning can be an effective pedagogy for civic engagement, but only when it is intentional (Saltmarsh and Hartley, 2011).

Service learning, civic engagement, and political engagement are based on a unidirectional flow of knowledge production. Higher education practitioners, as experts, send students out into the community to identify and solve programs.

Democratic engagement is based upon reciprocity and co-creation of knowledge. Both the community and higher education institution members have a shared authority for knowledge production and student, faculty, and community members work together to address community problems. The Carnegie Community Engagement Classification is framed more with a democratic engagement orientation (this is not surprising considering the major role that John Saltmarsh and NERCHE play in the classification) than a service learning or civic engagement perspective. Applying for the Community Engagement Classification is challenging if an institution is operating from a service learning or civic engagement frame as the role of reciprocity and co-creation of knowledge is not as prominent compared to democratic engagement. Ideologically and pedagogically, service

learning, civic engagement, political engagement, critical engagement, and social justice are compatible with democratic engagement; however, reciprocity and co-creation of knowledge (see Saltmarsh, et al., 2009, p. 11, for a clear comparison between civic engagement and democratic engagement), are not as clearly articulated.

Critical engagement is often used a justification for civic engagement; however, critical engagement lacks a clear discussion of pedagogy. I identified two major perspectives with the critical engagement frame, democratic empowerment and threatening neoliberalism. Democratic empowerment draws from John Dewey and pragmatic liberalism and functions as more of an ethic, than a specific pedagogy. The way that democratic empowerment has been used in civic education has been more in the prognostic capacity, rather than in a diagnostic or pedagogical capacity. The threatening neoliberalism perspective tends to focus upon the institutional level rather than classroom specific strategies to address neoliberalism—faculty need to. As a whole, the critical engagement frame functions more ideologically, but positions civic engagement as an alternative to traditional, neoliberal practices.

Both the democratic engagement and critical engagement frames suggest a need to reconsider the role academic culture and neoliberalism play in civic education. Kliever (2013) argues that civic engagement has yet to consider neoliberalism, which could undermine civic education. Boyte and Fretz (2011), Kliever (2013), Giroux (2009), and Giroux and Giroux (2004) are situated in different perspectives in the civic education movement, yet are addressing a similar cultural change.

Citizenship Implications

Regardless of the frame, civic education is ultimately about creating good citizens, although there is debate as to what a “good citizen” looks like. Putnam (2000) argues that there has been a decline in civic and political participation since the end of WWII. As discussed in Chapter IV, Putnam’s argument has been articulated into the diagnostic framing of most of the civic education frames. Westheimer and Kahne (2004), which are widely cited in civic education, argue that there are three basic types of citizens: the personally responsible citizen, the participatory citizen, and the justice-oriented citizen.

The personally responsible citizen “acts responsibly in his/her community; works and pays taxes; obeys laws; recycles, gives blood; volunteers to lend a hand in times of crisis” (Westheimer & Kahne, p. 240). The personally responsible citizen can be seen in the service learning and civic engagement frames as the “good citizen”.

The participatory citizen is an “active member of community organizations and/or improvement efforts; organizes community efforts to care for those in need; promote economic development, or clean up environment; knows how government agencies work; knows strategies for accomplishing collective tasks” (Westheimer & Kahne, p. 240) The participatory citizen is the “good citizen” in the civic, political, and democratic engagement frames, who works through existing community and political structure to foster change.

The justice-oriented citizen “critically assesses social, political, and economic structures to see beyond surface causes; seeks out and addresses areas of injustice; knows about democratic social movements and how to effect systemic change” (Westheimer &

Kahne, p. 240). The justice-oriented citizen is the “good citizen” in the critical engagement and social justice frames. The justice-oriented citizen seeks to “change established systems and structures that reproduce patterns of injustice over time” (Westheimer & Kahne, p. 240).

While Putnam (2000) and other political scientist argue that there has been a serious decline in civic and political participation, Dalton (2009) argues that the concept of citizenship has shifted. Dalton (2009) differentiates between duty-based citizenship and engaged citizenship. Duty-based citizenship “stresses the duties and responsibilities of citizenship, with a limited participatory role. This is a constrained model of citizenship, which reinforces the existing political order and existing authority patterns” (Dalton, 2009, p. 31). Dalton (2009) argues that Putnam (2000) and most political scientist, conceptualize citizenship as duty-based. Engaged citizenship shares elements with traditional liberalism; however engaged citizenship is more concerned with relationships and direct participation, than electoral politics. “[E]ngaged citizens are less likely to vote in elections, but they protest more often, are more active political consumers, and are developing new patterns of political action” (Dalton, 2009, p. 165). Dalton (2009) argues that while there has been a decline in duty-based citizenship activities, there has been an increase in engaged citizenship activities.

Loader, Vromen, and Xenos (2014) echo Dalton’s argument, noting that most millennials are civically and politically engaged in nontraditional ways such as through social media. Loader et al. (2014) note that globally, citizenship education has been promoted to curb the decline of civic and political participation, but this education is widely duty-based citizenship.

In this new guise of constructive social participation, citizenship includes, as one might expect, participation by young people in conventional political activities such as voting and party membership; but it also increasingly includes volunteering, community cohesion and the development of 'social capital' [citing Putnam, 2000]. Consequently, whilst emphasizing the duty of citizens to engage in voluntary activities and 'give something back' to their communities, such curricula do not yet seem to encompass self-actualizing democratic engagement with unconventional political activity associated with protest and social movements and repertoires of participation through consumer boycotts, wearing emblems, protesting or signing petitions [sic]. (Loader et al. 2014, p. 8)

Both duty-based and engaged citizenship have strengths and limitations; however, the majority of civic education, as Loader et al. (2014) suggest, rely upon a duty-based conceptualization of citizenship. Given the widespread influence of Putnam (2000) on the diagnostic and prognostic framing of the civic education movement perhaps the concept of the “good citizen” needs to be reconsidered.

Both the service learning and civic engagement frames rely upon a duty-based concept of citizenship—individuals have a duty to serve their communities and participate in decisions making. Lisman (1998) argues that a fundamental part of civic literacy is participatory decision-making and civic duty.

The political engagement frame also relies upon duty-based citizenship by promoting participation in policy decision, electoral politics, and government; although what counts as “political” is broader than voting and electoral politics.

