Service Learning, General

11-1992

Clarifying and Measuring Community, Service, and Citizenship

Rutgers University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/slceslgen

Part of the Service Learning Commons

Please take our feedback survey at: https://unomaha.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_8cchtFmpDyGfBLE

Recommended Citation

Clarifying and Measuring Community, Service, and Citizenship
A Working Group Meeting Held at Rutgers University
November 22 to 24, 1992
Summary Report[*]

I. General Overview:

The working group met for the first time at Rutgers University November 22 to 24, 1992 for critical discussions of issues concerning community, service, and learning in the context of education-based service learning programs. The working group's 31 members included representatives from universities, service organizations, foundations, and community activists. Participants worked closely over the two days, meeting in three discreet sessions dedicated specifically to the theory of community and citizenship, the practice of service-based learning, and--with particular reference to service learning-- the measurement of civic outcomes.

The working sessions produced a critical foundation for an ongoing collaborative project to develop and field test a national civic skills assessment instrument and a volume of papers written by working group members concerning the theory and practice of service-based learning and democratic citizenship.

The three sessions had as their respective tasks:

> 1. [Monday, November 23, Morning] to clarify democratic conceptions of community, citizenship, and service;
> 2. [Monday, November 23, Afternoon] to explore the practical applications of these concepts to the practice of service-based learning for democratic citizenship; and
> 3. [Tuesday, November 24, Morning] to produce the conceptual framework for a national civic skills assessment instrument.

Each working session involved a full group discussion organized around an activity intended to highlight significant clarification and measurement questions. Conceptual papers by Professor Benjamin R. Barber (Director of the Walt Whitman Center), Dr. Harry Boyte (Director, Project Public Life; and Humphrey Institute, University of Minnesota), Professor Alan Ryan (Princeton University), and Professor Rogers Smith (Yale University) introduced the group to a shared set of themes about community and citizenship that framed the first session.** The second session was preceded by an in-class demonstration of a Rutgers Community Service course and a talk by Brian Morton, a former gang member who is currently a student service organizer at the Rutgers Camden campus. Professor Richard Battistoni (Director, Rutgers Civic Education and Community Service Program) led a group of eleven students, who are serving in community organizations as an integral part of their course requirements, through a carefully guided discussion of service and citizenship. The third session was introduced by a presentation from the measurement team leader, Professor Jeff Smith (Rutgers, Department of Educational Statistics), on themes of "validity," "reliability," and "believability" in psychometric measurement design. To guide the discussion further, the measurement team prepared a citizenship skills worksheet which group members were asked to fill out as the discussion proceeded. Summary results from fourteen worksheets are attached to this report [Appendix A].

** Copies of the working papers are available from the Walt Whitman Center. Titles of the Working papers follow:
--Benjamin R. Barber, "Democratic Concepts: Some Preliminary Clarifications"
--Harry C. Boyte, "Citizenship and the Public World"

--Alan Ryan, "Higher Education and Citizenship: An Individualist Perspective"
--Rogers M. Smith, "American Conceptions of Citizenship and the Problem of Civic Education"

II. <u>Summary Outcomes from the Working Group</u>:

The following remarks are an attempt to draw conclusions from and highlight specific moments of one and one half days of broad gauged and subtle theoretical and practical discussions. Obviously, a short report cannot do full justice to those discussions. Fuller transcripts will be available upon request from the Walt Whitman Center.

1. *Clarification of democratic conceptions of community, citizenship, and service:*

In this session, devoted to the clarification of essential democratic concepts, papers by Professor Barber and Professor Smith provided the group with significant models for better understanding contrasting varieties of democratic citizenship that range from individualistic and liberal to participatory and deliberative. Professor Ryan's paper on the individual and community offered essential criticisms and connections that helped the group to mediate between the contrasting political visions of liberal and communitarian democracy. Professor Ryan, Dr. Boyte, and Professor Amitai Etzioni (University Professor, George Washington University and spokesperson for the Responsive Community) led a rigorously argued discussion about the constitution of various communities, including political communities. The project of theoretical clarification proved to be a useful departure point for a tightly integrated conversation that brought the theorists and practitioners together in pursuit of a series of issues, ranging from concerns about the relationship between the individual and community in democratic political life, to provocative considerations about the nature and qualities of political power, to questions about the extent to which all the communities contained within a democratic nation can, and should, be internally democratized, and how to best understand and promote political agency. Among the arguments advanced were the following:

- Democratic citizenship can be conceptualized in terms of several models which stress differing ideals of the constitution of citizenship. Rogers Smith presented three historical and legal models of citizenship in the American context: a liberal model emphasizing individual rights; a

3

participatory model stressing democratic participation; and an Americanist model ("Americanism") emphasizing the special claims of social groups. Smith argued that all three models are active in the political process. Benjamin R. Barber further explored the tensions between models of democratic citizenship. He introduced character types to capture the tensions between liberal individualism, participatory democracy, deliberative democracy and Americanism (or "unitary" democracy).

- The salience of the Americanist claims to citizenship made by certain social groups, frequently based on ethnic, racial, gender, or religious identity, was taken to be a serious and ongoing challenge by group members. In current debates, the problem of a hegemonic Americanism is often confronted by the couterhegemonic claims of multiculturalism, which tend to undermine severely any basis for group identity. Although disempowered groups may facilitate their ability to mobilize by making appeals to special claims derived from group identity , the very same language of special claims can be used by power holding groups to continue to subordinate disempowered groups.

