

2-12-2016

Responsive and Responsible: Levels of Faculty Encouragement of Civic Engagement

Eddie R. Cole

College of William and Mary, ercole@wm.edu

Elijah C. Howe

Indiana University, echowe@indiana.edu

Thomas F. Nelson Laird

Indiana University, tflaird@indiana.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wm.edu/articles>



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

Recommended Citation

Cole, Eddie R.; Howe, Elijah C.; and Nelson Laird, Thomas F., "Responsive and Responsible: Levels of Faculty Encouragement of Civic Engagement" (2016). *Articles*. 54.

<https://scholarworks.wm.edu/articles/54>



Responsive and Responsible: Faculty Encouragement of Civic Engagement

Eddie R. Cole, Elijah C. Howe & Thomas F. Nelson Laird

To cite this article: Eddie R. Cole, Elijah C. Howe & Thomas F. Nelson Laird (2016) Responsive and Responsible: Faculty Encouragement of Civic Engagement, Journal of College and Character, 17:1, 8-22

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/2194587X.2015.1125366>



Published online: 12 Feb 2016.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 1



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

Responsive and Responsible: Faculty Encouragement of Civic Engagement

Eddie R. Cole, College of William & Mary^a

Elijah C. Howe, Indiana University^b

Thomas F. Nelson Laird, Indiana University^c

Abstract

This study explores how often faculty members encourage students to engage with campus, local, state, national, and global issues. Using data from the 2013 administration of the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE), the results show that faculty members are more likely to encourage students to engage in state, national, or global issues than campus or local issues. Differences in faculty encouragement of civic engagement are also presented across gender, racial/ethnic identification, rank and employment status, and institutional affiliation, among other characteristics. Implications for practice are provided.

The purpose of a college education is a reoccurring topic in the national discussion about higher education. In many camps, the ability to successfully live in, navigate, and thrive in a democratic society is a central concern of higher education (Bok, 2001; Boyte & Hollander, 1999; Ehrlich, 2000; The National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement, 2012). Federal and state legislators, educational policymakers, and regional accreditation agencies are continuously demanding more precise assessments of whether undergraduate education is preparing graduates to be productive citizens. Despite this recent push from within higher education and beyond, throughout the 20th century, Americans' participation in civic activities declined in all forms ranging from voluntary associations to voting in formal elections (Putnam, 2000; Sax, 2000; Skocpol, 1997; Skocpol, Ganz, & Munson, 2000).

In response to this decline of civic engagement, in 1985, four university presidents founded Campus Compact. Today, this national coalition is comprised of more than 1,100 colleges and universities committed to the civic purposes of higher education (Campus Compact, 2014). Among those purposes are

^aEddie R. Cole (ercole@wm.edu) is an assistant professor in the higher education program at the College of William & Mary. He examines college presidents' rhetoric, especially during moments of student unrest, and faculty teaching practices.

^bElijah C. Howe (echowe@indiana.edu) is a Ph.D. candidate in the higher education and student affairs program at Indiana University. His research focus is the intersection of philanthropy and higher education, particularly student philanthropy.

^cThomas F. Nelson Laird (tflaird@indiana.edu) is an associate professor in the higher education and student affairs program and director of the Center for Postsecondary Research at Indiana University. His work focuses on improving teaching and learning at colleges and universities.

campus-community partnerships, service-learning, and civic engagement. The explicit foci of civic-missioned entities, such as Campus Compact, are a testament to higher education's resurgence in its commitment to civic preparation. In 2005, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching introduced a categorization of universities by their curricular engagement, outreach and partnerships, or the combination of the two (New England Resource Center for Higher Education, 2015). Since then, higher education's commitment to civic engagement has only grown and gained more allies, as evidenced by the 2014 "White House Civic Learning and National Service Summit," which convened to discuss the nation's civic health and higher education's role in maintaining it (Boyte, 2014).

Although administrators have endorsed these initiatives, faculty members are directly responsible for bringing these endorsements into the classroom. However, despite the increased focus on, and frequent documentation of, the importance of civic education, little is known about how faculty members encourage civic engagement among their students. This study helps to fill that void.

Civic Engagement and Faculty Practices

The college years are a critical time in developing a notion of civic agency for students (Astin, 1993; Kuh, 1991; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991). To be clear, civic engagement differs from service learning. Finley (2011) stated, "Although service-learning by definition engages students in a community, that engagement *may* or *may not* be politically-oriented or intentionally structured to deepen the specific knowledge or skills associated with developing democratic participation or citizenship" (p. 3). Campus Compact defines civic engagement as "having two interdependent dimensions: individual and organizational" (Cress, Burack, Giles, Elkins, & Stevens, 2010, p. 5). The individual dimension is how colleges focus on creating "civically-minded persons who know how to use their knowledge and skills for community betterment..." and for the organizational dimension, the focus is to "create infrastructure (policies, procedures, and programs) that link campuses and communities through reciprocal partnerships" (Cress et al., 2010, p. 5). Actual civic engagement is accomplished, in part, by providing students with opportunities in their course experiences to interact with and learn from diverse perspectives and acquire civic knowledge and skills regarding a variety of political and social issues (Bowman, 2011). These experiences are important because without faculty members' encouragement of specific activities, students may miss opportunities for civic engagement.