The democratic engagement frame pushes higher education to develop more meaningful, reciprocal relationships with the community, but is still heavily influenced by civic engagement and offers more of a duty-based model of citizenship.

The critical engagement also promotes a duty-based model of citizenship. Giroux and Giroux (2004) would argue that engaged citizenship is nothing more than neoliberalism, particularly the use of purchasing power as political protest and focus upon individual, “self-centered” action. Dalton (2009) would argue in response, engaged citizenship highlights self-interest and individual action; however, there is still a deep sense of social responsibility.

The social justice frame also draws for a more duty-based citizenship; seeking change through established systems of authority and in policy. Although social justice is critical of hegemony, it seeks to change it through traditional politics.

The point here is not to say that the civic education movement is not compatible with Dalton’s (2009) concept of engaged citizenship—that the movement has yet to adapt to shift in citizenship—but that citizenship has yet to really be critically evaluated. If millennials are already practicing engaged citizenship, how might the civic education movement capitalize on this cultural shift? What are the implications of duty-based and engaged citizenship on civic education pedagogy? The questions need further consideration in the civic education movement.

Developing a Civic Education Pedagogy

The main goal of this project is to identify and compare the key perspectives in the civic education movement so that future discussion on civic education can be more fruitful. Civic education can be overwhelming if one is not well versed in the literature,

and difficulty to articulate if communicating to more of a lay audience. Here I offer more practical considerations for civic education practitioners to develop their own definitions, and how to better articulate their conceptualization of civic education at their own institutions.

Defining Civic Education

At a basic level, civic education or engagement is the deliberate pedagogy to transform young people into good and productive citizens. Civic engagement can be accomplished through a number of educational activities and experiences. As Crick (2008) suggested, democracy is a matter of long-term behavior, not a “definitive definition for a precise curricular moment” (p. 13). Deliberate pedagogy refers to clear methods of teaching and learning, clear learning outcomes, and empirical assessment of learning outcomes. As mentioned previously, there is not a single “correct” definition for civic education, in fact there should not be a single definition. In addition to a standalone definition, consider drafting a position paper that provides the background literature and perspective. A position paper can help better articulate the civic education definition. The following are basic questions that should be asked when defining civic education:

- 1) What is the core mission and values of the institution?
- 2) What role does civic education play in the mission and values of the institution?
- 3) What sort of civic education activities are already going on at the institution?
- 4) What is the role of service learning at the institution? Is it a major or minor focus?

- 5) What role does political participation play at the institution? Is it a major or minor focus?
- 6) What role does social justice play at the institution? Is it a major or minor focus?
- 7) What role does critical engagement play at the institution? Is it a major or minor focus?
- 8) What sort of civic activities should be added? What sort of activities would be excluded by the proposed definition?
- 9) What sort of student outcomes are desired? How might those outcomes be assessed?
- 10) What would a “good citizen” look like with the proposed definition?
- 11) What civic education frame(s) would a proposed definition fit into (remember frame overlap is common)?
- 12) How would the proposed definition fit into the civic education literature?

These basic questions identify some of the main divisions within the movement and can draw attention to the particular values, concepts, and perspectives that should guide an institution towards a definition that fits its values and goals. Debate and discussion is important. A good definition of civic education clearly expresses the values of the institution and intended civic activity, but also is open enough to allow for innovation and growth.

Pedagogical Development

At the institutional level, higher education institutions need to offer a number of diverse civic engagement opportunities that promote service, civic responsibility, and

political participation. Civic education is a long term commitment, not a single course or program. For example, service learning does not focus upon political participation, but rather upon community service, which can overlook (or intentionally avoid) political topics and action. The same goes for a strict civic engagement or political engagement focus. Start with the first year experience and general education as the foundation to civic education, an early focus on civic education will prime students for later civic or political engagement (see Hunter & Moody, 2009; Spiezio, 2009).

At the classroom level civic education requires an open classroom, where student feel comfortable expressing their opinions (see Campbell, 2008). Instructors should engage controversial and political topics openly and as non-partisan as possible. This does not mean that the teacher cannot have an opinion, but that the focus is upon critical analysis and facilitating students to develop their own opinions (see, Hess & Avery, 2008; Hess, 2009). Stanley Fish (2008) does has a good point about critical thinking and “academicizing” political topics; however, it is impossible to separate the “real world” context from the academic. Colby et al. (2007), in their research on political engagement found, that political engagement had no effect on political party or political ideology. Students were not politically indoctrinated through PEP pedagogy. As Saltmarsh and Hartley (2011) argue service learning and civic engagement programs are often apolitical, which can overlook the importance of politics and political belief in civic life.

Research Limitations and Future Research

This project was conceived to understand the breadth of the civic education literature opposed to the depth. One obvious limitation to this approach is some literature has to be ignored in the analysis. Sillars and Gronbeck (2001) process of textualization

was used to identify what texts were significant—what would be important and what was not needed. Another researcher could replicate this project and identify a different set of literature. There is always a risk of leaving out an important perspective. At some point, every researcher makes choices as what to include, what survey or assessment results to report, what area of literature needs to be explored. What is beneficial to rhetorical analysis are the texts I chose to include are public, and other scholars have the opportunity to respond to this project—if a perspective is miscategorized or excluded future research could address it.

More research is needed to compare perspectives in the civic engagement movement, including research that address assessment of civic education outcomes. Since the ideological orientation is very similar for most civic education frames, assessment tools and learning outcomes could potentially be adapted and used across civic education perspectives.

This project intentionally focuses upon the national and regional level of the civic engagement movement, as well as the academic literature; but there are numerous institutional programs and civic education centers who do significant civic work that need to be explored the framing matrix I developed. The national movement only describes part of the overall work being done in civic education. Furthermore, research is needed that explores the ways in which the civic education frames are used by practitioners and manifest themselves into the classroom and the community.

Future research regarding the conceptualization of citizenship and civic education is also needed. Civic education is dominated by a duty-based, political liberalism

ideology, which has benefits, but as Dalton (2009) suggests other conceptualizations of citizenship may influence perceptions of civic and political engagement.

I have presented seven civic education frames; however, there may be more that exist. As Jacoby (2009), there are as many definitions of civic education as there are scholars, perhaps more work needs to be done to identify other frames. Democracy and movements are not static, new frames may be created as both democracy and the civic education movement evolves.

