An Evaluation of “I-Change” and Other Social Civility Campaigns
Caitlin Vitosky

EVOKE
About the Ethnographer
I guess I'm not really sure what information regarding my background is relevant to my project topic, so I'll start with the basics. I'm a white female who grew up in Urbana and went through the Urbana public school system. Now, I'm currently a Junior in Anthropology and Classics. This ANTH 411 class was my first upper level Anthropology class. Maybe that is why it took me a long time to decide on a topic for this project.

I work at the Ice Arena as the Learn-to-Skate Coordinator and as a private figure skating coach, which requires me to pass a significant portion of time at the rink. Additionally, most of my classes this semester were very close to the rink, with only one of them held in a building on the main quad. Therefore, my introduction to this I-Change campaign was through the free-hand, spray painted responses to this campaign that I photographed on the West side of 5th street between Armory and Chalmers, the block on which the rink sits. I initially wanted to focus on "chalking" sidewalks on campus in relation to graffiti and how that is used by students as a medium for expression in general, communication, and advertising. However, I was intrigued by the I-Change logos and the free-hand responses since I didn't really understand them. After some basic research into the campaign, I decided to focus more on the campaign itself rather than sidewalk chalking because I was interested in why it focused on bigotry but not racism - something that still seems prevalent on this campus. The concept of race and issue of racism has also always been something of interest to me since my mother taught at an unusually diverse public school for the majority of my childhood. Therefore, I was introduced to the many issues surrounding race and racism at a very early age. So, with my introduction, I also saw the major negative reactions to the campaign without even really knowing what it was all about. Perhaps it is also important that I saw negative reactions to the campaign first and more prevalently (although in general, it can probably be said that people don't spray paint positive reactions to campaigns like that very often).

Since I didn't have class on the quad, I didn't really walk through the main quad much this semester and I guess I missed the majority of the I-Change campaign and also missed the huge chalked campaign ads in the back (South end) of the Illini Union. So I really started working on this project after the campaign had ended, so that may also affect my findings.

EXPLORE
Question
What questions is your inquiry contingent upon?
In addition to my newest entry for my questions, I would like to look at what the student responses to this I-Change campaign tell us about our student body. I originally decided to change topics after seeing spray-painted responses to the "bigot" and "stupid" signs on the sidewalks. I have provided digital images of these responses below, the first four of which were all found on Fifth Street between Armory and Chalmers streets on the same block that the ice arena stands on (the other two were found on the quad only).

Files:
UIUC Thinks.JPG (Mon 10/16/2006 14:14)
Ethnocentrism.JPG (Mon 10/16/2006 14:15)
I've decided to change topics and now want to focus on the group I-Change and their sidewalk postings "bigot" and what their message is supposed to be. I'm not familiar with their group but I've seen a lot of their messages on the campus sidewalks recently and am curious about them.

Who is behind the I-Change campaign and what is their goal in spray-chalking campus sidewalks and posting signs with words such as bigot, ugly, stupid, and rude? When did this begin and why was it started? Who funds this campaign and is it a long or short term project? Do students actually care about this campaign and do they pay attention to the marketing ploys of this campaign? Has it been effective? What does this campaign and it’s mission statement tell us about what the Illini Union Board thinks about our student body and their social skills or lack there of? What does it tell us about how the University administration views issues such as diversity and community building in regard to our student body? Who is this aimed at; grad students and undergrad or just undergrad? What about faculty and staff? If it does not target them, then why not? Who actually was involved in writing it?

I have provided digital images of the spray-chalked I-Change messages below which all were found on the quad

Files:
PA140763.JPG (Mon 10/16/2006 14:22)
PA140800.JPG (Mon 10/16/2006 14:23)
I Chief 2.JPG (Mon 10/16/2006 14:24)
I Chief.JPG (Mon 10/16/2006 14:24)
PA140808.JPG (Mon 10/16/2006 14:25)
Ugly.JPG (Mon 10/16/2006 14:26)
Stupid.JPG (Mon 10/16/2006 14:27)

The question behind my initial inquiry concerns the qualifications and process for hiring academic professionals such as directors, assistant deans, deans, etc. As a “townie” and daughter of an administrator (of the whole University of Illinois not just UIUC), I have often wondered why such positions within UIUC do not require some sort of management/leadership background in order to help these people in their new appointments as academic administrators.

Files:
Caitlin Vitosky Inquiry Page 1.doc (Tue 10/03/2006 0:00)

Plan
How will you go about answering your inquiry?
I definitely want to do a survey. A focus group on this topic would be more time efficient than individual interviews but at this point is hard to find people to talk to. Perhaps I'm looking the wrong place. I want to try to do a focus group if I can get enough people together.

My first step in this research project should probably be to revisit and reread the entries on the discussion board which was provided by the IUB in order to stimulate discussion on the campaign. The direct link is: http://webtools.uiuc.edu/blog/view?blogId=42.
There are not very many entries in total but the content of them, if I am allowed to use the content, explains a lot about both the campaign itself and has many interesting student responses.