A number of studies, particularly since the publication of Ernest Boyer's (1990) *Scholarship Reconsidered*, have focused on faculty involvement with the community outside of the academy. This scholarship has emphasized faculty research and community service but not the way faculty promote civic engagement in their classroom instruction. Another line of research related to faculty and civic engagement is research on the political perspectives of faculty (Elchardus & Spruyt, 2009; Gross, 2013; Zipp & Fenwick, 2006). This research is important for understanding the totality of faculty involvement with the public beyond their academic colleagues; however, it does not address the way faculty encourage the civic engagement, political or apolitical, of their students.

For instance, there is great variation in how civic engagement is promoted across different institutional types. It is proposed that larger research universities are less likely to successfully incorporate civic engagement as a "regular feature of educational life" (Lounsbury & Pollack, 2001, p. 333), while liberal arts colleges, as Prince Jr. (2000) claimed, are the best prepared of all institutional types to promote civic responsibility of their students. Due to the residential nature, small size, and emphasis on how to think rather than what to think, liberal arts colleges are considered to be uniquely situated to teach civic

responsibility in a critical laboratory-like atmosphere (Prince Jr., 2000). Other studies, primarily focused on large research universities, have investigated the organizational factors and institutional support that promote faculty engaged scholarship and service (Barnhardt, 2015; Demb & Wade, 2012; Hinck & Brandell, 2000; Holland, 1997, 1999). While these studies do not consider organizational factors in relation to faculty teaching practices, the distinctions of institutional types are noteworthy to us because our study considers a range of institutional types to better assess if faculty encouragement in the classroom matches what are believed to be differences by institution type.

Disciplinary differences also play a role in the way faculty encourage civic engagement. Among all faculty surveyed, Eagan et al. (2014) noted that far fewer faculty believe instilling in students a sense of service to community was very important or essential during college when compared to other goals, such as employment. Sax (2000) argued that engineering is notorious for failing to encourage the development of civic engagement in students while increasing their sense of materialism. Disciplinary differences play a role in the likelihood civic engagement is encouraged, but Battistoni (2002) contended that no discipline is entirely averse or unable to teach civic engagement. Our study adds depth to the assertion that academic fields encourage civic engagement at varying levels while identifying which fields do so more often than others.

The challenge here, as Boyte (2008) found at one campus, is that many faculty members have “avoided mention of their public interests, which led most of them into academia. . .” (p. 12). Therefore, as Boyte (2008) posited, most civic engagement neglects the topics of power and politics, which impairs the development of a student’s sense of agency. Additionally, Colby, Beaumont, Ehrlich, and Corngold (2007) argued that student gains in political engagement demonstrate “that a focus on teaching political action skills may be helpful for promoting some other key outcomes” (p. 15). This focus is important to note because civic engagement is about the acquisition of civic knowledge and skills and developing the agency necessary to act on that knowledge with those skills.

By investigating how faculty teach civic issues, which this study does, we can further our knowledge of how students learn about civic engagement. Our particular study focuses on faculty encouragement of students’ engagement, in any form, with local, campus, state, national, or global issues. With high-profile stakeholders expressing their concern for the future of democratic education and increased accountability exerting pressure on the academy, teaching practices have been placed at the center of the debate. Therefore, this study explores faculty members’ encouragement of students to engage in local, campus, state, national, or international affairs and what faculty characteristics indicate the likelihood of incorporating civic engagement into their classroom practices. Two specific questions guided our analyses:

1. How much do faculty members report encouraging undergraduates’ civic engagement?
2. How does encouragement of civic engagement vary by faculty characteristics, including their institutional perceptions, and by institution?

Methods

Data Source and Measures

The data used for this study came from the 2013 administration of the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE). FSSE annually collects data from faculty members at baccalaureate-granting colleges

and universities where students have completed the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). Results from FSSE provide institutions with an assessment of faculty attitudes and behaviors related to educational practices known to produce positive educational outcomes for undergraduate students.

Sample

In this study, we rely on a total of 2,317 faculty respondents, 987 from nine public institutions and 1,330 from nine private institutions. Of the sample of faculty members, 52% were male. For race or ethnicity, 75% were White, with 6% African American, 4% Asian, 3% Hispanic or Latino, and 5% other/multiracial; the remaining 7% indicated a preference not to identify race or ethnicity. Faculty with doctorates comprised 64% of the respondents. By rank, 23% were professors, 22% were associate professors, 25% were assistant professors, 10% were full-time lecturers/instructors, and the remaining 20% were part-time lecturers/instructors. In addition, only 16% of the faculty reported their academic appointment was in the biological or physical sciences, mathematics, engineering, or computer science fields. See [Table 1](#) for highlights of faculty characteristics.

Of the 146 institutions that participated in FSSE 2013, 18 chose to append items about civic engagement to the end of the core FSSE instrument. Of those 18 institutions, according to the Carnegie Classification of colleges and universities, 4 were baccalaureate colleges, 10 were master's institutions, and 4 were doctoral or research universities. Half of the institutions were private, and a little over half of the private institutions were religiously affiliated. According to Campus Compact records, 6 of the 18 institutions were members (www.compact.org). See [Table 2](#) for summary information about the 18 institutions, as well as means and standard deviations for the two civic engagement scales.