- Community has multiple levels and locations. In the contemporary context, as Professor Jean Cohen (Columbia University) noted, we live in a highly differentiated social structure that contains many communities and where local and other kinds of "sub-communities" are nested within larger national and international communities. Citizens participate at various levels of community including the nation-state.

- Recalling the debates between Kallen and Dewey, Smita Singh (Commission on National and Community Service) helped focus the conversation on problems surrounding the extent to which specific communities can and should be internally democratic. This part of the conversation was an important reminder that the extent to which the state should be involved in democratizing various communities remains a significant and unresolved problem for democratic theory. It also led participants to question whether a democratic state can encompass non-democratic communities and itself remain democratic.

4

- Democratic language contains competing discourses of <u>community</u> and <u>interest</u> which appeal to different conceptions of politics and community building. Professor Etzioni presented a communitarian model which stressed cooperation, identity, and shared values. For this vision of communitarianism, the problem of building community is about creating shared values; political problems are best solved by appealing to shared values instead of power. Reliance on power will only further disadvantage subordinate groups. By contrast to a communitarian ideal, Dr. Boyte offered a "political" model of community that stressed conflict, power, and problem-solving. Boyte argued that community building is about problem-solving. People become citizens "as they work at it." This model was strongly supported by the theory and practice of the Industrial Areas Foundation as represented by Ernesto Cortez, Jr. (Director, Texas Industrial Areas Foundation) and Gerald Taylor (National Staff, Industrial Areas Foundation).

- Professor Mary Stanley (Maxwell School, Syracuse University) stressed the importance or creating and recreating institutional spaces which promote agency, or the capacity to act. As Ernesto Cortez, Jr. and Gerald Taylor noted, this includes citizens' abilities to interact with the federal, state, and local governments as well as other institutions, including economic markets.

- Several group members, including Amitai Etzioni, Harry Boyte, and Gerald Taylor, grappled with the question of how best to understand power. It was variously defined in a relational mode as command over resources, as a sense of efficacy in the world, and as acting together in concert on a shared problem. Professor Lisa Disch (University of Minnesota) insisted on the relational character of power, while others noted that it permeates market relationships as well as political associations. This raised a whole new set of questions about the relationship between the political community [sovereignty?] , the market [contractual relations] , and civil society [non-coercive but public mediating associations].

2. *Exploring the practical applications of the concepts to the practice of service-based learning for democratic citizenship:*

The second working session started during lunch with welcoming remarks by the Rutgers University Provost, Dr. Joseph Seneca, and an overview of the Rutgers Civic Education and Community Service program by Professor Battistoni. The session was led by participants with extensive real world community service and community mobilization experience and focused on the practical implications of democratic theories of community, citizenship, and service for education-based service learning programs. A class demonstration by a Rutgers Civic Education and Community Service course introduced the task of exploring the practical applications for the working group. Eleven students led by Professor Battistoni sat in the middle of the conference room surrounded by working group members who became anxious spectators to an actual class in session. The students were initially reticent, but they eventually launched into a spirited debate including, among other topics, multiculturalism, gender inequalities, and economic problems confronting the communities where they serve as part of their civic education. The pedagogical specificity of this class anchored the rest of the afternoon's discussion. While any of the remarks made by group members referred to specific observations about that session, the tenor of the observations applied generally to education-based service learning for citizenship; many of their specific observations could be generalized into generic questions about service learning.

Much of the discussion focused on questions about the design and outcomes of service programs. Service learning programs that are effective at teaching civic skills need to be designed for specific audiences, and special considerations need to be taken with regards to the relationships between sponsoring institutions and the communities where learners are placed. Programs should help students learn how think and act politically; this includes teaching students how best to use the traditional political process. An understanding of limits as well as possibilities is a critical learning outcome. Learning civics through service integrated into other institutional programs should help students better situate and sensitize themselves in the full complexity of social problems and processes.

6

- Social ethics outcomes of service-based learning were among the most sensitive problems raised by group members. Alan Ryan contrasted civic education for empathy or social solidarity (r.e.; Toynbee Hall) with civic education for community and political organizing. Gerald Taylor suggested that two models of civic education might be captured in the ideas of "service ministry" and "transformational ministry."

- Several discussants suggested that the projects of empathy and organization are part of one developmental continuum. As Smita Singh remarked, students "start with moral solidarity, empathy, and personalizing of their experience. And given the right structure and format, often times it takes a few years, they go to a more politicized view of what they are doing." Reflecting on the Southern Christian Leadership Conference Citizenship Education Program, which she directed, Dorothy Cotton said, "We were working from the position of moral solidarity simultaneously as we were working from the position of political capacity."

- Education-based civic education may result in a number of outcomes that include ethical visions of the political world as well as practical leadership skills. It is important to decide what citizenship skills service programs should teach. Suzanne Morse (Director, Pew Partnership for Social Change) pulled much of the conversation together with a list of skills and capacities for citizenship that included: the ability to talk publicly; a sense of public interest, the ability to imagine a different society, an ability to judge, and the courage to act.