I would also like to try to interview the Contact Person for the IUB I-Change Campaign. From researching the I-Change campaign and this person’s name I found that this campaign was initiated by the Illini Union Board and is being headed up by the Illini Union Director’s undergraduate interns. This person along with some of this person’s friends have also created a Facebook group titled “I-Change” and post information about the campaign on that webpage as well. There is a second creator for that page that I would also like to interview. Perhaps I could also post entries on both the IUB discussion board and the Facebook group to ask if any of the campaign participants or the student responders would let me interview them either individually or as a focus group.

My next step in researching this campaign, would be to look at Penn State’s campaign, off of which the UIUC campaign was based. I think this might be important historical background information.

I would then want to conduct a medium scale survey of the student body, perhaps by distributing the survey on the Quad first. It would probably be beneficial to distribute the survey in other areas as well, like dorms, the undergrad library, maybe even post it on the two discussion boards I found with a way for them to return it to me securely.

In regards to what texts I would use to help me, I know that I will definitely use the readings from week 3, including Fairclough, Strauss, and Balshem. Fairclough’s should be especially helpful in analyzing assumptions made by the documents I read as well as the students’ and administrators’ surveys and interviews that I conduct. In addition, I will need to use Briggs’s and Weiss’s articles on interviewing to help me prepare for these surveys and interviews. And, although I have not yet read Quinn’s article on schemas, it sounds as though that may also be helpful. Finally, Morgan’s article on focus groups and the Fink/Kosecoff article on surveys will also be helpful.

**OBSERVE**

**What observations, or findings are you encountering in your research?**

As much as I wanted to do a survey on I-Change itself, that didn't work out since it was finished by the time I began researching it. However, I would like to include, as a supplement, some excerpts taken from the I-Change discussion board. As mentioned by Professor Moody, the most interesting aspect of the campaign is it's idea of civility. This is reflected to some degree in these comments. These comments also are a good selection of the wide range of student responses, which allows me a little space to continue to discuss student responses. Unfortunately, these responses often focused more on the methods used in marketing this campaign instead of the campaign itself. Each line break indicates a different response and my comments are prefaced by my initials, CV.

```
“Many people are ridiculing the program and calling the means of marketing it "vandalism." In reality the organizers of this program are just trying to make a difference in the community. The time that people have spent criticizing this program could have been put to better use, like attempting to improve society.”
```

```
“Shouldn’t the student body be working united as one to help fix the overall problem instead of fighting against one another over the temporary means a message is conveyed.
```
It saddens and disappoints me that some people care more about a word on the sidewalk instead of the overall picture."

IChange's Bigot is more than just a chalked word on the sidewalk, it has a philosophy behind it, and that's pressure-washer-proof. I think I-Change is a cool idea, with a unique marketing plan and runs on unconventional terms...to bad people don’t like change on any level, unless its a complete boycott to avoid what they don’t understand - don’t let that define you.

CV: These first three responses were some of the most supportive of the campaign that I found on the online discussion board. These three people all received very negative remarks from other students, some of which I posted below. Clearly, these three bought into the civility aspect and overall philosophy behind I-Change's campaign and did not seem bothered, unlike many others, that the campaign stopped at posters and chalking and did not include any events or forums.

I was a very touchy-feely "don't say gay or retarded around me" person once too and recently I got over it. I make it a point not to use those words, unless I am implying joy or medically diagnosed disability, respectively, but I also realized that people would not change, unless it hit them in the face.

CV: This particular person chose the pseudonym "I Think" as his/her name for the discussion board and posted more than anyone else. In general, s/he actually seemed to support the ideas that I-Change was based upon. However, as the last statement shows, "I Think" thought the actual campaign was a waste since "people [will] not change, unless it hit[s] them in the face". This comment encompasses a common sentiment among those who chose to post on the discussion board. Many seem to think that the campaign had good intentions with poor follow through. Incidentally, they tended to focus more on the follow through and less on the actual meat of the campaign's philosophy. This brings into question the effectiveness of the campaign as a whole, since according to both my findings and another student in this same class's findings, so few people even knew what the campaign was let alone what the focus of it was. In fact, in discussing my project with the ANTH 411 class, the only other person that knew what this campaign was (or that it existed) was the person that also chose to focus their project on I-Change. With that in mind, it seems that the people with discussion posts of this sentiment have a valid point, even if stated in rather frank speech.

I've begun to realize that there IS a difference between those kinds of things that specifically connect a certain group to an undesirable trait AND the myriad of words used to describe the minority groups.

CV: This post was written by one of the founders of the I-Change campaign, and thus it is not surprising that this excerpt is from one of the more supportive posts. In conjunction with the interview I conducted with him, this gets at the base of what the campaign is
supposed to be about. As stated earlier, not many people seemed to catch onto this idea and focused more on whether the logos were spray-chalked or spray-painted. The actual idea of a civil campaign was completely lost in arguments over this subject, and others, even after posts such as this. One of the few people that did seem to get the point was "I-Think," who posted the following comment embedded in a very lengthy post.

Blowing the two words that are brought up by the campaign out of proportion shows how aware you are of the GREATER topic that this campaign is meant to address. Most people miss it...thus campaign is not adequately set up...those who agree with the ideals of the campaign did so before it ever hit the campus.