Since institutions chose to append the civic engagement items and, similarly, faculty chose to participate in the survey, the generalizability of our study may be limited, and our findings should be viewed as exploratory and in need of further confirmation. For example, our study did not include any large public institutions (i.e. greater than 15,000 undergraduates), which influenced the proportion of faculty from public and private institutions. Though a self-selected group, [Table 2](#) illustrates that our sample of institutions was diverse, which contributes to a literature that is often limited by institutional type.

Measures

At the 18 institutions, faculty participants received an item set about their perceptions of how much their institutions emphasized civic engagement and about how much the faculty members encouraged their students to be engaged civically. For our dependent variable, we relied on the items that gauged how often faculty encouraged students to engage with campus, local, state, national, and global issues. Faculty were asked, "During the current school year, whether course-related or not, about how much have you encouraged students you teach or advise to do the following?" See [Table 3](#) for the scale and component item information. The categorical independent variables used are described in [Table 1](#). In addition, we used a measure of faculty course load (mean = 5.9, sd = 2.8), which was the sum of the number of undergraduate and graduate courses a faculty member taught during the 2012–13 academic year. We also used a scale that indicates the extent faculty reported that their institutions emphasized the following for undergraduates: (a) helping people resolve their disagreements with each other; (b) resolving conflicts that involve bias, discrimination, and prejudice; (c) leading a group where people from different backgrounds feel welcomed and included; and (d) contributing to the well-being of their community.

Table 1

Faculty characteristics

| Characteristic | Sub-Groups | In Sub-Group (%) |
|------------------------------|---|------------------|
| Female | No (i.e. male) | 52 |
| | Yes | 48 |
| Racial/ethnic Identification | Asian/Pacific Islander | 4 |
| | Black/African American | 6 |
| | Hispanic or Latino | 3 |
| | White | 75 |
| | Other* | 5 |
| U.S. citizen | Preferred not to respond | 7 |
| | No | 1 |
| Doctorate earned | Yes | 99 |
| | No | 36 |
| Rank and employment status | Yes | 64 |
| | Part-time instructor/lecturer | 20 |
| | Full-time instructor/lecturer | 10 |
| | Assistant professor | 25 |
| | Associate professor | 22 |
| | Professor | 23 |
| Disciplinary area | Arts and humanities | 27 |
| | Biological sciences, agriculture, & natural resources | 5 |
| | Physical sciences, mathematics, & computer sciences | 9 |
| | Social sciences | 13 |
| | Business | 10 |
| | Communications, media, & public relations | 3 |
| | Education | 9 |
| | Engineering | 1 |
| | Health professions | 9 |
| | Social service professions | 4 |
| Other disciplines | 9 | |

*Other includes faculty that indicated "other" for their racial ethnic identification as well as those who identified as Native American or multi-racial.

Faculty responded on a four-point scale from "Very little" to "Very much," and their item responses were averaged to generate a scale score for Institutional Emphasis on civic engagement (mean = 2.8, sd = 0.84, $\alpha = 0.89$). Finally, we used dichotomous indicators of institutional affiliation (e.g., faculty members at Institution 1 all received a one for a variable indicating affiliation with Institution 1, while all other faculty received a zero). The independent variables used in our regression analyses are described in the following section.

Table 2

Institutional characteristics and means of faculty encouragement of civic engagement and institutional emphasis on civic engagement

| Institution | Carnegie Classification | Sector | N | Institutional Emphasis on Civic Engagement | | Faculty Encouragement of Civic Engagement | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|---------|-----|--|------|---|------|
| | | | | Mean | SD | Mean | SD |
| Institution 8 | Baccalaureate | Private | 8 | 2.84 | 1.00 | 3.19 | 0.75 |
| Institution 14 | Master's | Public | 78 | 2.74 | 0.99 | 2.71 | 0.89 |
| Institution 10 | Master's | Private | 74 | 2.95 | 0.73 | 2.63 | 0.76 |
| Institution 1 ^{cc} | Doctoral/Research | Private | 142 | 2.95 | 0.87 | 2.56 | 0.80 |
| Institution 6 ^{cc} | Master's | Public | 80 | 2.51 | 0.78 | 2.53 | 0.87 |
| Institution 11 | Master's | Public | 120 | 2.60 | 0.83 | 2.46 | 0.71 |
| Institution 18 | Master's | Public | 50 | 2.55 | 0.89 | 2.45 | 0.81 |
| Institution 7 | Baccalaureate | Public | 95 | 2.57 | 0.77 | 2.43 | 0.71 |
| Institution 9 | Master's | Private | 48 | 2.61 | 0.88 | 2.37 | 0.75 |
| Institution 2 ^{cc} | Master's | Private | 87 | 2.84 | 0.80 | 2.35 | 0.84 |
| Institution 13 | Master's | Public | 125 | 2.29 | 0.70 | 2.31 | 0.72 |
| Institution 15 | Master's | Public | 171 | 2.38 | 0.76 | 2.31 | 0.85 |
| Institution 5 ^{cc} | Doctoral/Research | Public | 103 | 2.50 | 0.81 | 2.28 | 0.75 |
| Institution 16 | Doctoral/Research | Public | 165 | 2.53 | 0.87 | 2.22 | 0.69 |
| Institution 4 ^{cc} | Baccalaureate | Private | 114 | 2.75 | 0.75 | 2.20 | 0.80 |
| Institution 3 ^{cc} | Doctoral/Research | Private | 86 | 2.51 | 0.77 | 2.11 | 0.83 |
| Institution 17 | Master's | Private | 730 | 3.11 | 0.77 | 2.06 | 0.82 |
| Institution 12 | Baccalaureate | Private | 41 | 2.51 | 0.52 | 2.00 | 0.65 |

Note. Institutions ordered highest to lowest by their means on Faculty Encouragement of CE.

