EDUCATING THE CIVIC PROFESSIONAL

Reconfigurations and Resistances

Scott J. Peters

Cornell University

This paper explores an important purpose that some scholars in professional programs of study are utilizing service-learning to pursue: namely, the purpose of educating the civic professional by integrating education for work and citizenship.   While such a purpose holds promise, an examination of a practice story from the field of landscape architecture illustrates the ways in which its pursuit can be profoundly challenging. As the story reveals, it can require faculty, students, and community members to undergo several fundamental reconfigurations in attitudes, identities, and practices, each of which generates significant resistance.

"Education has come to mean not the production, morally and intellectually, of men and women, but of mere specialists." So David Kinley (1897, p. 46) complained in 1897. Kinley—a professor of political economy at the University of Illinois who held degrees from Yale, Johns Hopkins, and the University of Wisconsin—thought that such an education was "degenerate." In his view, it "turns out engineers and political economists and clergymen and journalists and other specialists, who are specialists, and as far as training goes, nothing more" (p. 46).

A particularly striking expression of the positive ideal behind Kinley's complaint can be found in a brief passage from a speech delivered in 1944 by Michigan State College[1] president John A. Hannah. Speaking in Chicago before the fifty-eighth annual convention of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, Hannah (1945, p. 76) proclaimed:

> Our colleges should not be content with only the training of outstanding agriculturalists, or engineers, or home economists, or teachers, or scientists, or lawyers, or doctors, or veterinarians— it is not enough that our young people be outstanding technicians. The first and never-forgotten objective must be that every human product of our educational system must be given the training

that will enable him [*sic*] to be an effective citizen, appreciating his opportunities, and fully

willing to assume his responsibilities in a great democracy.

Today no less than in Kinley's time, however, Hannah's view of what American higher education's "first and never-forgotten objective" *must* be does not line up well with what many feel it actually *is* in practice. This is so despite an ample supply of high rhetoric about the importance of education for citizenship and the existence in some institutions of substantive opportunities for students to pursue moral and civic development (Colby et al., 2003). According to some scholars and critics (e.g., Wilshire 1990; Sullivan, 2000), in both undergraduate and graduate programs in a wide variety of professional fields, education for technical competence in pursuit of economic aims vastly overshadows, if not entirely displaces, education for citizenship. As Ernest Boyer (1987, p. 3) observed in his study of undergraduate education, "Narrow vocationalism, with its emphasis on skills training, dominates campus."

Service-learning offers a promising but as of yet underdeveloped and underappreciated way of addressing this problem: not by providing students with *separate* opportunities for civic education, however valuable such opportunities might be, but by providing a means for the *integration* of education for work and citizenship in professional programs of study. By adopting service-learning as a means for integrating education for work and citizenship, professional programs of study can ground the often vague and abstract objective of civic education in the pursuit of the "practical" objective of preparing students to enter their chosen professions. Such an integration offers promise of transforming professional programs of study from vehicles for educating "mere specialists" and "outstanding technicians" to vehicles for educating *civic professionals* who are "fully willing to assume [their] responsibilities in a great democracy."

The concept of civic professionalism points to the public functions and social responsibilities of the professions.[2] According to William Sullivan (2003, p. 10), civic professionals make a "public pledge to deploy technical expertise and judgment not only skillfully but also for public-regarding ends and in a public-regarding way". Accordingly, what makes professionalism more or less "civic" is not just the degree to which professionals' intentions can be shown to be "public-regarding" but the degree to which their *practice* can be shown to be so as well. To practice one's profession in a public-regarding way in a full and direct sense, professionals must view themselves as active participants in civic life. They must cast their identities, roles, and expertise around a democratic, public mission, suffusing their technical competence with civic awareness and purpose. In Sullivan's (1995, p. xix) words, they must embrace a conviction that "there is finally no successful separation between the

skills of problem solving and those of deliberation and judgment, no viable pursuit of technical excellence without participation in those civic enterprises through which expertise discovers its human meaning".

The conviction just stated reflects a keen awareness of the limits of technical knowledge and expertise as tools for pursuing public interests and ends. While professionals' specialized and often highly technical knowledge and expertise are or can be of great value in helping society understand and address complex civic issues and problems, most contemporary problems cannot be adequately understood and addressed by technical knowledge and skills alone (Schön 1983). They require a dynamic balancing of technical, moral, and cultural processes and rationalities (Scott 1998; Fischer 2000; Flyvbjerg 2001). According to Sullivan (1995, p. 171), such a balancing is the "task of civic democracy, to which professions can contribute only if they see themselves as parts of an interacting public discussion" of civic issues and problems with their fellow citizens. Because professionals do not widely see themselves this way today, professional identities must be redefined around a public mission, opening professionals' eyes and imaginations to the civic responsibilities and possibilities of their work. "In this way," Sullivan (1999, p. 9) writes, "citizenship enters ever more seriously into the job description of professionals, not as externally imposed add-on, but as a defining feature" of professional activity.