- Ed Skloot (Executive Director, Surdna Foundation) suggested that service learning programs may have at least three kinds of results that may be political: individual growth, social change, and effects on the community. Programs need to make difficult considerations about what kinds of results they hope to effect in the individuals, institutions, and communities where service-based learning occurs.

- It is important to find out whether students are doing more good than harm in the communities where they are placed. Deborah Visser

7

(Program Officer for Community Revitalization, Surdna Foundation) posed questions about the benefits and effects of service programs. What are the effects on the communities where students are placed? Who benefits from service learning programs? Are programs primarily pedagogical-- of service to students and their education? Or are they intended to solve real world problems? Can the university be a social agency? Should it?

● Service-based learning programs should be designed to begin where the participating students are. Learners in varied institutional settings will certainly bring different skills with them to the programs. Programs need to flexible enough to accommodate a mixture of class and field work in order to strengthen the skills deemed appropriate for their specific institutional contexts. As Keith Canty (Director, D.C. Service Corps) remarked, some learners begin service programs without even a vague sense of citizenship: "You talk with them about being American and they get offended.... They have disassociated themselves from everything."

● Service-based learning for citizenship needs to emphasize the workings of the traditional political process as well as the politics of community building. Charles Supple (Vice President, Youth Engaged In Service, Points of Light Foundation) emphasized the importance of students learning to address community problems with reference to appropriate political institutions. Why, he asked, didn't the students talk about the state?

● Placements for service-based learning should be in a broad variety of locations, so that students can be exposed to both the centers and workings of power in America as well as identified problem areas. Gerald Taylor noted that this includes service placements connected to the political process.

● Several working group participants emphasized the importance of students developing a sense of how limited their initial understanding of social problems may be. Smita Singh commented, "One of the most

8

dangerous things we can do for the students is to have them leave these courses, or leave the community service, feeling as if they fully understand the other half, or they somehow have a grip on the entire picture."

- Keith Morton, (Campus Compact) emphasized how important community service experiences can be for helping students to develop better understandings of the social world in which they live. This is especially true where service is part of broader set of relationships: "One of the core reasons for doing community service-based learning is that you get to know something about the lives of the people that you work with. If it is going to be relationship driven, it is hard to do service learning if there is not a relationship that extends beyond the immediate service purpose of being together."

- As Richard Battistoni observed, to best integrate service learning programs into local communities, the originating institutions, *qua* institutions, need to work at being "good citizens." Students and other community members will quickly perceive the hypocrisy of schools that preach community service to them but make poor institutional citizens themselves.

- Some students expressed an interest in continuing their service work after the course but were uncertain about their ability to continue serving. It is important to develop ongoing institutional support for students who want to continue serving. Brian Morton, a Rutgers Camden student service organizer observed how important it was to help interested students to continue their service work after the course was completed. He urged ongoing institutional support for students who want to continue serving and described his own efforts in Camden to do just that.

At the end of a long day's work, Gerald Taylor, brought the group back to earth with a story that made some laugh and some nearly cry and whose moral underscored how easily the real purposes of a service project can be lost. He recounted the true story of the "accident ministry:"

There was a church at a little bend in the road. This bend in the road was one that people couldn't see around, and there were lots of accidents because there was no street light and what not. So they put together a service ministry called the accident ministry.

The accident ministry would stay-awake and listen for the cars to screech and crash. Then the accident ministry people would run out and help the people, and there was lots of training for all the church on how to do accident ministry, and they were prepared to do accident ministry.

Five years later they have a celebration of accident ministry. All those on accident ministry over the years are recognized. They ask how they can make accident ministry better? Someone says, "We need more connections with the accident victims, so I suggest we have walkie-talkies for all the people out on accident ministry, so that we can put the voices of the wounded on the machine, so people can hear their voices and connect with them, and just get 911 out here faster." Someone says that's a great idea, and everyone claps. Another person says we need new recruits for the accident ministry because people are getting too old. So everyone volunteers to go recruit new members.

A little girl in the back put up her hand and said, "You know, I don't understand why we don't just straighten the road out, put some street lights up and stop all the accidents. That means we have to go negotiate with the public works department, but that will take care of all the accidents."

Everybody got quiet, and said, "Oh my god, that's politics; the church can't do politics." Everyone applauded. The next person recommended an ambulance to speed the process of getting the victims to the hospital.

That is service ministry, and that is what this discussion reminds me of. And its not bad. I'm not saying service ministry is bad. It is helpful, but the fundamental question is, "is that what we want these folk to do?"

3. *Producing the conceptual framework for a national civic competency test.*

The third session began on Tuesday morning with participants well rested after a Walt Whitman Center dinner hosted by Mrs. Leah Barber at the Barber's home in Piscataway and a good night's sleep. This session was led by Professor Jeff Smith and the measurement team (Janice Ballou, Director Center Public Interest Polling; and Professor Brenda Loyd, University of Virginia). The session focused on the question of how best to develop measurements to assess the civic outcomes of service-based learning and retained a concrete and technical character throughout. The specific task was to develop a shared conceptual framework within which a battery of indicators might be developed which together would constitute a National Civic Skills Assessment Instrument. The session began with a presentation by measurement team leader Professor Jeff Smith. He presented basic problems in psychometric measurement which confront anyone hoping to develop a "valid," "reliable," and "believable" measure. A measure is valid if it captures the concept one is studying. A measure is reliable if it yields the same results on repeated trials. And, a measure is believable, or has face validity, if the results of the test make sense to most people. Smith observed that one of the most important questions the group needed to confront was "What have we left out of the measure?" To be useful, a citizenship measure must includea full range of attributes and characteristics we reasonably associate with citizenship (validity). It must be able to indicate these important attributes across a variety of audiences (reliability). And it needs to be both stated and interpreted in a manner that most people will actually believe is citizenship. Brenda Loyd stated the problem in terms of a dilemma: "Our dilemma is that we must have specific variables to test, yet at the same time maintain the richness of the ideas of citizenship we have been talking about."