Conclusion

Hikins and Cherwitz (2010) and Saltmarsh and Hartley (2011) suggest that civic education has the potential to become nothing more than a public relations ploy, rather than a long-term solution to student and faculty civic disengagement. Saltmarsh and Hartley (2011) argue that civic engagement has yet to fulfill its democratic purpose, and there is a need for introspection and deliberate democratic purposes and processes in the civic education movement. Frames analysis and rhetorical theory can help in this endeavor.

What research in the discipline of rhetoric reveals, then, is that institutional and cultural changes require deliberate and strategically crafted language. Just as in politics, an academic institution's rhetoric is far more than a vehicle for transmitting and publicizing its core values, policies, and day-to-day operations.

(Hikins & Cherwitz, 2010, p. 271)

This project shows the value of frames analysis and rhetorical theory to civic education, as a method to foster dialogue and cultural critique—to move the civic education movement beyond public relations and into a truly meaningful, transformative pedagogy.

This project is unique because it provides an overview of the entire civic education movement and the discourse that surrounds the various perspectives on civic education. The discourse of civic education, as with most academic discourse, is siloed and detached from other perspectives. Across perspectives, disciplines, institutions, and programs, good civic work is being done that needs to be identified, celebrated, and critiqued. But the problem of definition and fragmentation of the civic education movement prevents clear articulation at every level of civic education, making it difficult to get student, faculty, and administrative support. The core values of civic education are important and higher education is receptive, but only insofar as civic education advocates can effectively articulate and envision civic education, now and into the future.

REFERENCES

- American Association of State Colleges and Universities. (2002). *Stepping forward as stewards of place: A guide for leading public engagement at state colleges and universities*. Washington D.C.: American Association of State Colleges and Universities.
- American Association of State Colleges and Universities. (2005). *Democracy and civic engagement: A guide for higher education*. Washington D.C.: American Association of State Colleges and Universities.
- American Association of State Colleges and Universities. (2006a). *Electoral voices: Engaging college students in elections*. Washington D.C.: American Association of State Colleges and Universities.
- American Association of State Colleges and Universities. (2006b). *Tools and insights for universities called to regional stewardship*. Washington D.C.: American Association of State Colleges and Universities.
- American Association of State Colleges and Universities. (2015a). America's Future: Protecting the fiscal health of our democracy. Retrieved March 25, 2015, from <http://www.aascu.org/programs/adp/americasfuture/>
- American Association of State Colleges and Universities. (2015b). American Democracy Project. Retrieved April 12, 2015, from <http://www.aascu.org/programs/ADP/>
- American Association of State Colleges and Universities. (2015c). Campus & Community Civic Health Initiative. Retrieved March 25, 2015, from <http://www.aascu.org/programs/adp/civichealth/>
- American Association of State Colleges and Universities. (2015d). Campus & Community Health Initiative description. Retrieved March 25, 2015, from https://adpaascu.files.wordpress.com/2012/05/adp-ncoc-campus-community-civic-health-initiative_description.pdf
- American Association of State Colleges and Universities. (2015e). Civic Agency. Retrieved March 25, 2015, from <http://www.aascu.org/programs/adp/civicagency/>
- American Association of State Colleges and Universities. (2015f). Deliberative Polling. Retrieved March 25, 2015, from <http://www.aascu.org/programs/adp/dpolling/>
- American Association of State Colleges and Universities. (2015g). The Democracy Commitment. Retrieved March 25, 2015, from <http://www.aascu.org/programs/adp/democracycommitment/>
- American Association of State Colleges and Universities. (2015h). eCitizenship: New tools, new strategies, new spaces. Retrieved March 25, 2015, from <http://www.aascu.org/programs/adp/eCitizenship/>
- American Association of State Colleges and Universities. (2015i). Economic inequality in our democracy: A joint ADP/TDC national initiative. Retrieved March 25, 2015, from <http://www.aascu.org/programs/adp/EconomicInequality/>

- American Association of State Colleges and Universities. (2015j). Global Engagement Initiative. Retrieved March 25, 2015, from <http://www.aascu.org/programs/adp/GlobalEngagement/>
- American Association of State Colleges and Universities (2015). Political Engagement Project (PEP). Retrieved March 25, 2015, from <http://www.aascu.org/programs/adp/PEP/>
- Apple, M. W. (2000). Between neoliberalism and neoconservatism: Education and conservatism in a global context. In N. C. Burbules & C. A. Torres (Eds.), *Globalization and Education: Critical Perspectives*. New York: Routledge.
- Apple, M. W. (2004). *Ideology and curriculum*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Aristotle. (1991). *On rhetoric: A theory of civic discourse* (G. A. Kennedy, Trans.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Arum, R., & Roksa, J. (2011). *Academically adrift: Limited learning on college campuses*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Associated New American Colleges. (2015). About us: The New American Colleges and Universities. Retrieved March 25, 2015, from <http://www.anac.org/aboutus.html>
- Association of American Colleges and Universities. (2015). Civic learning. Retrieved March 25, 2015, from <https://www.aacu.org/resources/civic-learning>
- Battistoni, R. M. (2002). *Civic engagement across the curriculum: A resource book for service-learning faculty in all disciplines*. Providence, RI: Campus Compact.
- Beaumont, E., Colby, A., Ehrlich, T., & Torney-Purta, J. (2006). Promoting political competence and engagement in college students: An empirical study. *Journal of Political Science Education*, 2, 249-270. doi: 10.1080/15512160600840467
- Bell, L. A. (1997). Theoretical foundations of social justice education. In M. Adams, L. A. Bell, & P. Griffin (Eds.), *Teaching for diversity and social justice: A sourcebook* (pp. 3-15). New York: Routledge.
- Benford, R. D., & Snow, D. A. (2000). Framing processes and social movements: An overview and assessment. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26, 611.
- Bennion, E. (2006). Civic education and citizen engagement: Mobilizing voters as a required field experiment. *Journal of Political Science Education*, 2, 205-227. doi: 10.1080/15512160600686555
- Bensimon, E. M. (1989). The meaning of "good presidential leadership": A frame analysis. *Review of Higher Education*, 12(2), 107-123.
- Bensimon, E. M. (1990). Viewing the presidency: Perceptual congruence between presidents and leaders on their campuses. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 1(2), 71-90.
- Berinsky, A. J., & Lenz, G. S. (2011). Education and political participation: Exploring the causal link. *Political Behavior*, 33(3), 357-373.
- Bitzer, L. F. (1992). The rhetorical situation. *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, 25, 1-14.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2008). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership* (4th ed.). San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.
- Boyte, H. C. (2003). A different kind of politics: John Dewey and the meaning of citizenship in the 21st century. *The good society*, 12(2), 1-15.
- Boyte, H. C. (2004). *Going public: Academics and public life*. Dayton, OH: Kettering Foundation.