Professional programs of study cannot by themselves transform the culture and politics of the professions in American life.[3] However, they can help to advance the project of redefining professional identities and practices along democratic lines through service-learning experiences that aim to integrate education for work and citizenship. Such a project is already well underway in the service-learning movement. In what follows, I first briefly identify why and how it has been taken up in two professional fields—engineering and biology—as revealed in two volumes in the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) series, "Service-Learning in the Disciplines".[4] I then explore in depth one scholar's experience in utilizing service-learning as a means of educating the civic professional in the field of landscape architecture. The scholar is Paula Horrigan, a tenured associate professor in the Department of Landscape Architecture at Cornell University. Horrigan teaches her students to adopt a civic orientation toward their profession that encourages them to place their technical skills and knowledge in the service of democratic purposes. While Horrigan's experience illustrates the promise of utilizing service-learning as a means for educating the civic professional, it also raises serious questions about its ultimate viability and sustainability. An examination of her experience reveals some of the specific ways in which employing service-learning as a strategy for educating

the civic professional can be deeply challenging, requiring faculty, students, and community members to undergo several fundamental reconfigurations in attitudes and practices, each of which generates significant resistance.

From Technocrats to "True" Professionals

In his introductory essay as editor of *Projects That Matter: Concepts and Models for Service-Learning in Engineering*, Edmund Tsang (2000, p. 1) writes that a "paradigm shift is taking place in undergraduate engineering education". This shift has led to the addition in 1998 of several "soft" skills to the undergraduate engineering curriculum that are now mandated to meet accreditation criteria. Such skills include the ability to work and learn collaboratively in teams and the ability to communicate technical concepts and knowledge to the public. Also included in accreditation criteria are a number of knowledge measures, such as an understanding and appreciation of diversity, an understanding and awareness of the social, economic, and environmental impact of engineering decisions, and an understanding of professional and ethical responsibility.[5] The essays included in *Projects That Matter* discuss how scholars in a variety of engineering disciplines have begun to utilize service-learning to develop such skills, awareness and understandings in their students. At the same time, the essays show how service-learning enhances students' learning of technical skills and knowledge through real-world application while also providing meaningful technical assistance and expertise to community-based "clients" or "customers".

It is evident, however, that some engineering faculty see the "paradigm shift" in engineering education as being about more than a change in what should be included in the curriculum in order to educate more socially aware and technically competent engineers. It is also about facilitating a much deeper and more fundamental change relating to engineers' civic identities, roles, and practices. This larger purpose is evident in Peter T. Martin's essay in *Projects That Matter* on service-learning in civil and environmental engineering. Martin (2000, p. 136), an associate professor of civil and environmental engineering at the University of Utah, sees service-learning as being valuable for helping students acquire a "fresh perspective on their roles as citizen-professionals," providing them with "an enhanced understanding of what it means to become a professional engineer" (p. 136). In his view, "the service-learning experience helps students to realize that they can develop from being technocrats remote from the communities they serve to being true professionals" (p. 145).

Martin's view of what it means to be a "true" engineering professional crosses a normative line that is supposed to cleanly separate technical professions like engineering from politics. Martin does not believe such a line should

exist. "Politics is too important to be left to the politicians", he writes (p. 144). For Martin, service-learning is a means for teaching why and how engineers should actively engage in politics. He reports that through their service-learning experiences,

> engineering students learn that the promotion and selection of an infrastructure project has a political dimension from the outset. More important, they learn that as engineers they have a responsibility to contribute to the political process. They learn that engineers who abrogate this component of their professional responsibility diminish their leadership status, reducing their role to simply providing technical support. . . . They learn about citizenship, but not from a class called Citizenship (p. 144).

The theme of using service-learning to facilitate a reconfiguration of professional identity from technocrat to "citizen-professional" appears in another one of the AAHE volumes, *Life, Learning, and Community: Concepts and Models for Service-Learning in Biology*. In this volume, biology professors David Brubaker and Joel Ostroff (2000, p. 1) observe that the resistance against the incorporation of service-learning into natural science programs and courses has in part been a reflection of "how members of the scientific community (both researchers and teachers) perceived their primary civic role in society—namely, as discovering and creating new bodies of knowledge regarding the physical world and transmitting that knowledge to their students in the classroom and laboratory." They note that scientific researchers and teachers have often "viewed interacting with people and issues in the community outside the academy as someone else's responsibility" (p. 1).

Brubaker and Ostroff report an increasing sense in the biology community that researchers, teachers, and students must change this detached view of their profession. They advocate service-learning as a means for facilitating this change by "humanizing science" for students and inspiring in them a "scientific social consciousness" (p. 142). They see service-learning in the biological sciences as helping to "educate a generation intellectually armed and emotionally prepared to contribute to a more enlightened world" (p. 143). Service-learning, they write, "will help to make our emerging biologists more than just effectively trained scientists. It will also make them true citizens" (p. 143).

For those who are committed to transforming professional identities and practices along democratic lines, Martin's and Brubaker and Ostroff's accounts of how service-learning can be a means for integrating education for work and citizenship are encouraging and inspiring. But their accounts are also sobering. They note in their

essays—mostly in passing—many ways in which their work is challenging, cutting against students' expectations and the cultures and politics of academic and professional fields. Adding service-learning to the curriculum in order to enhance the learning of technical and "soft" skills while helping out the community produces one set of challenges. A deeper set is produced when educators take the further step of adopting service-learning as a means for transforming core professional identities and practices along democratic lines.

Educating the Civic Professional In Landscape Architecture

In order to examine the ways that educating the civic professional can be challenging, I turn now to an account of Paula Horrigan's experience and work in landscape architecture. I interviewed Horrigan as part of a research initiative I am pursuing into the civic dimensions of educational practice in American higher education that explores how scholars understand and pursue higher education's civic mission. By "civic" dimensions, I refer to those dimensions that have a direct bearing on the nature and process of democratic citizenship, which come into play when academic professionals enter the public realm and engage with their fellow citizens in public work. Such dimensions enable scholars to link the work of scholarship—teaching and research—to the public work of democracy—the articulation, deliberation, and negotiation of public interests, ideals, problems, and issues and the development and exercise of knowledge and power in addressing them (Mathews, 1994/1999; Boyte and Kari, 1996, 2000).