After the measurement team presentation, Jeff Smith invited the working group to assist in developing a set of indicators, or scales, which included:

a. knowledge;
b. skills;
c. participation;
d. span and depth of involvement in civic affairs;
e. political/philosophical orientations;
f. social orientations and convictions,
g. expectations and responsibilities concerning government.

A summary analysis of citizenship worksheets returned to the Whitman Center is attached as Appendix A and indicates categorical responses to each of the conceptual scales. The following remarks are meant to highlight a few of the issues raised in the measurement session.

- Democratic citizenship is a normative idea. Any instrument designed to capture fully the skills, attitudes, and behaviors of democratic citizens will necessarily be value-laden.

- The instrument should discriminate between qualities of democratic citizenship and other models of citizenship. Manfred Stanley (Maxwell School, Syracuse University) urged the group to develop instruments that would not only measure citizenship per se, but would also help differentiate models of democratic citizenship from authoritarian, totalitarian, or other models of citizenship.

- The instrument should be sensitive to internal differences between visions of democratic citizenship [e.g.; liberal versus participatory]. It may be used in a variety of contexts and should be designed to facilitate measuring the outcomes of a variety of educational experiences. The instrument will be used in a broad variety of service environments and should facilitate the measurement of the differing kinds of civic skills that attend differing modes of service.

- The instrument should distinguish acquired skills from birthrights of democratic citizenship. As Janice Ballou indicated, knowledge of history, rights, and obligations is an important aspect of democratic citizenship. This kind of knowledge creates the possibility for access to politics. The instrument should be designed to distinguish between components of citizenship which are inherited and those which are acquired through civic activity. Along one dimension the instrument would examine capacity for access, and along another dimension it would measure "social stewardship."

- Janice Ballou encouraged the working group to consider developing scales that range from "passive" to "active" where citizens are "active or passive depending on various circumstances, contexts, and issue orientations." This kind of scale is well suited for contextualizing citizenship skills within a framework of multiple models of democracy.

- We should anticipate teachers using the instrument as a teaching aid. Professor Battistoni urged us to consider the possibility that teachers using the instrument will "teach to the test." This may mean that we need to develop interpretative materials to help teachers better understand student responses.

As noted above, this report cannot do full justice to the richness and texture of the discussions of our working group. Much more will be accomplished when the group has examined new and revised working papers and meets again next year. It is already clear to us, however, that the goal we have set ourselves of clarifying community, service learning, and citizenship in the broad framework of democracy, and of developing a technical instrument capable of assessing the civic skills associated with community, service learning, and citizenship is both feasible and doable.

Appendix A

Following is the text from the worksheet that was used by the measurement team to gather comments and reactions to measurement issues. Fourteen working group members returned the completed worksheets to the Whitman Center. Responses are organized according to a common theme under each measurement issue and generally follow the order of the original worksheet.

Whitman Center Conference on Citizenship
Reactions to Measurement Issues

I.   **Overview:** The purpose of this form is to gather your thoughts and ideas concerning our goal of trying to develop a measure or set of measures concerning citizenship. As the group discussion proceeds, we would appreciate your jotting down your reactions and ideas on this form. We will collect the forms and use them in the development of the measure.

II.   **Constructs to be measured:** The first agenda item is to explore what constructs (or traits, scales, etc.) should be included in such a measure. At the Whitman Center, we have spent some time on this topic and have generated the list below. We'd like your general reactions to them (should or should not be included, should be expanded, conceptualization should be different) and to find out what else you think should be on such a measure. The constructs are deliberately left fairly broad at this point.

1.   **Knowledge base:** What should a citizen know?

History
History of self
History of country
History of this country (inclusive of all peoples).
"Texts of membership" -- Constitution, Bill of Rights, 3 constitutional law cases, history.
Documents (e.g., Constitution) -- Supreme Court cases, key events

Rights
Inherent rights (2)
His/her civil rights.
Awareness of rights/inherent rights
Understanding your rights
Rights and responsibilities of citizens.
Rights as citizen, history of development of this concept of rights.

Values
Basic values -- meaning of freedom, justice, democracy.

Knowledge or Understanding of Government
Process of governance
A basic idea about how society works (government to people; people to people; three branches).
Knowledge of governmental structure (federalism) and procedures

How systems work, how government works or is set up to work and ones place in all of this.

Basic knowledge of government and how it works.

Basic governing institutions, how to access them

Structure of society -- nature of economy, government, law, families, with some historical context and differences from other forms of society.

Input in the political process.

Citizenship
What are the basic ways people become U.S. citizens? What are the basic criteria/expectations?

Understand the context for their citizenship, i.e., school, family, neighborhood, state,etc. This will vary according to circumstance, age, and issue.