^{cc} Institutions 1–6 are members of Campus Compact.

Analyses

To examine how much faculty members encourage undergraduates to engage civically (Research Question 1), we looked at the pattern of responses to the items in Table 3. We examined the proportion of faculty who chose each response and compared the pattern of responses across items.

We used multiple linear regression to answer the second question, with faculty encouragement of civic engagement as the outcome and faculty characteristics and institutional affiliation measures as independent variables. Because our respondents were nested within institutions, we needed an analytic approach to deal with the potential problems introduced by such nesting (Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002). More sophisticated approaches to dealing with this issue (e.g., hierarchical linear modeling) were not used because we had only 18 institutions in our sample. Instead, we used the institutional affiliation measures to simultaneously control for institutional differences and explore the differences between institutions. However, our chosen approach meant that institution-level differences (e.g., public versus private or

Table 3

Dependent variable scale and component items

 Faculty Encouragement of Civic Engagement (10 items; $\alpha = 0.95$; Mean = 2.27; SD = 0.82)

| | |
|--------|--|
| Items: | Inform themselves about local or campus issues |
| | Inform themselves about state, national, or global issues |
| | Discuss local or campus issues with others |
| | Discuss state, national, or global issues with others |
| | Raise awareness about local or campus issues |
| | Raise awareness about state, national, or global issues |
| | Ask others to address local or campus issues |
| | Ask others to address state, national, or global issues |
| | Organize others to work on local or campus issues |
| | Organize others to work on state, national, or global issues |

Note. Faculty members were asked, "During the current school year, whether course-related or not, about how much have you encouraged students you teach or advise to do the following" and then responded to each item on a four-point scale ranging from "Never" to "Very Often." Scale scores are averages of faculty responses to the 10 items.

Campus Compact membership) needed to be examined by looking at the pattern of differences observed between the 18 institutions rather than looking at a single variable.

In the regression analysis, the dependent variable and all continuous independent variables were standardized prior to running the regression analysis. As a result, the regression coefficients are standardized mean differences for dichotomous variables and effect sizes for continuous variables adjusted for the effects of the other independent variables. For race/ethnicity, rank and employment status, and disciplinary area, faculty respondents in a category (e.g., Asian) received a one, and all other faculty received a zero. In the regression analyses dichotomous variables representing all categories but one were included. The omitted variables designated the reference groups (White, professor, arts and humanities, respectively).

Results

In the following sub-sections, we describe our findings. In the first, we explain how much faculty encouraged civic engagement. In the second, we describe how faculty and institutional characteristics seemed to influence faculty encouragement of civic engagement.

Faculty Encouragement of Civic Engagement

Table 4 contains the item frequencies examined to determine how much faculty encouraged different aspects of civic engagement. It is notable that, across campuses, between 50 and 90% of faculty members reported doing each activity at least "sometimes." Overall, this suggests that many faculty members were encouraging their students to engage in campus, local, state, national, and/or global issues.

When examining the items more closely, we observed two main patterns that may warrant some concern on campuses invested in promoting civic engagement. First, more faculty encouraged their

Table 4

Item frequencies for faculty encouragement of civic engagement

| | Never (%) | Sometimes (%) | Often (%) | Very Often (%) |
|--|-----------|---------------|-----------|----------------|
| Inform themselves about local or campus issues | 13 | 38 | 29 | 20 |
| Inform themselves about state, national, or global issues | 10 | 30 | 29 | 31 |
| Discuss local or campus issues with others | 20 | 42 | 23 | 15 |
| Discuss state, national, or global issues with others | 15 | 33 | 27 | 24 |
| Raise awareness about local or campus issues | 23 | 41 | 22 | 14 |
| Raise awareness about state, national, or global issues | 17 | 35 | 25 | 24 |
| Ask others to address local or campus issues | 38 | 38 | 15 | 10 |
| Ask others to address state, national, or global issues | 36 | 33 | 17 | 13 |
| Organize others to work on local or campus issues | 50 | 31 | 11 | 8 |
| Organize others to work on state, national, or global issues | 49 | 30 | 12 | 9 |

Note. Faculty members were asked, “During the current school year, whether course-related or not, about how much have you encouraged students you teach or advise to do the following” and then responded to each item on a four-point scale indicated above.

students to *inform* themselves about issues rather than *discuss* issues with others. Even fewer encouraged their students to *raise awareness*, fewer still encouraged their students to *ask others* to address issues, and the fewest faculty encouraged their students to *organize others* to work on issues. For example, while 60% of faculty members encouraged their students “often” or “very often” to inform themselves about state, national, or global issues, 51% encouraged them that often to discuss such issues, 49% encouraged them that often to raise awareness about such issues, 30% encouraged them that often to ask others to address such issues, and only 21% encouraged their students that often to organize others to work on such issues.