This is a relatively unexplored area of investigation. As Wellman (2000, p. 323) observes, "Despite all the attention to assessment and accountability, the civic educational and service roles of higher education remain invisible, unreported, and largely undefined." In relation to this problem, Schneider (2000, p. 100) writes that there "remains a crucial need for exploration of potential connections between the core missions of colleges and universities as educational institutions and the quality of our civic life." The work of educating the civic professional is one such connection, and an account of Horrigan's experience helps us to explore its promise and challenge.

My account and interpretation of Horrigan's experience was developed from the transcripts of five in-depth, tape-recorded interviews, conducted using semi-structured, open-ended question protocols adapted from Seidman's (1998) and Forester's (1999) phenomenological approaches to interviewing. Following methods used in a form of qualitative research called narrative inquiry (Clandinin and Connelly 2000), the interviews were aimed first at

identifying and constructing a "practice story" (Forester 1999) from Horrigan's experience and then at working to interpret the story's meaning and significance. The first interview included three areas of questions: background questions that probed Horrigan's personal and professional history in order to uncover key commitments, purposes, interests, influences, and experiences; questions focused on drawing out a detailed account of Horrigan's role and work in a specific service-learning practice story; and reflective questions that probed Horrigan's view of the lessons, significance and meaning of the practice story and her broader experience with service-learning as an approach for integrating education for work and citizenship. Four follow-up interviews were conducted in order to draw out additional details, check my interpretations of the meaning and significance of Horrigan's experience against her own interpretations, and provide an opportunity for critical questioning and reflection, all of which helped to strengthen the trustworthiness, coherence, and correspondence of the interview data (Lincoln and Guba, 1985; Riessman, 1993).

It is important to acknowledge that Horrigan's account of her experience is necessarily both partial and subjective. It should therefore not be assumed to reveal or represent an unproblematic and objectively "true" version of the past as it "actually" was. But this is not the aim of narrative inquiry. What narrative inquiry seeks to produce is not objective "Truth" but the truths of people's experiences, communicated and revealed through the telling and interpretation of stories (Personal Narratives Group 1989, p. 261).

Challenging the Status Quo

Alasdair McIntyre (1984, p. 216) once wrote, "I can only answer the question 'What am I to do?' if I can answer the prior question 'Of what story or stories do I find myself a part.'" Paula Horrigan finds herself a part of a story of the "status quo" in her professional and academic field of landscape architecture that she is determined to challenge and change. "My field comes out of a modernist approach," Horrigan says, "a lot of bias towards form and aesthetics and away from the dynamics of design as a power construct which has to do with human relationships—relationships between people and each other, people and places, and people and their environments. I am interested in challenging those modes of thinking that have separated people from places."[6]

Horrigan traces the problem of the design profession's focus on aesthetics and form and its neglect of attention to the dynamics of power and relationships to the kind of education professional designers—including landscape architects—receive:

Education has focused on the cultivation of the designer as the elite individual: designer with a capital "D", or artist with a capital "A". It has fostered that through the *way* it educates people, and part of that is the education has been very much situated here at the academy, and a lot of the learning is in isolation. It is reflective to the extent of individual and personal reflection, but it is not reflective in a more community-situated way. It is like looking at your belly button, I guess. You continue to look at yourself to find the answers as opposed to really looking at the larger citizenry.

While Horrigan reports that her department at Cornell has engaged in a lot of community work, in her view "it has been mostly work *on* the community as opposed to work *with* the community. And one of my interests is in challenging the status quo, in subverting those systems that support that."

Horrigan's critique of her field provides a context for understanding her own professional and educational goals. In her words:

My goals are to create wonderful and meaningful places with communities, to reinvigorate the relationship between people and their places and empower them through that process. Another goal is to empower my students to recognize that their work has the potential to change the world. They can be leaders. And so I want to motivate them at that level so that their work is situated in a meaningful way. I want to connect them at that place where they can embrace the spectrum of power that they can have in helping to motivate the relationships between people and places that are empowering to people and sustaining. I want the education experience to set up an opportunity for them to engage at that level, so that they can see that their work has ethics and values associated with it. When they make a place it goes out into the world. Our field is about making space that directly impacts relationships. I want them to be accountable and sensitive to that and responsible to it and combine that with all their other motivations.

Here we see how Horrigan as a professor of landscape architecture has adopted the civic professional's "public pledge to deploy technical expertise and judgment not only skillfully but also for public-regarding ends and in a public-regarding way" (Sullivan 2003, p. 10). Horrigan came to embrace the identity and goals of civic professionalism through a developmental process grounded in her life experience. Early in her life she was shaped and influenced by her parents and grandmother, who she describes as being devoted to a "service mission," and by

her own community service and activist experiences in high school and college. Her mentoring by various teachers about how to connect art and society and her early work experiences around sustainable agriculture and environmental education in California, Connecticut, and Rhode Island were also important influences. Her graduate education in Cornell University's Department of Landscape Architecture and several years of experience as a working landscape architect in England and New York State introduced her to mainstream approaches to her profession. She learned the theory and practice of ecological and participatory planning and design through the work of a number of pioneering artists, design professionals, and scholars (e.g., Halprin, 1970; Alexander, 1977; Hester, 1984; King, 1989; Seamon, 1993; and Schneekloth & Shibley, 1995).