Knowledge or Understanding about community
Understanding your responsibilities to your community, country

Current events in community and society.

Concerns of community/local and national

Associational knowledge -- knowing how to organize, where to find information

What communities does the person belong to? Which do they care most about and why?

Obligation
Range of obligations -- a concept of obligations

Obligation/accountability: who is responsible for this problem/failure of policy and who gets credit.

Issues of Power
Powerholders in one's group(s)

Who is powerful in your town? In the U.S.? Elected officials? The rich? Men? White people? Voters? The media? The courts? The corporations?

Ability to Communicate/Think/Act
Ongoing capacity to articulate self to others and describe "relevant" public environment (also put as "constructing narrative"), but the point is a language capacity, a means for thinking and interacting. It doesn't matter, to me if we're about a common language among us all, or if we're measuring the emerging language of specific individuals/groups.

Relationship between people as citizens.

Knowledge of access

Access

Agency

Critical thinking skills

Arts of association

Questions/Suggestions Raised
Is there one base? Could people know lots of alternative things?

How do you balance a person who is immensely deft at local lobbying and a person who has some of that detailed knowledge but quite a lot of general knowledge?

Who/what is public?

1. **Knowledge base.** Detailed critique and determination of nature of scales.

    <u>Rights and responsibilities</u>
    Basic rights and responsibilities.
    Rights
    Responsibilities
    Know constitutional and civil rights (this would encompass and sense of pride).
    Have a working understanding of the different "ideologies" that constitute American political discourse and policy: "social" conservative, liberal, socialist, market conservative, "democratic".

    <u>Public Space</u>
    To be able to name/identify the space that is <u>their</u> "public". I think a "gang" might be a legitimate public space. Why <u>assume</u> all gang members have the "skills" of citizenship but are inherently <u>against</u> the polity: isn't the polity <u>against</u> them?
    Have a working understanding of the "public" space (its power-structure) that is relevant to them -- who is in charge, how to appeal decisions.

    <u>Other comments</u>
    Read newspapers that are produced there, or ?? information -- a newsletter, bulletin board (see info from a variety of perspectives).
    Different models of participation.
    History of community and society.
    Basic structure of society and government.
    Global perspective -- understands international context of U.S. citizenship.
    Growth
    Social Service
    Interaction
    Logic and practical reasoning

2. **Skills related to citizenship:** What should a citizen be able to do?

    <u>Agency</u>
    Exercise personal agency
    Capability to act. Willingness to act/ propensity to act.   Where does one situate oneself in the public sphere?
    Agency and initiative and what people actually do.
    Be agential -- develop initiative
    Level of engagement -- sources of info, reading newspapers, participating in public meetings/associations.
    Courage to act.
    Should be able to "work" system, should have skills to actively participate and affect change.

    <u>Strategic skills</u>
    Strategic thinking
    Fluidity

Strategic/Public sensibility -- skills, ??? and judgment that enables ??? analysis, action, evaluation to be practices. general skills: public judgment, power-mapping, diversity, negotiation, public evaluation.
Ability to distinguish between perceived and real barriers to people's participation. Then ability to strategically attack the real barriers.

Critical thinking
Be able to think more broadly than their individual interests.
The capacity to imagine a different way of living together as a community (thinking about who is not at the table who should be)
Be critical of direction of society
Critical thinking.
Analytical skills.

Communication/Deliberation
Communicate
Understand
Ability to communicate.
Public talk (and listen) deliberatively -- talk is a political act.
Ability to articulate ideas and problems.
Ability to negotiate, mediate.
Ability to listen actively.
Time -- time for changes to occur, patience.

Planning & Organizational skills
Organizational skills (2). How to get things done.
How to make decisions -- plan and implement.
Plan
Set agendas.
Be able to work with others toward common goals.

Self-Placement and Reciprocity
Ability to put yourself in place of others, take another perspective.
Have disposition to reciprocity -- understanding situation of others individuals and groups; being able to come to agreement.
Where does one place oneself? This could break into levels: can one relate situations to "most appropriate" responses?; direct service; organizing a citizens' group; lobbying government, etc. Also where does one place oneself on different levels: local, national, policy, etc.

Policy Understanding and Decision-making
Ability to anticipate consequences of policies.
Ability to judge issues in a public way (not what I think but what we think).
Identify issues relevant to self as well as public.
Participate in decision-making on problems/policies that affect their life conditions.
Seek information on problems/policies that affect their lives.
Evaluate information on problems/policies that affect their lives.
Attend public meetings/hearings to comment on "agendas" of a decision that affects them.

Do you think you can figure out ways to act to solve your problems? What ways are your likely to try? List options -- see leaders, organize others, etc.
Problem solving.
Do you think you can identify the sources of your problems -- e.g., your emotional state/ abilities? Your family? Your school or job? Your town or national government? The economic system?
Is it important to you to stop now and then, identify the problems in your life, and think about what's causing them?

Other comments
Read the New York Times; distinguish fact from editorial comments.
Map social world.
Sense of ownership over the polity.
Respect
Tolerate
To buy into the dream (rights, education, home, etc).
Vote (2)
Contribute to society in order to enhance [society]

Questions/Suggestions Raised
We seem to agree that there are barriers to participation -- perceived and actual.
Have we lowered the barriers to participation?
Know how to find out what you don't know?