- Boyte, H. C., & Fretz, E. (2011). Civic professionalism. In J. A. Saltmarsh & M. Hartley (Eds.), *"To serve a larger purpose": Engagement for democracy and the transformation of higher education* (pp. 82-101). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Bruns, J. W., & Bruns, D. L. (2007). Effecting change in colleges and universities. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 1(2), 53-63.
- Butin, D. W. (2008a). Saving the university on his own time: Stanley Fish, service-learning, and knowledge legitimation in the academy. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 15(1), 62-69.
- Butin, D. W. (2008b). *Service-learning and social justice education: Strengthening justice-oriented community based models of teaching and learning*. New York: Routledge.
- Butin, D. W. (2010). *Service-learning in theory and practice: The future of community engagement in higher education*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Campbell, D. E. (2008). Voice in the classroom: How an open classroom climate fosters political engagement among adolescents. *Political Behavior*, 30, 437-454. doi: 10.1007/s11109-008-9063-z
- Campbell, D. E. (2009). Civic engagement and education: An empirical test of the sorting model. *American Journal of Political Science*, 53(4), 771-786.
- Campus Compact. (2015a). Mission & Vision. Retrieved March 25, 2015, from <http://compact.org/who-we-are/mission-and-vision/>
- Campus Compact. (2015b). Who we are. Retrieved March 25, 2015, from <http://www.compact.org/about/history-mission-vision/>
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (2015). Who we are. Retrieved April 14, 2015, from <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/who-we-are/>
- Carr, D. (2008). Rights, Duties and Responsibilities. In J. Arthur, I. Davies, & C. Hahn (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of education for citizenship and democracy* (pp. 20-28). Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Carragee, K. M., & Roefs, W. (2004). The neglect of power in recent framing research. *Journal of Communication*, 54, 214-233.
- Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement. (2015). CIRCLE's mission. Retrieved March 25, 2015, from <http://www.civicyouth.org/about-circle/>
- Chambers, T., & Gopaul, B. (2010). Toward a social justice-centered engaged scholarship: A public and a private good. In H. E. Fitzgerald, C. Burack, & S. D. Seifer (Eds.), *Handbook of engaged scholarship: Contemporary landscapes, future directions* (Vol. 1, pp. 55-70). East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.
- Childers, J. W., & Hentzi, G. (1995). *The Columbia dictionary of modern literary and cultural criticism*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Cialdini, R. B. (2001). *Influence: Science and practice*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Cohen, A. M., & Kisker, C. B. (2010). *The shaping of American higher education: Emergence and growth of the contemporary system*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Colby, A., Beaumont, E., Ehrlich, T., & Corngold, J. (2007). *Educating for democracy: Preparing undergraduates for responsible political engagement*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Colby, A., Ehrlich, T., Beaumont, E., & Stephens, J. (2003). *Educating citizens: Preparing America's undergraduates for lives of moral and civic responsibility*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Community College National Center for Community Engagement. (2015). About. Retrieved March 25, 2015, from <http://ccnce.org/about/>
- Comstock-Gay, S., & Goldman, J. (2009). Civic engagement and the new agenda for democratic reform. *National Civic Review*, 98, 63-66. doi: 10.1002/ncr.254
- Crick, B. (2008). Democracy. In J. Arthur, I. Davies, & C. Hahn (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of education for citizenship and democracy* (pp. 13-19). Los Angeles: SAGE.
- D'Angelo, P. (2002). News framing as a multiparadigmatic research program: A response to Entman. *Journal of Communication*, 52(4), 870.
- Dahlgren, P. (2009). *Media and political engagement: Citizens, communication, and democracy*. Cambridge, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Dalton, R. J. (2009). *The good citizen: How a younger generation is reshaping American politics*. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press.
- Dewey, J. (1910). *How we think*. Boston: D.C. Heath & Co.
- Dewey, J. (1980). *The middle works, 1899-1924 (Vol. 9)*. J. A. Boydston (Ed.). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1987). *The later works, 1925-1953. (Vol. 11)*. J. A. Boydston (Ed.). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1997). *Experience and education*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Dewey, J. (2008). *Democracy and education*. Radford, VA: Wilder.
- Dey, E. L. (2009). *Civic responsibility: What is the campus climate for learning?* Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Donahue, D. M., & Cress, C. (2010). A community of scholars educating for political engagement. *Journal for Civic Commitment*, 16(1), 1-10.
- Dunford, R. W., & Palmer, I. C. (1995). Claims about frames: practitioners' assessment of the utility of reframing. *Journal of Management Education*, 19(1), 96.
- Durham, F. D. (2001). Breaching Powerful Boundaries: A Postmodern Critique of Framing. In S. D. Reese, O. H. Gandy, & A. E. Grant (Eds.), *Framing public life perspectives on media and our understanding of the social world* (pp. 123-136). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Eddy, P. L. (2010). Leaders as Linchpins for Framing Meaning. *Community College Review*, 37(4), 313.
- Ehrlich, T., & Colby, A. (2004). Political Bias in Undergraduate Education. *Liberal Education*, 90(3), 4.
- Ehrlich, T., & Jacoby, B. (2009). *Civic engagement in higher education: Concepts and practices*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Towards clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43, 51-58.
- Entman, R. M. (2007). Framing bias: Media in the distribution of power. *Journal of Communication*, 57, 163-173.