To pursue her goal of educating civic professionals, Horrigan has developed an undergraduate, senior year design studio titled "Experiential Community Design." She developed the concept for the studio in the fall of 1994 in collaboration with students and community members. After several years of piloting the studio, faculty in the department voted to integrate it into the curriculum as a required course for undergraduates majoring in landscape architecture. The course, which is grounded in a service-learning pedagogy, is intentionally designed to be a means for teaching a civic orientation toward the profession of landscape architecture. It fosters "design as placemaking, civic action and community building" (Horrigan, 2004, p. 1). The class meets twice a week on campus for seminars, discussions of readings, reflections on a community design project the class is engaged in, and workshops on a variety of skills related to participatory planning and design. One day per week is spent working in the field on a community design project that Horrigan negotiates and organizes with a community or neighborhood organization before the semester begins. The service project provides the central means for students' learning, reflecting one of Horrigan's core pedagogical perspectives: "You can either tell somebody something, or you can immerse them in it and they experience it."

A Specific Practice Story

During the spring 2002 semester, Horrigan co-taught the community design studio with Cheryl Doble, an assistant professor of landscape architecture in the College of Environmental Science and Forestry at Syracuse University. Students from both universities enrolled in the course. The focus of the class was a community design project in the North Side of Binghamton, New York, a small city of just under fifty thousand people that is located in upstate New York about forty miles southeast of the Cornell campus. The Binghamton project emerged from Horrigan and Doble's participation in the New York State Quality Communities Initiative, which encourages and supports faculty

and students from State University of New York (SUNY) institutions to work with twelve designated communities that are in particular need of economic and community development. Binghamton, a city that has been hit especially hard over the past few decades by the loss of industrial jobs and population, is included as one of the designated communities.

Before the spring 2002 semester began, Horrigan and Doble approached staff in Binghamton's City Hall to explore how they and their students might work with city residents. A staff member in the planning department told them about a faith-based neighborhood group on the North Side of the city called the "Communities of Shalom", thinking that the group might be interested in working with them. The group had recently formed and was beginning to become active in community development in the North Side. The North Side is a particularly distressed area, but it also has many assets and possibilities, as Horrigan describes:

> Economically, a lot of disinvestment has happened there. It has had every possible urban renewal
> planning scheme applied to it: transportation planning, tearing down whole neighborhoods and
> putting in highways. And it has had a lot of deterioration over time. And yet it is adjacent to
> downtown, so conceivably, it should be a very healthy neighborhood. It actually has all the
> components of what would constitute a neighborhood, but they are all out of whack. If you could
> get those into a healthy place you would have a healthy neighborhood.

Horrigan and Doble approached one of the leaders of the Communities of Shalom—Gary Doupe, an activist minister of a North Side church—to see if the group might be interested in working with them. They learned that the group was composed mainly of members from neighborhood churches, and that they had just been through a national training on leadership for grassroots community development and planning. The group was at a pivotal moment in their work where they were preparing to write a vision statement for the North Side neighborhood. Horrigan and Doble saw a match with their interests. They told Doupe that they and their students could help them to "shape some of their community visions and to do a participatory planning and design process with them." According to Horrigan, while Doupe was initially skeptical of the idea, "when we said that we were interested in working *with* them instead of *on* them, he realized that that was really important." Doupe was "really scoping us out and didn't want to work with somebody who was going to work on them," Horrigan remembers. "But with them was different. He recognized that there was sympathy, a way of thinking about how to undertake a project which

was consistent with what they had been doing with Shalom." Doupe took the proposal for the partnership to the Communities of Shalom group, and the group decided to accept it.

Over the course of the semester, the class met five times with neighborhood residents in various churches on the North Side, each time on a Sunday afternoon and evening that included sharing a potluck meal. In these work sessions, Horrigan and Doble guided their students through a process of conversation, deliberation, and collaborative design with North Side residents. An initial visioning session was held with the community, during which students worked to draw out stories of the neighborhood's history and development. Work groups of students and residents were formed around four priority areas that were identified in the initial visioning meeting. The groups included a visioning group, a neighborhood group, a riverfront group, and a marketplace group. The semester culminated in a neighborhood-wide meeting, during which students and residents displayed and discussed a set of scale models and maps the students had created of a redesigned neighborhood that reflected the visions of the residents.

Horrigan's account of her experience with the Binghamton project in its founding phase (the project is still evolving, with a new set of students engaged) is richly layered with observations about neighborhood dynamics and city politics, descriptions of interesting characters, details of specific events and activities, reflections on her students' (and her own) learning, and insights into her motivations, purposes, feelings, and practices. As I worked with the transcript of the first interview with her, what captured my attention was a set of what I came to see as interconnected reconfigurations and resistances. The *story* I saw in Horrigan's account of the Binghamton project is the story of how the project required Horrigan and Doble as teachers, their students as landscape architects in the making, and neighborhood residents as partners in a participatory design and planning process to undergo multiple reconfigurations of attitudes and practices, each of which generated resistance.