Second, we found that a greater proportion of faculty members encouraged their students to engage in state, national, or global issues than in campus or local issues. For example, 60% of faculty members encouraged their students “often” or “very often” to inform themselves about state, national, or global issues, and 49% of faculty members did so about local or campus issues. Though many faculty members encouraged civic engagement in some way, certain faculty did so more than others. We explore what factors predicted greater encouragement of civic engagement in the next sub-section.

Factors Related to Faculty Encouragement of Civic Engagement

Our regression model, which explained 19% of the variance in our dependent variable, highlighted the key factors related to faculty encouragement of civic engagement. In our model, gender, racial/ethnic identification, rank and employment status, disciplinary area, perceived institutional emphasis on civic engagement, and institutional affiliation were all significant predictors of faculty encouragement of civic engagement, while U.S. citizenship, holding a doctorate, and course load did not have significant coefficients.

Gender. Controlling for the other factors in the model, women faculty members were slightly more likely to encourage student participation in civic engagement than their male colleagues. Women, on

average, scored just about one tenth of a standard deviation higher than their male colleagues ($B = 0.09$, $p \leq 0.05$). This difference is relatively small but statistically distinguishable from zero.

Racial/Ethnic Identification. Holding the effects of the other variables in the model constant, Hispanic and Latino faculty, faculty of “other” racial/ethnic identifications (including Native American and multi-racial faculty), and faculty who indicated a preference not to respond to the racial/ethnic identification question were all more likely than their White colleagues to encourage greater civic engagement among their students. The size of these racial ethnic differences ranged from 0.21 of a standard deviation ($p \leq 0.05$) for faculty with “other” racial/ethnic identifications to 0.25 of a standard deviation ($p \leq 0.001$) for faculty who preferred not to respond to the racial/ethnic identification item.

Rank and Employment Status. On average, part-time lecturers/instructors encouraged civic engagement about a quarter of a standard deviation less ($B = -0.27$, $p \leq 0.001$) than their professor colleagues after controlling for other characteristics in the model. The other rank and employment status differences were all quite small (ranging from -0.05 to 0.02) and not statistically distinguishable from zero ($p > 0.05$). Thus, part-time lecturers and instructors stand out as encouraging civic engagement less than their colleagues.

Disciplinary Area. We also found significant differences by disciplinary area even after controlling for the effects of the other variables in the model (disciplinary areas were coded using the standard groupings used by FSSE and NSSE, see <http://nsse.indiana.edu/pdf/NSSE%2010%20Major%20Categories.pdf>). Faculty in the physical sciences, mathematics, and computer sciences ($B = -0.58$, $p \leq 0.001$), biological sciences, agriculture, and natural resources ($B = -0.32$, $p \leq 0.001$), engineering ($B = -0.24$, $p > 0.05$), and business ($B = -0.17$, $p \leq 0.05$), on average, encouraged civic engagement less than their colleagues in arts and humanities, though the engineering difference was not statistically significant, likely due to the small number of engineering faculty in the sample. Faculty in communications, media, and public relations ($B = 0.47$, $p \leq 0.001$) and those in social service professions ($B = 0.46$, $p \leq 0.001$) encouraged civic engagement, on average, almost half a standard deviation more than their colleagues in the arts and humanities. Faculty members in the social sciences, education, health professions, and “other” disciplines averaged similar scores to those in the arts and humanities (coefficients ranged from -0.11 to 0.07), and the differences were not statistically distinguishable from zero.

Institutional Emphasis on Civic Engagement. The more faculty members perceived their institutions emphasized civic engagement, the more likely they would encourage civic engagement. Based on our model, we would anticipate that increasing the average faculty member’s perception of institutional emphasis on civic engagement by one standard deviation would result in that faculty member’s encouragement of civic engagement increasing nearly a quarter of a standard deviation ($B = 0.23$, $p \leq 0.001$).

Institutional Affiliation. The results displayed in Table 6 along with the characteristics in Table 2 suggest that, while there is considerable variability in institutional averages, no clear patterns in characteristics seem to explain those variations. Faculty members at Institutions 8, 14, 6, 10, 1, 18, and 7 all scored higher than their colleagues at Institution 11 (the reference group) after adjusting for the effects of the other variables in the model. However, only the difference between faculty at Institutions 14 and 11 ($B = 0.31$, the second largest positive difference) was statistically significant ($p \leq 0.05$). The difference between Institutions 8 and 11 ($B = 0.58$, the largest difference) was not statistically significant, likely because there was not enough statistical power to detect a difference (Institution 8 only had 8 respondents). Faculty members at Institutions 15, 13, 9, 5, 2, 16, 4, 3, 12, and 17 all scored below their colleagues at Institution 11. The differences for the faculties at Institutions 16, 4, 3, 12, and 17 compared to Institution 11 ranged from 0.23 to 0.51 of a standard deviation, and all were statistically significant.