2. **Skills related to citizenship.** Detailed critique and determination of nature of scales.

Agency
Agency/initiative
Knowing how to get things done.

Reciprocity
Disposition to reciprocity -- being able to understand the situation of others/other groups, identify, also not differences.
Ability to think about a problem from various ideological and strategic standpoints (disposition to reciprocity).

Critical Thinking/Communication/Organizational Skills
Be critical of direction of society/government/or other institutions or communities.
Ability to plan, in cooperation with others, solutions to those problems: includes ability to argue about/debate those solutions.
Ability to define and explain in an articulate way the particular problem(s) s/he has.
Ability to formulate way to execute that plan, in cooperation with others.

Other Comments
Service.
Identify shared goals for your community or institution.
Respect the rights of others.
Voting.

3.   **Participation in citizenship:** What should a citizen do?

<u>Agency</u>
Deliberate and act.
We must allow for alternative channels of action; disaffection from traditional institutions (democratic forms of exit).
Take control of themselves (lead)
Have capacity and will to act on their self-interest in public.
Formulate and enact a role that transforms their "public" space -- a school, a country, a nation...
Contribute to the common good/problem solving: pay taxes; obey laws; organize to help solve local problems.
To help community to grow
Economic (e.g. firms) and social institutions (e.g. schools) -- participate with a view to directing them to fulfill the needs and shared goals of those belonging to them.
Neighborhoods, government -- participate in communities that are significant to them.
Habits of using power.
Look for ways to improve society or whatever community one belongs to.

<u>Electoral Participation</u>
Vote (3)
Run for office
Contribute to/work for the candidate of his or her choice.

<u>Informed/Aware</u>
Be aware
Pay attention to national and local affairs.
Read newspapers from different ideological perspectives.

<u>Other Comments</u>
To be productive
Respect others rights and differences.

<u>Measurement Issues: Questions Suggested</u>
What is the least responsibility of citizenship?
What would you consider <u>active</u> citizenship?

<u>Questions/Suggestions Raised</u>
Could they do nothing if they knew exactly how they <u>would</u> if they needed to, and felt absolutely confident of success if they had to? [I think there's a strain even in "good citizen" between <u>good</u> citizen and good <u>citizen</u>; the more you load up the <u>capacity</u> side, the more plausible that s/he could have the capacity unused.]
We need to be careful not to subsume the values of public mindedness to the skills a citizen needs to be effective.

3.   **Participation in citizenship.** Detailed critique and determination of nature of scales.

Voting.
Accountability.
Could someone be a "good" citizen in the sense of having all the appropriate knowledge and skills, but be so disaffected that they didn't participate? Can you distinguish people like that from people who are merely ???

4.   **Span and depth of involvement in civic affairs:** What kinds of activities should a citizen engage in and to what extent?

<u>Levels of Participation</u>
This measurement could include <u>levels</u> of participation.
Local, state, and national. Church, school, home and neighborhoods.

<u>Activities/Actions</u>
Protecting others rights.
Vote.
Sit on a condo board, a county board, a workplace/union committee.
Protest in parades or other actions.
Organize/participate in a study circle.
Organize a consciousness-raising group (for "social" issues, workplace or school problems).

<u>Questions/Suggestions Raised</u>
Different people have different styles of participation. There are a variety of ways of participating, depending on the person they may/will do it. I, e.g., organize "political" things at my university, go to protest marches, cultural events, but really don't do more than <u>vote</u> in <u>electoral</u> politics.
This is one of these things citizens do based on their choices. But in order to exercise this right they must have acted previously to ensure they have a choice.
Could is maybe a better word [than should].
Not 'good' and 'bad' citizens -- active or passive.
This should not remain normative; let's actually find out how people are involved: one year after intervention, three years after, 10 years after.
Prefer using case studies of public situations. Asking what could one do...? Gets at level of political "sophistication" in terms of ability to 'map' environment and understanding of agency. Another level is to ask respondents: what kinds of activities should a citizen engage in?
People act out of their self-interest, broadly interest as "self among others." I therefore think this question leads us down a path which has great capacity to mislead us. The answer here is "Zen" -- they should practice "right engagement." The goal, rather, is to have people see their self-interests as linked or interdependent.

4.   **Span and depth of involvement in civic affairs.** Detailed critique and determination of nature of scales.

Exposure.
Understanding your own power in the political process.
What activities do you participate in beyond your family life? What do you see as your role in this activity?

5.   **Political/Philosophical orientation:**   Which   of   the   various   models   of government/citizenship does this person subscribe to?

Liberty/Freedom/Justice/Equality
Liberties, self-development.
Freedom, justice (equal rights and equal opportunity), democracy--participation.
Commitment to equal opportunity.
Commitment to inclusion.
Tolerance of diversity.
Vision of 'just' society.
Disposition to reciprocity.

Measurement Issues: Questions Suggested
What is a good citizen's most important responsibility? To work hard and support himself or herself and family? To vote? To pay taxes? To speak out about social problems? Do community service? Get involved in politics?
What should the criteria be for becoming citizens?
Do individuals have obligations to their communities? Which obligations are the most important -- to family? church? neighborhood? ethnic group or race? town? state? nation?
Should men and women play different roles in politics?   If so, what are the differences?
Are people from some cultures better suited to be American citizens than others? If so, what cultures?