Reconfigurations

Adopting a service-learning pedagogy that integrates technical and civic education has required Horrigan to change the way she approaches her teaching. "The way I think of myself has shifted a lot," she says. "I am not 'professing,' I am mentoring students and community members." In the Binghamton project, she describes her and Doble's teaching roles as "shepherding" their students and community members through a process that involves drawing out students' and neighborhood residents' ideas, knowledge, and visions, reflecting on what happens in community work sessions and strategizing about what the next steps should be, discussing readings, and practicing or inventing design methods and tools in community and on-campus workshops. This process, which Horrigan

repeatedly described as being "messy," involves a "dramatic reconfiguration" in her mode of teaching that includes "what you're learning and how you're learning it, who the players are at the table, [and] the timeframe in terms of how long it takes to do it."

Grounding the learning experience in the community as opposed to the classroom requires a major shift in what Horrigan describes as the "geography" or "space" of learning. "The space of the academy constructs its own system of learning," Horrigan observes. When "the space of learning changes, who is the teacher and who is the learner changes. There is a huge difference in terms of dynamics. The spatial shift in terms of the physical geography corresponds to [a shift in] the psychological space as well. So everything changes."

The Binghamton project, and others like it, have also required Horrigan to learn how to incorporate a new role into her teaching: the role of civic educator and organizer. While Horrigan learned the technical aspects of the design process in her graduate program at Cornell and the "artistic investigative process" through her personal artwork, she has had to learn the "civic processes of working with people" on the fly as she has immersed herself and her students in participatory design projects. Additionally, she says that until she became engaged in the Binghamton project, she had "never really learned the process itself as a critical one that actually might be called something like participatory action research."

The students involved in the Binghamton project had to undergo several reconfigurations as well. The first was to open themselves to working in teams rather than by themselves, which according to Horrigan marked a major departure, for most of them, from their previous academic experience. Second, students needed to dramatically reconfigure their view of professional education from one that is limited to the acquisition of technical knowledge and skills to a more expansive view that includes learning and developing *civic* knowledge, skills and values as well.[7] Among the civic skills Horrigan aims to teach are how to facilitate public discussions, how to make public processes participatory, and how to negotiate and mediate between different interests. Third, students had to reconfigure how they view the knowledge construction and communication process in their interactions with community members. Horrigan tells her students, "You are not here to just tell them, you are here to invent ways that knowledge gets disclosed." In order to "see the knowledge disclosed through the learning process," students had to become insiders, marking another reconfiguration from the typical stance professionals take as detached outsiders.

Students have to learn to reconfigure their attitudes about and approaches to the learning process in other ways as well. In service-learning that is grounded in participatory community design projects, Horrigan says, the learning process

> is messy. It is not linear. Students are often saying, "What are we doing next?" They don't have the exact syllabi. One student said, "I learned how much you got to think by the seat of your pants." It is emergent. It is reflective. You need to be able to improvise. That is one of the things that you are learning. That when you are involved with somebody, you realize that when you are in a dialogue there is a response. It isn't just linear, you can go in circles, and backwards and forwards at the same time.

Another significant reconfiguration required of students involves how they see the relative importance of product versus process. "Students are so used to having a portfolio," Horrigan observes. "The measure of their success is a beautiful drawing." But in the Binghamton project, "the deliverables that measure their success aren't the same." Instead of the "beautiful drawing" as the *single* measure of success, the quality and depth of the processes of engagement, the relationships and energy they build, the power and tools that they develop to help neighborhood residents articulate and give shape to their hopes and dreams, *and* the tangible design products they produce all become equally important. This reflects the core purposes of democratic, participatory design that Horrigan aims to teach. As Horrigan puts it, the work of *civic* design is "not just throwing the design out into the world. The gift of the design has to come out of a set of relationships that are created with the design and through the design process. The process very much dictates or propels the product. They are integrated."

Horrigan's account of the Binghamton project reveals how neighborhood residents need to undergo a set of reconfigurations, too. Following an approach that views design as a "gift" that comes out of a set of relationships requires a great deal from community members. As Horrigan puts it, it requires a shift from seeing "the relationship to the practitioner as one of serving the client, to creating a new dynamic out of that interrelationship." The situation begins at a place where residents "feel like they are totally divorced from the planning process [and] they don't understand the vocabulary." An invitation into the planning and design process as participant and co-creator rather than client requires that residents learn to "speak the same language" as the professionals, which in turn requires planners and designers (in this case, landscape architect students) to be willing to speak the community's language, and to see themselves as educators of the language and processes of planning so that residents become proficient in

basic planning and design concepts. Normally, "planners aren't thinking of how to educate them to do that," Horrigan says. Nor are residents normally interested, according to Horrigan, in being educated into the language, concepts and processes of design.

An additional reconfiguration required of residents that is evident in Horrigan's account of the Binghamton practice story involves shifting from an attitude of cynicism and victimization that some have come to hold, to one of "active faith" and hope. The work also requires residents to learn to "think small and big at the same time," and to become comfortable with long timeframes and messy, circular processes that don't always proceed in a linear fashion. Horrigan kept coming back to an openness to complexity combined with an openness to long timeframes as the main reconfigurations required of residents. She explains that in design and planning projects at the scale of a whole neighborhood,

> you're working on a much bigger problem, which requires looking at things in their most complex
>
> ways. So there's a lot of overlap and interaction. And it takes longer to look at those things. It also
>
> takes longer to activate all the components. And I think there's a level of frustration from the
>
> community, because it's more than they've ever been engaged in, and then the realities that come with
>
> that are also deeper. So, it's a much different level of investment. It's much different than going out
>
> and organizing a pick up of litter at the waterfront. We're trying to talk about a lot of stakeholders and
>
> their interests. We're trying to talk about the life of the river, the life of the community, the life of the
>
> economy. We're trying to engage them in a lot of complex ideas.