- Fish, S. (1999). *The trouble with principle*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Fish, S. (2003). Aim low. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from: <http://chronicle.com/article/Aim-Low/45210>
- Fish, S. (2005). An interview with Stanley Fish: Aiming low in the ivory tower. *National Civic Review*, 94(2), 41-45.
- Fish, S. (2008). *Save the world on your own time*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Freire, P. (2010). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- Frickel, S., & Gross, N. (2005). A general theory of scientific/intellectual movements. *American sociological review*, 70(2), 204-232.
- Furco, A. (2003). Issues of definition and program diversity in the study of service-learning. In S. Billig & A. S. Waterman (Eds.), *Studying service-learning : innovations in education research methodology* (pp. 13-33). Mahwah, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates.
- Gamson, W. A. (1995). Constructing social protest. In H. Johnston & B. Klandermans (Eds.), *Social movements and culture: Social movements, protest, and contention* (Vol. 4, pp. 373-393). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.
- Gamson, W. A., Croteau, D., Hoynes, W., & Sasson, T. (1992). Media images and the social construction of reality. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 18(1), 373-393. doi: doi:10.1146/annurev.so.18.080192.002105
- Gamson, W. A., & Lasch, K. E. (1983). The political culture of social welfare policy. In S. E. Spiro & E. Yuchtman-Yaar (Eds.), *Evaluating the welfare state: Social and political perspectives*. New York: Academic Press.
- Gamson, W. A., & Modigliani, A. (1987). The changing culture of affirmative action. *Research in Political Sociology*, 3, 137-177.
- Gamson, W. A., & Modigliani, A. (1989). Media discourse and public opinion on nuclear power: A constructionist approach. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 95(1), 1-37.
- Germino, D. L. (1990). *Antonio Gramsci: Architect of a new politics*. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press.
- Gibson, C. M. (2004). Thinking outside the (ballot) box: A broader political engagement strategy for America's civic organizations. *National Civic Review*, 93(2), 20-30.
- Giles, D. E., & Eyler, J. (1994). The theoretical roots of service-learning in John Dewey: Toward a theory of service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 1(1), 77-85.
- Giroux, H. A. (2009). Higher education and the promise of democracy. In G. A. Olson & J. W. Presley (Eds.), *The future of higher education: Perspectives from America's academic leaders* (pp. 53-62). Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Giroux, H. A., & Giroux, S. S. (2004). *Take back higher education: Race, youth, and the crisis of democracy in the post-civil rights era*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Goldfinger, J., & Presley, J. W. (Eds.). (2010). *Educating students for political engagement: A guide to implementation and assessment for colleges and universities*. New York: American Association of State Colleges and Universities.
- Gottlieb, K., & Robinson, G. (2006). *A Practical guide for integrating civic responsibility into the curriculum*. Washington, D.C.: Community College Press.

- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. New York: International.
- Greene, M. (1985). The role of education in democracy. *Educational Horizons*, 64(3), 3-9.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (2002). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Hahn, C., L. (2008). Education for Citizenship and Democracy in the United States. In J. Arthur, I. Davies, & C. Hahn (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of education for citizenship and democracy* (pp. 263-278). Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Hall, S. (1996). Gramsci's relevance for the study of race and ethnicity. In D. Morley & K.-H. Chen (Eds.), *Stuart Hall: Critical dialogues in cultural studies*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Hartley, M. (2011). Idealism and compromise and the civic engagement movement. In J. A. Saltmarsh & M. Hartley (Eds.), *"To serve a larger purpose": Engagement for democracy and the transformation of higher education* (pp. 27-48). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hawkes, D. (2003). *Ideology: The new critical idiom*. New York: Routledge.
- Hess, D. E. (2004). Controversies about controversial issues in democratic education. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 37(02), 257-261.
- Hess, D. E. (2009). *Controversy in the classroom: The democratic power of discussion*. London: Routledge.
- Hess, D. E., & Avery, P. G. (2008). Discussion of Controversial Issues as a Form and Goal of Democratic Education. In J. Arthur, I. Davies, & C. Hahn (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of education for citizenship and democracy* (pp. 506-518). Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Hikins, J. W., & Cherwitz, R. A. (2010). The engaged university: Where rhetorical theory matters. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 38(2), 115-126.
- Hildreth, R. W. (2012). John Dewey on experience: a critical resource for the theory and practice of youth civic engagement. *Citizenship Studies*, 16(7), 919-935. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13621025.2012.716209>
- Hillygus, D. S. (2005). The missing link: Exploring the relationship between higher education and political engagement. *Political Behavior*, 27(1), 25-47. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11109-005-3075-8>
- Hillygus, S. (2005). The missing link: Exploring the relationship between higher education and political engagement. *Political Behavior*, 27, 25-47. doi: 10.1007/s11109-005-3075-8
- Hollander, E. (2010). Forward. In D. W. Butin (Ed.), *Service-learning in theory and practice: The future of community engagement in higher education* (pp. vii-xii). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hu, S., & Kuh, G. D. (2002). Being (dis)engaged in educationally purposeful activities: The influences of student and institutional characteristics. *Research in higher education*, 43(5), 555-575.
- Hunt, S. A., Benford, R. D., & Snow, D. A. (1994). Identity fields: Framing processes and the social construction of movement identities. In E. Larana, H. Johnston, &

- J. R. Gusfield (Eds.), *New social movements: From ideology to identity*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Hunt, S. K., Simonds, C. J., & Simonds, B. K. (2009). Uniquely qualified, distinctively competent: Delivering 21st century skills in the basic course. *Basic Communication Course Annuals*, 21, 1-29.
- Ihlen, Ø., & Nitz, M. (2008). Framing contests in environmental disputes: Paying attention to media and cultural master frames. *International journal of strategic communication*, 2, 1-18.
- Iyengar, S. (1990). Framing responsibility for political issues: The case of poverty. *Political Behavior*, 12(1), 19-40.
- Jacoby, B. (1996). *Service-learning in higher education: Concepts and practices*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Jacoby, B. (2009). Civic engagement in today's higher education: An overview. In B. Jacoby (Ed.), *Civic engagement in higher education: Concepts and practices* (pp. 5-30). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kane, K. R., & Goldgehn, L. A. (2010). Beyond "The Total Organization": A Graduate-Level Simulation. *Journal of Management Education*.
- Kendall, J. C. (1990). Combining service and learning: An introduction *Combining service and learning: A resource book for community and public service* (pp. 1-33). Raleigh, NC: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.
- Kenny, M., Sigmon, L. K., Kiley-Brabeck, K., & Lerner, R. M. (2002). Promoting civic society through service learning: A view of the issues. In M. Kenny, L. K. Sigmon, K. Kiley-Brabeck, & R. M. Lerner (Eds.), *Learning to serve: Promoting civil society through service learning*. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Kettering Foundation. (2015). Our focus. Retrieved March 25, 2015, from <http://kettering.org/who-we-are/our-focus/>
- Kliwer, B. W. (2013). Why the civic engagement movement cannot achieve democratic and justice aims. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 19(2), 72-79.
- Kwan, S., & Graves, J. (2013). *Framing fat: Competing constructions in contemporary culture*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Laclau, E. (1977). *Politics and ideology in Marxist theory: Capitalism, fascism, populism*. London: New Left Books.
- Landman, T. (2013). Framing performance magic: The role of contract, discourse and effect. *Journal of performance magic*, 1(1), 47-68.
- Landy, M. (1994). *Film, politics, and Gramsci*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Lisman, C. D. (1998). *Toward a civil society civic literacy and service learning*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Loader, B. D., Vromen, A., & Xenos, M. A. (2014). *The networked young citizen: Social media, political participation and civic engagement*. New York: Routledge.
- Maguire, J. D. (1982). Toward a definition of the civic. *Liberal Education*, 68(4), 281-283.
- McCartney, A., Rios, M., Bennion, E. A., & Simpson, D. W. (2013). *Teaching civic engagement: From student to active citizen*. Washington, DC: American Political Science Association.