Questions/Suggestions Raised
Perhaps a combination of all the models. Should there be a proscription it should be based on the individuals' choices.
We should gauge attitudes toward public involvement -- affective notions of "enfranchisement."
This could be one of those indirect measures.
Who cares, really? What they need to know to act effectively is this government, within this polity, there is the latitude to act on different models of citizenship (ie. one can be more "active" or "passive").
Do most people subscribe to a model or to two or more that they appeal to selectively for different purposes? One might guess that a strongly participant person would be reluctant to accept the decisions of a majority vote or a representative, but it's only a guess, and s/he might easily split reactions -- being heavily participant locally or at work, but "liberal" in Ben's sense nationally.

5.   **Political/Philosophical orientation.** Detailed critique and determination of nature of scales.

Measurement Issues: Questions Suggested
How do you think decisions are made in your community? How should they be made? What changes should make this happen?

Questions/Suggestions Raised
Here I want to underscore Alan's point that it may be _very_ difficult to get agreement on these _general_ values, visions, orientations. It is _often_ easier to get agreement on a response to a _particular_ problem among people who do not share a "global" orientation and among whom debates about larger _world_ philosophy would be divisive and preclude coalitions around _specific_ issues. Again, to recall Arendt -- citizens act on _specific_ problems/events. _Ideologues_ and _totalitarians_ try to achieve a world-historical plan.

6.   **Societal orientation and conviction:** What does this person see as a desirable society and what is his/her commitment to realizing that society?

Agency
Willingness to act -- utilizing agency.

Reciprocity
Willingness to conceive of how one's personal actions will impact on others, acting in a way and making decisions based on not one's personal gains but on one's views of a better society for all.
Notion of common good. How personal decisions affect others, a social orientation.

Justice/Rights/Equality
Tolerance, respect for diversity.
Notions of justice. What is your vision of a just society?
Notions of fairness/entitlement.
Rights
Right to seek the American Dream.
Is committed to enhancing freedom for all.

Societal Interest vs. Self Interest
Individuals right to choose but my preference is for some kind of humanistic compassionate society.
Societal orientation/identification vs. self-interest.
Level of enlightened self-interest: 1) involvement/interest in "backyard" problems; 2) to national issues that seemingly have little _obvious_ impact upon one's day-to-day life; 3) willingness to give up -- (money, taxes, time, etc) to achieve what one thinks is good.

Other Comments
Education
Investment in the polity -- what level of the polity?
Attitudes towards political life.

<u>Measurement Issues: Questions Suggested</u>
Would you prefer to see the U.S. as primarily a nation of English speakers, or many
languages?
Would you prefer to see the U.S. as primarily a nation of people of color, or
primarily white? or Don't Care?
Would you prefer to see the U.S. as a society in which men and women do child-
rearing and homemaking equally, or on in which women can have jobs outside the
home, but are primarily mothers and homemakers?
Would you prefer to see U.S. as a society in which all are prosperous? In which all
participate in government?
How important is it to you to have racially and ethnically integrated schools?
legislatures? workplaces? neighborhoods? families?

<u>Questions/Suggestions Raised</u>
I see this issue a little differently. Perhaps we should address our diversity upfront...
"Given a diverse society like America how do you see this society working for
citizens?"
Irrelevant. I <u>do</u> think people need to be able to state the <u>problems</u> they think they
see in a society and that this skill is often informed by an ideology/philosophy of
society. but I think many people (in the U.S.) might <u>not</u> put forward a statement of
their ideology or might not view their social orientation in those terms. I suppose
(in response to the points raised in the session) I am assuming this person has a
fundamental commitment to liberal democracy, so that Hitler does <u>not</u> end up
looking like a good citizen.
Can you control this so that "desirable" doesn't mean <u>utopian</u> -- so that s/he could
sensibly say it's not up to him or her to do it?

6.   **Societal orientation/conviction.** Detailed critique and determination of nature os
        scales.

        What responsibility do you feel that citizens have for each other?
        What are the strengths and weaknesses for how we live?
        Interaction of all cultures.
        Return to the community in service -- given back.
        Taking part in the political process.

7.   **Expectations and responsibilities concerning government:** What does this person see
        as his/her responsibility toward society and what does he/she expect to get out of it?

        <u>Rights</u>
        In order to protect the rights of citizenship. What responsibilities do citizens have?
        Rights, obligations.
        Open-ended questions -- "What rights do you have as a citizen?"
        To have their rights and life style respected.
        Respect for others (cultures, life styles, etc).

Other Comments

To serve their community, state, nation.
Government has a role to moderate and coordinate social activities for the general and individual good respectively.
To buy into the [American] dream.

Questions/Suggestions Raised

This would be an interesting question to put on a citizenship measure. It would help elicit their understanding of politics, their political philosophy (so to speak). I do not think there is ? norm regarding what a citizen should think about this and hence I do not think it can be measured. I do, however, think the question itself is a useful measure.

I don't know under what categories these go, but I believe a citizen should understand their place in the society and their ability and responsibility to act and make a difference. They need to be prepared to do so and feel connected and a part. They should understand how their personal/private interests interact, conflict, impact on public interest. They should be open to others and sensitive to others and willing to see other options and alternatives.

7. **Expectations and responsibilities concerning government.** Detailed critique and determination of nature of scales.