Resistances

In Horrigan's account of the Binghamton practice story, every reconfiguration identified above generates resistance. "I think there is definitely resistance to the whole dynamic" among some, but not all of the students, Horrigan says. Some students resist working in groups. They resist taking time away from learning fairly straightforward technical design skills following a linear syllabus in order to learn complicated civic skills where they must figure out what happens next themselves. They resist adding civic processes and outcomes to what counts as the measures of their success. They resist the time, effort, and inconvenience of shifting the space of learning from the familiar, upscale campus to the unfamiliar—and in the Binghamton case, decidedly downscale and gritty—community.

With respect to some of the neighborhood residents, there is a resistance to the effort and energy required to sustain active participation in the work. There is a resistance to learning the concepts and language of design and

planning. There is a resistance to complexity, to thinking both big and small, to long timeframes and nonlinear processes that often do not appear to be going anywhere or to be producing anything of value quickly enough. And there is a resistance to shifting from ingrained attitudes of cynicism, hopelessness and victimization to attitudes that reflect faith in their own wisdom and power and the possibilities processes of public work hold in helping them to build a better neighborhood.

Horrigan's account of her experience reveals additional resistances from elsewhere: specifically, from some staff in Binghamton's City Hall and from some colleagues in the Department of Landscape Architecture at Cornell. Horrigan expects and accepts resistance from these places. A democratic, civic orientation to design and planning is still in many ways subversive and countercultural, she says. It is at odds with the technocratic view that is deeply inscribed in the culture of landscape architecture, one that is embraced both within the profession and without. The methods, purposes, timeframes, values, politics, and pedagogy of a democratic reconfiguration of the profession are not fully understood or accepted. For example, while city officials and staff have endorsed and supported Horrigan's work with the North Side neighborhood, Horrigan reports that they are having trouble accepting the messy and unpredictable reality of what it looks like in practice. Their resistance to accepting this reality is reflected in their attempts to hold the work to the same criteria and expectations of a technocratic design and planning process. It must also be pointed out that democratic practice in landscape architecture has especially significant implications for issues of power and control. Processes that change power dynamics and realities are often actively and passively resisted, as anyone who has become engaged in them can attest.

Finally, in reflecting on her experience in using service-learning to teach a civic orientation to landscape architecture, Horrigan describes how she is also resistant to the reconfigurations the work requires of her. "I continue to learn how difficult it is to do this stuff," she says.

> It is difficult to embrace complexity. That is very hard. As much as I believe in all this stuff theoretically, it is hard to do it all and continually engage at that level. Part of me says keep trying to be more effective. The other part of me says just to pull out, it's too hard. I could just go back to another way of doing things and it would be a lot easier. There would be a lot less dimensions to it. I'm definitely at a moment in my career and my life where I'm asking, "What do I want to be doing with this stuff?" Don't think that I don't think about it every day.

So far, Horrigan has not given up and gone back to an "easier" way of teaching. She presses on as a self-described "resistor" herself. Up against the seriousness and depth of the multiple reconfigurations and resistances her work requires and generates—not to mention the enormous investment of energy and time it takes—she resists giving up. She is sustained and inspired by the integrity and commitment of many of her students, and by the wisdom and spirit of many people from the neighborhoods and communities she has worked with. She is also sustained by her faith in and commitment to the democratic possibilities of her profession, possibilities she has not just imagined but has actually seen in operation in places like the North Side of Binghamton, New York.

Professional Work as Public Work

William Sullivan (1995, p. xvi) observes in his study of professionalism in American life, *Work and Integrity*, that professionalism in its "worst" forms "can lock individuals in a narrow focus upon technical competence, and sometimes individual success, to the exclusion of all other considerations." Paula Horrigan's approach to service-learning is aimed at providing landscape architecture students with the experiences and skills they will need to place "other considerations"—namely civic considerations—at the center of their developing professional identities and practices. Much like Martin in engineering and Brubaker and Ostroff in biology, Horrigan encourages her students to approach their work as *public* work, integrating their identities as professionals with their identities as citizens. In doing so, she is teaching her students a work-centered conception of citizenship, one that is distinctly different than conceptions that are centered on volunteerism or voting (Boyte and Kari, 1996, 2000; Battistoni 2002). Scholars in professional programs of study who are utilizing service-learning to educate for civic professionalism are, in effect, enlarging and deepening the democratic possibilities, impacts, and meanings of professional work. By joining with citizens outside the academy in serious public work, students and scholars are also contributing to the strengthening of American democracy, positioning the university as a partner in democratic renewal in ways that push beyond one-way provisions of expert technical assistance or volunteer service.

While Horrigan's approach to educating the civic professional appears in some ways to be both rewarding and promising, her experience rather starkly illustrates its many difficult challenges, raising questions not only about the ultimate viability and sustainability of her work, but of the work of others who are committed to educating for civic professionalism in their fields and professions as well. The fact that such work is challenging should not come as a surprise. Higher education's historical role in shaping professional culture and practice has not exactly been

conducive to educating the civic professional. As Bledstein (1976) argues, the university played (and continues to play) a key role in the development and support of a narrowly careerist, antidemocratic "culture of professionalism" in American life. In Bledstein's view, this culture isolates professionals from the public, transforms citizens into clients, breeds a public attitude of submission and passivity, and reduces complex moral and political issues to narrow scientific and technical problems, taking them out of public domain and isolating them within the "private" sphere of the professions. Additionally, as political theorist Bernard Crick (1962/1972, p. 96) argues, research universities are dominated by a "social doctrine of Technology" which "holds that all the important problems facing human civilization are technical, and that therefore they are all soluble on the basis of existing knowledge or readily attainable knowledge." The politics of this technocratic doctrine, in Crick's view, is actually an anti-politics that carries a sharply limited view of the purpose and function of education. The technocrat will, in Crick's words, "try to reduce all education to technique and training, and its object will be to produce social-engineers to transform society into something radically more efficient and effective" (p. 98).