- Mooney, P. H., & Hunt, S. A. (1996). A repertoire of interpretations: Master frames and ideological continuity in U.S. agrarian mobilization. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 37, 177-197. doi: 10.1111/j.1533-8525.1996.tb02336.x
- Morrill, R. L. (1982). Educating for Democratic Values. *Liberal Education*, 68(4), 365-376.
- Musil, C. M. (2009). Educating students for personal and social responsibility: The civic learning spiral. In B. Jacoby (Ed.), *Civic engagement in higher education: Concepts and practices* (pp. 49-68). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities. (2014a). About NAICU. Retrieved March 25, 2015, from <https://www.naicu.edu/about/>
- National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities. (2014b). Welcome to Your Vote, Your Voice. Retrieved March 25, 2015, from <http://yourvoteyourvoice.org/>
- National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities. (2014c). Your Vote, Your Voice National Campus Voter Registration Project returns for 2014. Retrieved March 25, 2015, from <https://www.aacu.org/resources/civic-learning>
- National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. (2015). Civic learning and democratic engagement. Retrieved March 25, 2015, from <https://www.naspa.org/focus-areas/civic-learning-and-democratic-engagement>
- National Forum on Higher Education and the Public Good. (2013). Values. Retrieved March 25, 2015, from <http://thenationalforum.org/aboutus/values/>
- Neuman, W. R., Marcus, G. E., Crigler, A. N., & Mackuen, M. (2007). *The affect effect: Dynamics of emotion in political thinking and behavior*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- New England Resource Center for Higher Education. (2015a). Carnegie Community Engagement Classification. Retrieved March 25, 2015, from http://nerche.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=341&Itemid=92
- New England Resource Center for Higher Education. (2015b). Mission. Retrieved March 25, 2015, from http://nerche.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=2&Itemid=2
- Palmer, I., & Dunford, R. (1996). Reframing and organizational action: the unexplored link. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 9(6), 12-25.
- Palmer, P. J. (1990). Community, conflict and ways of knowing: Ways to deepen our educational agenda *Combining service and learning: A resource book for community and public service* (pp. 105-113). Raleigh, NC: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.
- Plater, W. M. (2011). Collective leadership for engagement: Reclaiming the public purpose of higher education. In J. A. Saltmarsh & M. Hartley (Eds.), *"To serve a larger purpose": Engagement for democracy and the transformation of higher education* (pp. 102-129). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Prentice, M. (2007a). Service learning and civic engagement. *Academic Questions*, 20(2), 135-145.
- Prentice, M. (2007b). Social justice through service learning: Community colleges as ground zero. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 40(3), 266-273.

- Presley, J. W. (2011). Chief Academic Officers and community-engaged faculty. In J. A. Saltmarsh & M. Hartley (Eds.), *"To serve a larger purpose" : Engagement for democracy and the transformation of higher education* (pp. 130-153). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Project Pericles. (2015). About Project Pericles. Retrieved March 25, 2015, from <http://www.projectpericles.org/projectpericles/about/>
- Putnam, R. D. (1995). Bowling alone: America's declining social capital. *JOURNAL OF DEMOCRACY*, 6(1), 65-78.
- Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Reber, B. H. (2005). Framing analysis of activist rhetoric: How the Sierra Club succeeds or fails at creating salient messages. *Public Relations Review*, 31(2), 185.
- Reese, S. D. (2007). The framing project: A bridging model for media research revisited. *Journal of Communication*, 57, 148-154.
- Retallick, J., & Fink, D. (2002). Framing leadership: Contributions and impediments to educational change. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 5(2), 91-104.
- Rice, T. W., & Redlawsk, D. P. (2009). Why civic service. In T. W. Rice & D. P. Redlawsk (Eds.), *Civic service: Service-learning with state and local government partners*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Rudolph, F. (1977). *Curriculum: A history of the American undergraduate course of study since 1636*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Rudolph, F. (1990). *The American college and university : a history ; introductory essay and supplemental bibliography*. Athens, Ga. [u.a.]: Univ. of Georgia Pr.
- Sabo Center for Democracy and Citizenship. (2015). Mission and purpose. Retrieved March 25, 2015, from <http://www.augsburg.edu/sabo/about/mission-purpose/>
- Saltmarsh, J. A. (1996). Education for critical citizenship: John Dewey's contribution to the pedagogy of community service learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 3(1), 13-21.
- Saltmarsh, J. A. (2005). The civic promise of service learning. *Liberal Education*, 91(2), 6.
- Saltmarsh, J. A. (2011). Education for critical citizenship: John Dewey's contribution to the pedagogy of community service-learning. In J. A. Saltmarsh & E. A. Zlotkowski (Eds.), *Higher education and democracy: Essays on service-learning and civic engagement* (pp. 41-54). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Saltmarsh, J. A., & Hartley, M. (2011). Democratic Engagement. In J. A. Saltmarsh & M. Hartley (Eds.), *"To serve a larger purpose": Engagement for democracy and the transformation of higher education* (pp. 14-26). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Saltmarsh, J. A., Hartley, M., & Clayton, P. (2009). Democratic engagement white paper. Boston: New England Resource Center for Higher Education.
- Sander, T. H., & Putnam, R. D. (2010). Still Bowling Alone? The Post-9/11 Split. *Journal of Democracy*, 21(1), 9-16.
- Sax, L. J., & Astin, A. W. (1998). Developing "civic virtue" among college students. In J. N. Gardner & G. Van der Veer (Eds.), *The senior year experience: Facilitating*