Fairness
To serve all people.
To assist society to understand itself.

Should government work for everyone?

8.-12. **Other Reactions to Measurement Issues.**

Measurement Issues: Questions Suggested

What was government intended to do? What does it do?
How do you decide on public issues that effect you?
When faced with an issue that affects your school or community who do you talk with about it?
What is your relationship as a citizen to others in your community?
When faced with a tough unpredictable problem are you willing to take an action toward a solution?
Do you watch the news?

Questions/Suggestions Raised

What is missing is some sort of personality measure, motivation to act, political efficacy -- belief that you can make a difference.
Outcomes of actions: What did their action(s) achieve? Most of the measures you have here address individual learning/development. While this is important, it is also important to see an outcome. The active citizen/enfranchised citizen needs to do something.
As you develop broad and sharply defined measures, I believe it would indeed be useful to meet with various groups -- e.g., the military, the Peace Corps, Conservation

Corps, IAF -- and explore the citizenship and stewardship potentials of experiences in such groups. The representatives of these groups will react too your citizenship measures and you will react to their descriptions of outcomes and potentials. That takes your measuring instrument to the next level. Then you test the instrument and compare it with parallel instruments that emerge from other ?? interactions.

The Working Group: (31)

Ms. Janice Ballou; Director, Center for Public Interest Polling,
      Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University
Professor Benjamin R. Barber; Director, Walt Whitman Center for
      the Culture and Politics of Democracy, Rutgers University
Professor Richard Battistoni; Director, Civic Education and
      Community Service Program, Rutgers University
Professor Harry Boyte; The Humphrey Center, University of
      Minnesota
Mr. Keith Canty; Director, D. C. Service Corps
Professor Jean Cohen; Department of Political Science, Columbia
      University
Mr. Ernesto Cortez, Jr.; Director, Texas Industrial Areas
      Foundation
Mr. David Crowley; Project Director of CampusServe, Council on
      Higher Education
Mr. John Dedrick; Project Director for Surdna Grant, Walt Whitman
      Center
Professor Lisa Disch; Department of Political Science, University
      of Minnesota
Ms. Monique Dixon; Director of Programs, Phillips Brooks House,
      Harvard University
Mr. Donald J. Eberly; Executive Director, Coalition for National
      Service
Professor Amitai Etzioni; University Professor, George Washington
      University
Ms. Franciena Fowler-Turner, CVA; Director, St. Ann's Volunteer
      Program
Professor Ricard Gomà; Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona
Professor Carol Gould; Stevens Institute of Technology
Professor Rick Lau, Department of Political Science, Rutgers
      University
Professor Brenda Loyd; Curry School of Education, University of
      Virginia
Dr. Suzanne Morse; Director, Pew Partnership for Civic Change
Mr. Keith Morton; Project Director of Integrating Service with
      Academic Study, Campus Compact
Professor Alan Ryan; Department of Politics, Princeton University
Ms. Smita Singh; Program Officer, Commission on National and
      Community Service

The Working Group Continued:

Professor Jeff Smith; Graduate School of Education, Rutgers University
Professor Rogers Smith; Department of Political Science, Yale University
Professor Manfred Stanley; The Maxwell School, Syracuse University
Professor Mary Stanley; The Maxwell School, Syracuse University
Mr. Charles Supple; Vice President, Youth Engaged in Service, The Points of Light Foundation
Mr. Edward Skloot; Executive Director, Surdna Foundation
Mr. Gerald Taylor; National Staff, Industrial Areas Foundation
Dr. Josep Valles; Rector, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona
Ms. Deborah Visser; Program Officer for Community Revitalization, Surdna Foundation

Participant Observers: (9)

Professor Eleanor Brilliant; School of Social Work, Rutgers University
Dr. Martin Friedman; New Jersey Department of Higher Education
Professor Norman Glickman; Director, Center for Urban Policy Research, Rutgers University
Mr. Mark Murphy; Executive Director, Fund For New Jersey
Professor Catherine Stimpson; University Professor, Rutgers University
Professor Jon Van Til; Department of Urban Studies, Rutgers University
Professor Mary Jane Willis; Cooperative Extension, Rutgers University
Professor Linda Zerilli; Associate Director, Walt Whitman Center for the Culture and Politics of Democracy
Dr. Susan Zivi; Director, The New Jersey Academy for Service and Service Learning, The New Jersey Institute of Technology

<u>Walt Whitman Center Staff</u>:   (9)

Mr. Michael Cripps, Conference Assistant
Ms. Lynn Davern; Secretary, Walt Whitman Center
Dr. Wendy Gunther-Canada; Conference Coordinator
Mr. D. A. Hamlin; Kettering Fellow
Ms. Megumi Kinoshita; Project Assistant
Mr. Scott McLean; Conference Assistant
Ms. Claire Snyder; Coordinator, Walt Whitman Center
Mr. Greg Vafis; Project Assistant
Ms. Michelle Yurecko; Project Assistant

<u>Potential Working Group members who were unable to attend the
first meeting</u>: (4)

President Donald Kennedy; Stanford University
Dr. Francis Moore Lappé; The Institute for the Arts of Democracy
Professor Jane Mansbridge; Department of Political Science; North
        Western University
Professor James S. Fishkin; Department of Political Science,
        University of Texas at Austin