Table 5

Regression analysis on faculty encouragement of civic engagement (N = 2,317)

| | B | SE of B | p |
|---|--------------------------------|----------------|----------|
| Constant | 0.10 | 0.22 | 0.639 |
| Female | 0.09 | 0.04 | 0.033* |
| Racial/ethnic identification (White = ref. group) | | | |
| Asian | 0.00 | 0.10 | 0.988 |
| Black/African American | 0.15 | 0.09 | 0.092 |
| Hispanic | 0.23 | 0.12 | 0.044* |
| Other race/ethnicity | 0.21 | 0.09 | 0.023* |
| Preferred not to respond | 0.25 | 0.07 | 0.001*** |
| U.S. citizen | 0.01 | 0.18 | 0.964 |
| Doctorate earned | 0.08 | 0.05 | 0.113 |
| Rank and employment status (Professor = ref group) | | | |
| Part-time lecturer/instructor | -0.27 | 0.07 | 0.000*** |
| Full-time lecturer/instructor | -0.05 | 0.08 | 0.574 |
| Assistant professor | 0.02 | 0.06 | 0.746 |
| Associate professor | -0.03 | 0.06 | 0.629 |
| Course load | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.069 |
| Disciplinary area (Arts and humanities = ref group) | | | |
| Biological sciences, agriculture, & natural resources | -0.32 | 0.09 | 0.001*** |
| Physical sciences, mathematics, & computer sciences | -0.58 | 0.07 | 0.000*** |
| Social sciences | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.259 |
| Business | -0.17 | 0.07 | 0.018* |
| Communications, media, & public relations | 0.47 | 0.13 | 0.000*** |
| Education | 0.00 | 0.08 | 0.972 |
| Engineering | -0.24 | 0.17 | 0.164 |
| Health professions | 0.02 | 0.08 | 0.826 |
| Social service professions | 0.46 | 0.10 | 0.000*** |
| Other disciplines | -0.11 | 0.07 | 0.137 |
| Institutional emphasis on CE | 0.23 | 0.02 | 0.000*** |
| Institutional affiliation | <i>see Table 6 for results</i> | | |
| Multiple R | 0.43 | | |
| R squared | 0.19 | | |
| Standard error | 0.91 | | |
| F | 12.60*** | | |

Note. See Table 6 for the regression results pertaining to institutional affiliation.

* $p \leq 0.05$, ** $p \leq 0.01$, *** $p \leq 0.001$

Table 6

Regression results for institutional affiliation predicting faculty encouragement of civic engagement (N = 2,317)

| | B | SE of B | p |
|-----------------------------|----------|----------------|----------|
| Institution 8 | 0.58 | 0.34 | 0.086 |
| Institution 14 | 0.31 | 0.14 | 0.026* |
| Institution 6 ^{cc} | 0.14 | 0.13 | 0.295 |
| Institution 10 | 0.13 | 0.14 | 0.352 |
| Institution 1 ^{cc} | 0.10 | 0.12 | 0.365 |
| Institution 18 | 0.07 | 0.16 | 0.657 |
| Institution 7 | 0.04 | 0.13 | 0.724 |
| Institution 15 | -0.06 | 0.11 | 0.568 |
| Institution 13 | -0.07 | 0.12 | 0.542 |
| Institution 9 | -0.12 | 0.16 | 0.443 |
| Institution 5 ^{cc} | -0.16 | 0.12 | 0.194 |
| Institution 2 ^{cc} | -0.22 | 0.13 | 0.090 |
| Institution 16 | -0.23 | 0.11 | 0.042* |
| Institution 4 ^{cc} | -0.31 | 0.12 | 0.009** |
| Institution 3 ^{cc} | -0.34 | 0.13 | 0.010** |
| Institution 12 | -0.50 | 0.17 | 0.003** |
| Institution 17 | -0.51 | 0.09 | 0.000*** |

Note. Faculty from Institution 11 served at the reference group. Institutions ordered by coefficient (B) size. See Table 5 for all other results from the regression analysis on faculty encouragement of CE.

* $p \leq 0.05$, ** $p \leq 0.01$, *** $p \leq 0.001$

^{cc} Institutions 1–6 are members of Campus Compact.

Discussion and Implications for Practice

Regarding the first research question, we find it promising that 50 to 90% of faculty report encouraging each civic engagement activity at least “sometimes.” Yet, the two patterns within these overall frequencies are noteworthy. First, the number of faculty who encourage students to do more than *inform themselves* of civic issues consistently declines when it comes to encouraging students to *raise awareness*, *ask others*, or *organize others* to address or work on civic issues. Bowman (2011) pointed out that true civic engagement is achieved when students are given the opportunity to interact across a variety of social issues. Therefore, if, for an individual, informing one’s self is the main focus of faculty encouragement, then that individual is likely missing opportunities for high-level civic engagement on college campuses. Secondly, faculty encourage their students to engage with state, national, or global civic issues more than local or on-campus issues. Less encouragement of local or on-campus issues runs counter to the daily efforts of many student affairs officers who promote diverse interactions at the individual level on college campuses. As highlighted in the literature, Campus Compact defines civic engagement from its organizational dimension

as a connection between the campus and community through partnerships (Cress et al., 2010), but Deneen (2012) argued the recent resurgence of civic engagement in higher education falls short of promoting these partnerships due to its focus on globalism, which “ignores the very existence of a defined civic sphere” (p. 150). Our finding that faculty encourage less local or campus civic engagement supports Deneen’s (2012) position that faculty are promoting civic engagement in an arena so large and diverse that it is difficult to apply civic knowledge constructively.