- integration, reflection, closure, and transition* (pp. 133-151). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Scherff, L., Prado, J., & Singer, N. R. (2009). *Testing and validating frames for online organizations*.
- Sigmon, R. L. (1990). Service-learning: Three principles. In J. C. Kendall (Ed.), *Combining service and learning: A resource book for community and public service* (pp. 56-64). Raleigh, NC: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.
- Sillars, M. O., & Gronbeck, B. E. (2001). *Communication criticism: Rhetoric, social codes, cultural studies*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- Simmons, J. R., & Lilly, B. (2010). The university and student political engagement. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 43, 347-349. doi: 10.1017/S1049096510000260
- Smudde, P. M. (2010). The education of citizen critics: The consubstantiality of Burke's philosophy and constructivist pedagogy. In P. M. Smudde (Ed.), *Humanistic critique of education: Teaching and learning as symbolic action* (pp. 92-114). West Lafayette, IN: Parlor Press.
- Snow, D. A., & Benford, R. D. (1988). Ideology, frame resonance, and participant mobilization. In B. Klandermans, H. Kriesi, & S. Tarrow (Eds.), *International social movement research* (Vol. 1, pp. 197-217). Greenwich: JAI Press.
- Snow, D. A., & Benford, R. D. (1992). Master frames and cycles of protest. In A. D. Morris & C. McClurg Muller (Eds.), *Frontiers in social movement theory* (Vol. 1, pp. 197-217): Yale University Press.
- Snow, D. A., Corrigan-Brown, C., & Vliegenthart, R. (2007). Framing the French riots: A comparative study of frame variation. *Social forces*, 86(2), 385-415.
- Spiezio, K. E., Baker, K. Q., & Boland, K. (2005). General education and civic engagement: An empirical analysis of pedagogical possibilities. *JGE: The Journal of General Education*, 54(4), 273-292.
- Spillane, J. P. (2004). Towards a theory of leadership practice: A distributed perspective. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 36(1), 3.
- Spillane, J. P., Reiser, B. J., & Reimer, T. (2002). Policy implementation and cognition: Reframing and refocusing implementation research. *Review of Educational Research*, 72(3), 387.
- Stanton, T. (1990). Service learning: Groping toward a definition. In J. C. Kendall (Ed.), *Combining service and learning: A resource book for community and public service* (pp. 65-67). Raleigh, NC: National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.
- Stewart, C. J., Smith, C. A., & Denton, R. E. (2007). *Persuasion and social movements*. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.
- Stewart, C. J., Smith, C. A., & Denton, R. E. (2001). *Persuasion and social movements* (4th ed.). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- Stuart Hunter, M., & Moody, B. L. (2009). Civic engagement in the first college year. In B. Jacoby (Ed.), *Civic engagement in higher education: Concepts and practices*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sylvester, D. (2010). Service learning as a vehicle for promoting student political efficacy. *Journal for Civic Commitment*, 16(1).

- Tarrow, S. (1992). Mentalities, political cultures, and collection action frames: Constructing meanings through action. In A. D. Morris & C. M. Mueller (Eds.), *Frontiers in social movement theory* (pp. 174-204). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Theelin, J. R. (2004). *A history of American higher education*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Van Gorp, B. (2007). The constructionist approach to framing: Bringing culture back in. *Journal of Communication*, 57, 60-78.
- Watson, J. B. (2004). A justification of the civic engagement model. In B. W. Speck & S. L. Hoppe (Eds.), *Service-learning: history, theory, and issues* (pp. 73-83). Westport, CN: Praeger.
- West, C. (1989). *The American evasion of philosophy: A genealogy of pragmatism*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. (2004). What kind of citizen? The politics of educating for democracy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 41(2), 237-269.
- Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. (2007). Introduction. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 40(2), 97-100. doi: 10.1080/10665680701228847
- Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. (2008). Introduction. In D. W. Butin (Ed.), *Service-learning and social justice education: Strengthening justice-oriented community based models of teaching and learning* (pp. vii-x). Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Woolard, C. (2009). *Free markets, agribusiness, and family farms: The ideological construction and contradictions of the American Farm Bureau*. (Unpublished master's thesis), Illinois State University, Normal, IL.
- Zald, M. N. (1996). Culture, ideology, and strategic framing. In D. McAdam, J. D. McCarthy, & M. N. Zald (Eds.), *Comparative perspectives on social movements: Political opportunities, mobilizing structures, and cultural framings*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Zoch, L. M., Collins, E. L., Sisco, H. F., & Supa, D. H. (2008). Empowering the activist: Using framing devices on activist organizations' web sites. *Public Relations Review*, 34(4), 351-358.
- Zompetti, J. P. (1997). Toward a Gramscian critical rhetoric. *Western Journal of Communication*, 61, 66-86.

APPENDIX A

ANALYSIS PROCESS OVERVIEW

I. Close Textual Analysis (Done for each text): This process has 3 main steps; however, analysis is tailored to the topic and research questions. Based upon my specific research questions and topic the following step is specific to my project.

A. Textualization (criteria to decide what to analyze): This will be the process by which I decide what texts (i.e., journal article, research reports, etc.) to analyze.

This process will be similar as the process of writing a review of literature

1. Basic questions for each article/text:

- a. Who do the author(s) cite? How does the author(s) position themselves within the literature?
- b. Who cites this article or author? Is this article cited often? Is this article credible within the literature?
- c. Who disagrees with the author's arguments?
- d. Is this article/text relevant to analysis?

B. Interpretation (what meaning the text provides): Once it is determined what texts are important and relevant, then begins the close analysis of the individual texts.

1. What is the Rhetorical Situation for the text?

- a. Exigence: What is the reason the author is speaking or writing the text?

(1) What is the problem statement? Is this statement blatant or is it implied?

(2) What is the diagnostic frame?

