

Introduction

Each year Jumpstart, a national early education organization sends thousands of college students into local communities to work with pre-kindergarten children on literacy skills.

During the course of their service, college students termed "Corps members" complete a Pre-Service, Mid-Year, and Year End Survey evaluating their learning. During the 2012—2013 academic year 80—90% of Corps members completed Pre-Service, Mid-Year, and Year-End surveys.

With approval from Jumpstart and the Georgia Institute of Technology Institutional Review Board, the research team analyzed the Pre-Service, Mid-Year, and Year End survey data to understand citizenship identity and program characteristics.

Research Questions

- Research Question 1:** Identify the face/phase of citizenship for Jumpstart Corps members during participation in the Jumpstart program.
- Research Question 2:** What characteristics of the Jumpstart program influence Corps members' face/phase of citizenship?

Musil (2003) Faces/Phases of Citizenship

Musil (2003) provided the Faces/Phases of Citizenship model to delineate "six expressions of citizenship" (p. 5). The model was developed to reflect definitions of community, values, and knowledge. The column on the left cites Musil's description of the faces/phases. The column on the right cites the Research Team's additional context for each face/phase.

Exclusionary	Exclusionary
Community is: Only Your Own Civic Scope: Civic Disregard Levels of Knowledge: Monocultural Benefits: A few and only for a while	Selfish, Rigid, Secluded, Borders (literal, philosophically), One time, One directional, Safe, Lack of application, No/Narrow context/depth, Randomness, Intentional disconnection
Oblivious	Oblivious
Community is: A resource to mine Civic Scope: Civic Detachment Levels of Knowledge: Largely Monocultural Benefits: One Party	Drop in, Sporadic, Random, Purposeless, Comfortable – Separation through the glass, Limited context, Perpetuate stereotypes, Learn from – not with, Lacks challenge, Limited intellectual development
Naive	Naive
Community is: A resource to engage Civic Scope: Civic Amnesia Levels of Knowledge: No History/Vantage Point Benefits: Random People	Based on "my" values, Introduce community, Low social/cultural context, Ongoing but lacks connections, Desire to "do good," No analysis of power dynamics, Limitations on learning, Organized distinct of those with knowledge/context
Charitable	Charitable
Community is: A resource that needs assistance Civic Scope: Civic Altruism Levels of Knowledge: Multicultural, yours is still the norm center Benefits: The giver's feelings, the sufferer's immediate needs	Rescuer – Saving Community, Not long term, "Duct Tape," Deliverable oriented, Sensitive to issues but unaware of depth, Fashionable – Showcase service, Care about community in segments, Preparation evident but not prominent
Reciprocal	Reciprocal
Community is: A resource to empower and be empowered by Civic Scope: Civic Engagement Levels of knowledge: Intercultural competencies Benefits: Society as a whole in the present	Relationships, Partnership, Work with the community for desired goal, Aware of power/privilege, Mutual learning, Preparation is clear/evident, Asset based community development rather than deficit based, Impacts learning in positive/complex ways, Synchronized
Generative	Generative
Community is: An interdependent resource filled with possibilities Civic Scope: Civic prosperity Levels of Knowledge: Interconnectedness Benefits: Everyone now and in the future	Interdependence/Intertwined, Social justice oriented, Sustainable change, Engaged/participatory learning, Process and goal, Way to see the world, Lifelong learning, Process oriented

General Information

- Pre-, Mid-Year, and Year End Survey data was analyzed to understand the face/phase of citizenship evident in Corps members' responses. All three surveys contained eight (8) questions under the heading "Citizenship."
- After raw data was collected and cases matched, a two-step cluster analysis was performed to further validate which questions clustered or banded together and therefore confirmed elements of the model.
- Descriptive statistics and a repeated measures ANOVA were generated to note the changes over time between the Pre-, Mid-Year, and Year End Survey responses to the Citizenship questions and the Mid-Year and Year End Program Satisfaction and Feedback questions. One-way ANOVA analyses were performed to note significance among specific demographic categories.
- *Full statistical analyses is available upon request.*

Conclusions

Musil (2003) stated that the Charitable face/phase was the "most typical face of citizenship on college campuses" (p. 6). The Research Team therefore placed Corps members at this "middle point" on the face/phase continuum when analyzing data collected. The results of the repeated measures ANOVA revealed that over time with the Jumpstart program, Corps members increased their perceived knowledge and awareness of self, contextual issues, and civic engagement. The Research Team therefore concluded that Corps members did display characteristics of the Reciprocal face/phase over their year of service with Jumpstart. The increase in statistically significant mean scores between the Pre-, Mid-, and Year End Surveys provided rationale for this conclusion. When mean scores were not consistently increasing but the results were statistically significant, the Research Team viewed the face/phase of citizenship as potentially stagnant. Of the citizenship questions that were not statistically significant, including forming group consensus, connecting with others from different backgrounds, and creating positive sustainable change, the Research Team concluded these as areas for program development to stimulate citizenship development.

When considering the programmatic influences on citizenship identity, statistical significance was evident in the importance of the Team Leader role and the strong relationship built with the partner site. These two responses illustrated the importance of peer leadership and community engagement which supported Corps members in their development of a citizenship identity. The role of the Site Manager was important to Corps members based on the high mean scores, but did not sustain the high mean score from the Mid-Year to Year End survey administrations.

The decrease in mean scores for the training that Corps members received led the Research Team to conclude that being on site became more applicable to prepare Corps members for their role and experience in the classroom rather than the training provided by Jumpstart. The template based training used by Jumpstart was most likely perceived as important before entering the classroom, given the high ratings on the Mid-Year survey. By the conclusion of the year however, the rating agreement decreased indicating that the training was not as applicable.

The Research Team concluded that while Corps members were expressing less agreement over time with questions related to connecting with others, debate, and understanding issues of social justice, this was an example of cognitive dissonance or a "crucible" moment. Theoretically, these types of experiences temporarily stagnate development but later lead to greater learning. The Research Team also concluded that both the initial training and relationship building with other Corps members and the Site Leader allowed for structure at the start of the experience however, once spending time at the sites, Corps members might have learned the "reality" of being in the classroom and relating to others during the experience.



Contact Information

Cara Appel-Silbaugh, Ph.D.
Associate Dean of Students
cas3@gatech.edu

Sarah Perkins
Civic Engagement Coordinator
sarah.perkins@vpss.gatech.edu

Shauna Nefos Webb
Area Manager, Residence Life
shauna.nefos@housing.gatech.edu

Sheree Gibson
Coordinator, Assessment & Research
sheree.gibson@housing.gatech.edu

Julius Cave
Jumpstart Site Manager
julius.cave@vpss.gatech.edu

Anil Shetty
Coordinator, Student Integrity
anil.shetty@vpss.gatech.edu