When looking at the second research question, we first discuss the differences in faculty encouragement by gender and racial/ethnic identification. The most encouragement of civic engagement came from women faculty, Hispanic and Latino faculty, faculty of “other” racial/ethnic identifications (including Native American and multi-racial faculty), and faculty who indicated a preference not to respond to the racial/ethnic identification question. Academic leaders may see this as reason to further diversify the faculty to reflect the characteristics of faculty more likely to encourage civic engagement. The same information may be used to set faculty development goals and initiatives for all faculty. Furthermore, the timeliness of these considerations must be underscored. We note the current wave of student protests in response to sexual assault on college campuses and the non-indictment of White police officers who killed unarmed African American men in Ferguson, Missouri, and Staten Island, New York. In some instances, the faculty stood in solidarity with the students (Yin, 2014). When considering what is known from research about the political perspectives of faculty (e.g., Elchardus & Spruyt, 2009; Gross, 2013; Zipp & Fenwick, 2006), these recent events can serve as a model (rather than a flashpoint) for how and which faculty and institutions can encourage civic engagement.

Part-time instructors/lecturers encouraged civic engagement less than other groups of faculty by academic rank and employment status. Although representing only 20% of the faculty respondents in this study, part-time instructors/lecturers serve a critical role in today’s classrooms. The number of part-time faculty “increased by 422.1 percent between 1970 and 2003,” and the trend shows no signs of stopping (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2008). Considering the growing attention on the inequality in institutional support of adjunct faculty, many of whom are part-time instructors/lecturers, our findings suggest this group of faculty may simply be too overworked and underpaid to see any incentive to encourage students to participate in any civic issues beyond what is directly related to course content.

With regard to disciplinary differences in civic engagement, when compared to faculty in arts and humanities, faculty in hard sciences (e.g., physical sciences, biological sciences, mathematics) encouraged civic engagement notably less, and faculty in business, communications fields, and social services encouraged civic engagement more. A possible explanation of these differences could be fields like business, communications, and social services are more naturally situated to incorporate civic issues, while the hard sciences are more formulaic and, therefore, find it difficult to interweave civic issues into course content. While this may be partially true, Battistoni (2002) argued that civic engagement can be integrated into any disciplinary tradition using common language and terminology, such as “social justice,” “public science,” and “healthy communities.” These concepts can be integrated into a variety of hard science courses through the study of issues like the environment and public health.

Interestingly, examining the institutional characteristics in Table 2 relative to these results conclusively reveals little. For example, Campus Compact membership does not seem to be connected to faculty averages on encouraging civic engagement, with averages at Campus Compact member institutions spread throughout the range of scores. In addition, public and private institutions are equally represented among the institutions scoring above and below the comparison group (though it is interesting to note that private institutions are overrepresented in the top four and bottom four institutions). There seem

to be some weak patterns for Carnegie Classification, size (which mirrors number of respondents), and average institutional emphasis on civic engagement. Master's institutions were more likely to be in the top scoring institutions, and doctoral/research institutions were more likely to be in the bottom scoring institutions, which corresponds to the noisy-but-detectable connection between smaller respondent numbers corresponding to higher scores. These findings align with Lounsbury and Pollack's (2001) assertion that research universities are less likely to integrate civic engagement into academic aspects of campus. Additionally, at those institutions where the average faculty rating of institutional emphasis on civic engagement was higher, scores for average faculty encouragement of civic engagement also tended to be higher, with some key counter examples (namely Institutions 6 and 17). Institution 17 probably deserves further examination, in particular, because it has the highest average rating of institutional emphasis on civic engagement and the lowest adjusted average faculty encouragement of civic engagement. Who, for example, promotes civic engagement at Institution 17?

Finally, the more faculty members perceive their institutions emphasize civic engagement, the more likely that those faculty members will encourage students to engage with civic issues. This association is related to our observation that being an institutional member of Campus Compact did not indicate whether faculty members on that campus were more likely to encourage civic engagement than faculty from non-member institutions. However, this finding does not mean that Campus Compact is ineffective. It could mean Campus Compact and other efforts have had an effect beyond its member institutions. With more than 1,100 institutions now participating in Campus Compact, it can be assumed that academic leaders and student affairs professionals at many non-member institutions have heard of their efforts and may be following suit, particularly at institutions that have an interest in civic engagement, which is presumably the case at all 18 of our institutions because they all chose to survey their faculty about civic engagement.

Future Research

This study is largely exploratory. Broadly speaking, we were interested in how institutions foster students' civic learning and behavior. More specifically, we wanted to know more about the faculty contribution to this learning process. This study is our effort to fill a void in the literature, where little is known about the role of faculty practices in encouraging civic engagement. Future research on faculty and civic engagement could focus on several areas: differences in institutional mission and type, the comparison of student and faculty data, and whether part-time instructors/lecturers see encouraging undergraduate civic engagement a responsibility of full-time faculty, and, in considering the work of Kuh (2008), a focus on civic engagement as a high-impact practice.

In closing, civic engagement is an action-oriented idea. Simply put, this study puts faculty at the center of the on-going discussion about the purpose of a college education and the formation of productive citizens.