It is important to point out that while universities contribute to the development and support of an antidemocratic culture of professionalism, its presence in American society is not solely the "fault" of the university. Rather, the development and support of such a culture is a collaborative effort that involves a wide range of forces and players. Even students collaborate by entering professional programs of study already embracing a technocratic view of how their chosen profession should be framed and conducted, resisting attempts to reconfigure it along democratic lines as public work.

In closing, I want to acknowledge that the account provided above of Paula Horrigan's experience in utilizing service-learning as a means for educating the civic professional is decidedly incomplete. While it sheds some light on the nature of the challenges involved in educating for civic professionalism, it raises a number of serious questions that require further inquiry. For example, given the kinds of reconfigurations it demands, the resistances it generates, and the power and interests that work against it, what can we reasonably expect to be able to accomplish by utilizing service-learning as a means for educating the civic professional? What strategies might prove useful in overcoming the resistances this kind of work generates? What else will be required for such work to be successful?

To answer such questions, the experiences and views of students, community members, and others with a stake in professional education must be drawn out and examined along with those of service-learning practitioners. The kind of research that might prove especially helpful here is action research that aims not only to critically examine

the motivations, nature and outcomes of service-learning for civic professionalism but also to build the kinds of theory, knowledge, and power that are needed to improve practice as well. New forms of narrative and practitioner inquiry could be particularly effective in pursuing the latter of these aims (e.g., McEwan and Egan 1995; Ritchie and Wilson 2000; Lyons and LaBoskey 2002).

Whatever approach is taken, both researchers and practitioners should keep one thing in mind: education for civic professionalism involves serious political as well as pedagogical challenges. Its viability and sustainability depend on the ability of scholars, students, and supportive publics to make a case for its value and significance, to develop effective ways for it to be pursued, and to organize and maintain a space for it in the academy. There is a significant research agenda to be developed and pursued here, as well as an organizing agenda. From my perspective, both agendas must be developed and pursued in critically constructive ways, mindful of tough realities that stand in the way while also striving to enhance our positive understanding of how higher education might contribute to enlarging and deepening the democratic practices and contributions of the professions.

Notes

[1]Michigan State College is the previous name for Michigan State University.
[2] Instead of civic professionalism, some scholars (e.g., Gutman 1987/1999; Olson and Dzur 2004) use the term "democratic professionalism" to name the embrace of a democratic identity and practice among the professions. In his study of the changing role of professionals in politics and public life, Brint (1994) uses the term "social trustee professionalism" to name a kind of professionalism that is attentive to moral and social purposes and that involves democratic forms of communication between professionals and interested publics.
[3]Many interests and forces well beyond higher education combine to influence and shape culture, politics, and practice in the professions. For insight into these forces, see especially Freidson (1986, 2001), Abbott (1988), Brint (1994), and Perkin (1996).
[4] The AAHE series, edited by Edward Zlotkowski, currently consists of 21 volumes covering a wide range of disciplines. For a description of the series, go to: www.aahe.org/publications.htm.
[5] The "soft" skills that were added to accreditation criteria for engineering programs in 1998 have been carried forward in subsequent years. In the current criteria for 2004-2005 accreditation cycle, explicit language relating to the pursuit of sustainability has been added. See Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (2003). The current statement of criteria is available at the ABET website at <http://www.abet.org>.
[6] All quotations of Paula Horrigan used in this paper are drawn from the transcripts of five tape-recorded interviews. The first interview was conducted by Leah Mayor in November of 2002. Four follow-up interviews were conducted by Scott Peters on October 30, 2003, February 26, 2004, March 8, 2004, and March 12, 2004.
[7] A view of civic learning that includes a blend of knowledge, skills, and values is presented in Howard (2001). While the syllabus for Horrigan's course does not include a specific list of civic knowledge, skills, and values as explicit learning goals, all three were present in the accounts she provided of her intentions and experiences in my

interviews with her. For a discussion of different approaches to conceptualizing and facilitating civic learning in service-learning courses, see Battistoni (2002).

References

Abbott, A. B. (1988). *The system of professions: An essay on the division of expert labor*. Chicago: University of

   Chicago Press.

Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology. (2003). *Criteria for accrediting engineering programs*.

   Available at the ABET website at <http://www.abet.org>.

Alexander, C. (1977). *A pattern language.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Battistoni, R. M. (2002). *Civic engagement across the curriculum: A resource book for service-learning faculty in

   all disciplines*. Providence, RI: Campus Compact.

Bledstein, B. J. (1976). *The culture of professionalism: The middle class and the development of higher education

   in America*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc.

Boyer, E. L. (1987). *College: The undergraduate experience in America*. New York: Harper & Row.

Boyte, H. C., & Kari, N. N. (1996). *Building America: The democratic promise of public work*. Philadelphia:

   Temple University Press.