(a) What is the problem the author identifies and who or what is to blame for the problem?

b. Audience: Who is the target audience? Who does the author think is the target audience?

(1) How does the author attempt to identify with the audience?

(2) What are the ideological assumptions the author requires of the audience?

c. Constraints: What are the people, events, objects, relationships, and ideological assumptions that can help or hinder the author?

(1) Does the diagnostic frame fit with the situation?

(2) What is the prognostic frame? Is it something that fits with the ideology and/or a master frame?

(3) What is the motivational frame? Does it fit the situation and audience?

2. Identify themes and frames

a. What is the ideological master frame?

b. What is the diagnostic, prognostic, and motivational frame?

c. How is strategic framing used?

d. What are the framing elements that are used?

(1) What are the metaphors, exemplars, catchphrases, depictions, and visual images used to invoke a particular frame?

e. What are the reasoning elements used?

(1) What are roots, consequences, and appeals to principle used?

3. Identify personal or cultural values (ideological assumptions)

4. Political aspect (ideological assumptions and power)

a. Is this text being used to justify or advance the author/organization into a position of power?

b. Is the author claiming expertise or authority?

5. Stylistic features

a. Is the arrangement of the text effective?

b. Is the language appropriate?

c. Do the arguments flow?

C. Evaluation (which involves making judgments as to the value of the text)

1. Is the text effective?

2. Do the ideological assumptions line up with the arguments presented?

3. How does this text interconnect with other texts?

4. What new arguments or interpretations does this text provide?

5. What is not being said? What are the latent assumptions?

6. What are the implications of the author's perspective on civic education?

II. Framing Matrix (Compares and organizes multiple texts into themes and frames)

A. What is the common ideological master frames presented in the texts?

B. What is the dominant perspective(s)? What is the outlying perspective(s)?

C. What are the points of contention?

D. What unifies and divides the civic education movement?

III. Repeat steps as necessary. Since this project is looking for emergent themes, some text(s) may need reevaluated later if a new theme or frame is discovered.

APPENDIX B:

CIVIC EDUCATION FRAMING MATRIX

Signature Frame	Cultural Producer(s) ⁶	Ideological Orientation
Service Learning Frame	Campus Compact, Carnegie Foundation of the Advancement of Teaching, AACCC, NERCHE, CIRCLE, & CCNCCE	Master Frame: Pragmatic Liberalism
Civic Engagement Frame	AASCU, ADP, PEP, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, SCDC, AACU, CIRCLE, Campus Compact, NERCHE, Kettering Foundation, & Project Pericles	Master Frame: Pragmatic Liberalism
Political Engagement Frame	AASCU, ADP, PEP, & Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching	Master Frame: Pragmatic Liberalism
Democratic Engagement Frame	AASCU, ADP, NERCHE, NASPA, & AACU	Master Frame: Pragmatic Liberalism
Critical Engagement Frame	Henry Giroux, Michael W. Apple, Maxine Greene, & Paulo Freire	Master Frame: Pragmatic Liberalism and Anti-Neoliberalism
Social Justice Frame	Campus Compact & NERCHE	Master Frame: Pragmatic Liberalism
Antifoundational Frame	Stanley Fish	Master Frame: Pragmatic Antifoundationalism

⁶ I include the civic education organizations here, but omit the authors associated with each signature frame, simply for the sake of space. If there were no organizations present, then I list the authors. Chapter IV discusses both organizations and authors.

Signature Frame	Diagnostic Framing	Prognostic Framing
Service Learning Frame	Lack of social connectedness; frayed social networks of an individualistic and narcissistic society; lack of visibility of what service youth do; higher education has moved away from its civic mission	Repairing lost connections between individuals and the community through service learning
Civic Engagement Frame	Lack of social connectedness; frayed social networks of an individualistic and narcissistic society; higher education has moved away from its civic mission	Repairing lost connections between individuals and the community; universities need to embrace and intuitional civic engagement
Political Engagement Frame	Lack of social connectedness; frayed social networks of an individualistic and narcissistic society; low levels of political participation; higher education has moved away from its civic mission	Universities need to embrace and intuitional civic engagement; political participation needs to be a focus in higher education to increase low participation
Democratic Engagement Frame	Lack of social connectedness; frayed social networks of an individualistic and narcissistic society; lack of effective integration of civic engagement into service learning; higher education has move away from its civic mission	Repairing lost connections between individuals and the community; universities need to embrace and institutionalize civic engagement; The civic engagement movement needs introspections, many civic engagement programs do not promote true democratic
Critical Engagement Frame	Neoliberalism in higher education destroys democracy, higher education has move away from its civic mission	Resist neoliberalism and corporatization of higher education
Social Justice Frame	Social injustice exists; higher education has move away from its civic mission	Use the classroom to advocate social justice; community activism
Antifoundational Frame	Civic education cannot accomplish its goals; many in the university are not "Doing their jobs"	Professors should focus on the classroom, not on solving social and political issues

Signature Frame	Motivational Framing	Pedagogical Framing ⁷
Service Learning Frame	Lack of social connectedness; community engagement needed for healthy community	Service learning
Civic Engagement Frame	Lack of social connectedness; civic engagement was once a priority; civic engagement is key to a healthy democracy; there is a need to address societal problems	Community experience; service learning; teaching civic skills; traditional classroom experience/lecture
Political Engagement Frame	Lack of social connectedness; civic engagement was once a priority; there is a need to affect public policy	Community experience; service learning; teaching civic skill; traditional classroom experience/lecture
Democratic Engagement Frame	Lack of social connectedness; civic engagement was once a priority; civic engagement has yet to achieve Dewey's democratic ideal; need to connect to the community in a reciprocal relationship	Community experience; service learning; teaching civic skills; traditional classroom experience/lecture; teaching through community relationships; higher education is in an ecosystem of knowledge production
Critical Engagement Frame	Civic engagement was once a priority; need to resist hegemony	Critical resistance and drawing attention to neoliberalism
Social Justice Frame	Injustice exists and higher education can help to advance social justice	Social justice; service learning
Antifoundational Frame	Civic engagement goes against the core function of higher education, teaching critical thinking	Academicizing; exposing students to new knowledge; critical thinking skills

⁷ The pedagogical framing is not exhaustive but rather serves as a general guide. There are multiple pedagogical permutations across civic education and a single pedagogy is not exclusive to a single signature frame.