References

- Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters most in college: Four critical years revisited*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Barnhardt, C. L. (2015). Campus educational contexts and civic participation: Organizational links to collective action. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 86(1), 38–70. doi:10.1353/jhe.2015.0003

- Battistoni, R. M. (2002). *Civic engagement across the curriculum: A resource book for service-learning faculty in all disciplines*. Providence, RI: Campus Compact.
- Bok, D. (2001). Universities and the decline of civic responsibility. *Journal of College & Character*, 2(9), 1–5. doi:10.2202/1940-1639.1301
- Bowman, N. A. (2011). Promoting participation in a diverse democracy: A meta-analysis of college diversity experiences and civic engagement. *Review of Educational Research*, 81(1), 29–68. doi:10.3102/0034654310383047
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, N.J.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Boyte, H. (2008). Against the current: Developing the civic agency of students. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 40(3), 8–15. doi:10.3200/CHNG.40.3.8-15
- Boyte, H. (2014). White House civic summit on higher education. *Huffpost College*. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/harry-boyte/white-house-civic-summit-_b_6006642.html?utm_hp_ref=college&ir=College
- Boyte, H., & Hollander, E. (1999). *Wingspread declaration on the civic responsibilities of research universities*. Retrieved from http://www.compact.org/wpcontent/uploads/2009/04/wingspread_declaration.pdf
- Campus Compact. (2014). *About us: Who we are*. Retrieved from <http://www.compact.org/about/history-mission-vision/>
- Colby, A., Beaumont, E., Ehrlich, T., & Corngold, J. (2007). *Educating for democracy: Preparing undergraduates for responsible political engagement*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Cress, C. M., Burack, C., Giles, D., Jr., Elkins, E., & Stevens, M. C. (2010). *A promising connection: Increasing college access and success through civic engagement*. Boston, MA: Campus Compact.
- Demb, A., & Wade, A. (2012). Reality check: Faculty involvement in outreach & engagement. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 83(3), 337–366. doi:10.1353/jhe.2012.0019
- Deneen, P. J. (2012). An unbalanced crucible. *Academic Questions*, 25(3), 337–342. doi:10.1007/s12129-012-9301-z
- Eagan, M. K., Stolzenberg, E. B., Berdan Lozano, J., Aragon, M. C., Suchard, M. R., & Hurtado, S. (2014). *Undergraduate teaching faculty: The 2013–2014 HERI faculty survey*. Los Angeles, CA: Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA.
- Ehrlich, T. (Ed.). (2000). *Civic responsibility and higher education*. Phoenix, AZ: American Council on Education and Oryx Press.
- Elchardus, M., & Spruyt, B. (2009). The culture of academic disciplines and the sociopolitical attitudes of students: A test of selection and socialization effects. *Social Science Quarterly*, 90(2), 446–460. doi:10.1111/ssqu.2009.90.issue-2
- Finley, A. (2011). *Civic learning and democratic engagements: A review of the literature in post-secondary education*. Paper prepared for the United States Department of Education.
- Gross, N. (2013). *Why are professors liberal and why do conservatives care?* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hinck, S. S., & Brandell, M. E. (2000). The relationship between institutional support and campus acceptance of academic service learning. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 43(5), 868–881. doi:10.1177/00027640021955522
- Holland, B. A. (1997). Analyzing institutional commitment to service: A model of key organizational factors. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 4, 30–41.
- Holland, B. A. (1999). Factors and strategies that influence faculty involvement in public service. *Journal of Public Service & Outreach*, 4(1), 37–43.
- Kuh, G. D. (1991). Teaching and learning-after class? *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 2, 35–51.
- Kuh, G. D. (2008). *High-impact educational practices: What they are, who has access to them, and why they matter*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Lounsbury, M., & Pollack, S. (2001). Institutionalizing civic engagement: Shifting logics and the cultural repackaging of service-learning in U.S. higher education. *Organization*, 8(2), 319–339. doi:10.1177/1350508401082016
- NERCHE. (2015). *Carnegie community engagement classification*. Retrieved from http://nerche.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=341&Itemid=601
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1991). *How college affects students: Findings and insights from twenty years of research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Prince, G. S., Jr. (2000). A liberal arts college perspective. In T. Ehrlich (Ed.), *Civic responsibility and higher education* (pp. 249–262). Phoenix, AZ: American Council on Education and Oryx Press.
- Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.
- Raudenbush, S. W., & Bryk, A. S. (2002). *Hierarchical linear models: Applications and data analysis methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Sax, L. J. (2000). Citizen development and the American college student. In T. Ehrlich (Ed.), *Civic responsibility and higher education* (pp. 3–18). Phoenix, AZ: American Council on Education and Oryx Press.
- Schuster, J. H., & Finkelstein, M. J. (2008). *The American faculty: The restructuring of academic work and careers*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Skocpol, T. (1997). The Tocqueville problem: Civic engagement in American democracy. *Social Science History*, 21(4), 455–479. doi:10.2307/1171662
- Skocpol, T., Ganz, M., & Munson, Z. (2000). A nation of organizers: The institutional origins of civic voluntarism in the United States. *The American Political Science Review*, 94(3), 527–546. doi:10.2307/2585829
- The National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement. (2012). *A crucible moment: College learning and democracy's future*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Yin, A. (2014). Northwestern professors sign letter in support of Black students. *The Daily Northwestern*. Retrieved from <http://dailynorthwestern.com/2014/12/11/campus/northwestern-professors-sign-letter-in-support-of-black-students/>
- Zipp, J. F., & Fenwick, R. (2006). Is the academy a liberal hegemony? The political orientations and educational values of professors. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 70(3), 304–326. doi:10.1093/poq/nfj009