Boyte, H. C., & Kari, N. N. (2000). Renewing the democratic spirit in American colleges and universities: Higher

   education as public work. In T. Ehrlich (Ed.), *Civic responsibility and higher education*, pp. 37-59. Westport,

   CT: Oryx Press.

Brint, S. (1994). *In an age of experts: The changing role of professionals in politics and public life*. Princeton, NJ:

   Princeton University Press.

Brubaker, D. C., & Ostroff, J. H. (Eds.) (2000). *Life, learning, and community: Concepts and models for service-

   learning*. Washington, DC: AAHE.

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research*. San

   Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Colby, A., Ehrlich, T., Beaumont, E., & Stephens, J. (2003). *Educating citizens: Preparing America's

   undergraduates for lives of moral and civic responsibility*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Crick, B. (1962/1972). *In defense of politics.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Fischer, F. (2000). *Citizens, experts, and the environment: The politics of local knowledge*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Flyvbjerg, B. (2001). *Making social science matter: Why social inquiry fails and how it can succeed again*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Forester, J. (1999). *The deliberative practitioner: Encouraging participatory planning processes*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Freidson, E. (1986). *Professional powers: A study of the institutionalization of formal knowledge*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Freidson, E. (1986). *Professionalism: The third logic*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gutmann, A. (1987/1999). *Democratic education*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Halprin, L. (1970). *The RSVP cycles: Creative processes in the human environment.* New York: G. Braziller.

Hannah, J. A. (1945). The place of the land-grant college in the public educational system of the future. In W.L. Slate (Ed.), *Proceedings of the association of land-grant colleges and universities, fifty-eighth annual convention*, pp. 75-79. Washington, DC: USDA.

Hester, R. T. (1984). *Planning neighborhood space with people.* New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company.

Horrigan, P. (2004). Shifting ground: Design as civic action and community building. Unpublished manuscript.

Howard, J. (2001). Service-learning course design workbook. *Michigan Journal of Community Service-Learning*, Companion Volume, Summer 2001.

King, S. (1989). *Co-design: A process of design participation.* New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company.

Kinley, D. (1897). Culture the aim of education. *The Illini*, October 15, p. 46.

Lyons, N., & LaBoskey, V. K. (Eds.) (2002). *Narrative inquiry in practice: Advancing the knowledge of teaching*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

McEwan, H., & Egan, K. (Eds.) (1995). *Narrative in teaching, learning, and research*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Martin, P. T. (2000). Service-learning and civil and environmental engineering: A department shows how it can be done. In E. Tsang (Ed.), *Projects that Matter: Concepts and models for service-learning in engineering*, pp. 135-147. Washington, DC: AAHE.

Mathews, D. (1994/1999). *Politics for people: Finding a responsible public voice.* Champaign, IL: University of

    Illinois Press.

Olson, S. M., & Dzur, Albert W. (2004). Revisiting informal justice: Restorative justice and democratic

    professionalism. *Law and Society Review*, 38(1), pp. 139-176.

Perkin, H. (1996). *The third revolution: Professional elites in the modern world.* New York: Routledge.

Personal Narratives Group (Eds.) (1989). *Interpreting women's lives: Feminist theory and personal narratives.*

    Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Riessman, C. K. (1993). *Narrative analysis.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Ritchie, J. S., & Wilson, D. E. (2000). *Teacher narrative as critical inquiry: Rewriting the script.* New York:

Teachers College Press.

Schneekloth, L. H., & Shibley, R. G. (1995). *Placemaking: The art and practice of building communities.* New

    York: Wiley.

Schneider, C. G. (2000). Educational missions and civic responsibility: Toward the engaged academy. In T. Ehrlich

    (Ed.), *Civic responsibility and higher education*, pp. 98-123. Westport, CT: Oryx Press.

Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action.* New York: Basic Books.

Scott, J. C. (1998). *Seeing like a state: How certain schemes to improve the human condition have failed.* New

    Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Seamon, D. (Ed.) (1993). *Dwelling, seeing, and designing: Toward a phenomenological ecology.* Albany, NY:

    SUNY Press.

Seidman, I. (1998). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social*

    sciences. New York: Teachers College Press.

Sullivan, W. M. (1995). *Work and integrity: The crisis and promise of professionalism in America.* New York:

    HarperBusiness.

Sullivan, W. M. (1999). What is left of professionalism after managed care? *Hastings Center Report* 29, no. 2

    (1999), pp. 7-13.

Sullivan, W. M. (2000). Institutional Identity and Social Responsibility in Higher Education. In T. Ehrlich (Ed.),

    Civic responsibility and higher education, pp. 19-36. Westport, CT: Oryx Press

Sullivan, W. M. (2003). Engaging the civic option: A new academic professionalism? *Campus Compact Reader*, Summer 2003, pp. 10-17.

Tsang, E. (Ed.) (2000). *Projects that Matter: Concepts and models for service-learning in engineering*. Washington, D.C.: AAHE.

Wellman, J. V. (2000). Accounting for the civic role: Assessment and accountability strategies for civic education and institutional service. In T. Ehrlich (Ed.), *Civic responsibility and higher education*, pp. 323-344. Westport, CT: Oryx Press.

Wilshire, B. (1990). *The moral collapse of the university: Professionalism, purity, and alienation*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Author

Scott J. Peters is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Education at Cornell University. His research explores the historical evolution and contemporary renewal of democratic purposes and practices in American higher education, with a focus on state and land-grant universities.