CV: "I-Think" was addressing another person who discussed the modern day usage of the words "gay" and "retarded," arguing that they have become so commonplace that any true negative connotation had been diluted into almost non-existance. I-Think's response makes a harsh accusation, and legitimately so, in regards to the I-Change campaign which seems to have failed to accurately affect change among the undergraduate student body, since the student responses have generally focused around topics tangent to the actual focus of the campaign. In regards to the idea of civility, though, this I-Think's post also suggests to some extent that any civil campaign would fail simply because the people that would agree with such philosophy already agreed. This makes sense since civility itself is a basic principle upon which our ideas of democracy are based. It is fair to say that most people living within a democratic society generally agree with the ideals of both civility and democracy simply by being raised in a democratic society and continuing to live in one. That said, I don't know that the statement made by I-Think is necessarily fair in relation to I-Change since the campaign did not go any further than sidewalk chalk ads and posters in class rooms. Perhaps, if run like the one at Penn State, it would have affected more change and produced different, and more positive results.

Honestly, the campaigns for this target is nothing more than just a mirror reflection of our current sociological structure. The fact is, these are just broad spectrums without actually knowing the people who do it... this is just a bunch of fascist idiots who just want to keep their ideal beliefs and force them among other people who don't share it. This is nothing but a waste of time for people, so in my opinion, this I-Change is the exact embodiment of everything that they try to battle. I don't even care what anyone thinks about my statements or anything, if this I-Change has their own righteous beliefs, then i do as well.

CV: The above statement seems rather confused on the definition of fascism. Then again, there does not seem to be any one agreed upon definition of exactly what fascism is, so perhaps this person started a new faction. As far as forcing "ideals among people," well, let's give this person the benefit of the doubt and assume they meant "upon" people. The one thing about this statement that I found most odd, was that the author claims not to care what people think about their statement. This was a surprisingly common statement - not caring about others' opinions - and yet they continued to argue with each other
through the online discussion board. Clearly, this campaign achieved one goal in getting people to talk about it; a goal that Amanda, my first interviewee, claimed was key to the campaign. Unfortunately, much of the talking involved confused statements such as the above, which looks as though it made true discussion rather tedious. Then again, discussion through posts on an online discussion board is tedious to begin with. Back to the main point, though, these discussion boards participants clearly care what others think. However, at times they do seem a little confused. Also interesting is this person's claim that I-Change embodies everything it attempts to battle. Exactly how s/he came to this conclusion, I am not sure, but that doesn't really matter. The fact is that this person, and others with similar sentiments, feel the I-Change campaign is no different than the people it is attempting to change, which is a direct response to Amanda's statement that

It is my opinion that this campaign is misguided and is a poor use of student/faculty/university resources. If you really want the campus to unite and come together, campaign about something that people really care about and that hasn't been jammed into their heads since the first grade. The world isn't fair, people say things that overgeneralize and stereotype. My parents can't pay for me to go to school here, I have learned to deal with it. My brother is severely autistic, but I have found that terms like 'retard' are social cliches used to describe 'normal' people who do something stupid and even use it myself. Don't tell me what words are 'wrong' or 'hurtful' when none of them apply to you.

CV: The sentiment in the above comment is another common one found on the discussion board. I'm not sure, however, that one can justify an argument such as this by simply stating that others do not have the right to claim offense to words that do not apply to them. Clearly, from looking at the discussion board, there are people that do take offense to these words whether or not the words actually apply. That seems to be the point of the campaign, as far as I can tell. From both the two interviews I have conducted, and the posters I've examined, it seems that the people that began this campaign take offense to these words and deem them inappropriate. However, I am not clear as to how or why they came to that conclusion.

The concept behind this project is admirable, and the marketing techniques used have been strong and effective. So what next? What does I-Change do? A month from now, a semester from now, when people talk about it, what will they say? "Oh yeah, they had those signs and posters...?"

CV: I found this comment very interesting, since not many people (on the discussion board) seem to have caught onto the fact that the campaign stopped when the chalking and posters stopped. I found myself asking very similar questions and not finding very satisfactory answers. Most interesting to me, in regards to tone and word choice, is that this person seems to be one of the only people that was able to get their point across constructively.

Are there programs, events, meetings, discussions, etc. that will be organized or
CV: As stated previously, there are very few constructive comments. The above statement is one of the other few. The other interesting thing involved with this discussion board, is that unless the questions were attacking the campaign, they generally were not answered. The above two comments are perfect examples of this. I found this strange since the moderator for the discussion board was one of the founders of the campaign. I would have expected some sort of effort to explain the reasoning behind why the campaign planners chose not to hold any events in conjunction with the campaign.

In general, I was rather disappointed with the discussion board, since so many people seemed unable to remove their focus from the chalking/spray paint issue. However, that in itself makes it clear that not having any sort of event in conjunction ended up being a detriment to the campaign. Not many people really discussed the actual issues involved in the campaign and when they did, as seen above, the discussion generally revolved around using words like "gay" and "retarded" or they focused on the subject of interracial couples. A few others mentioned the targeted stereotypes like engineers having no social life, but that was a distant second. It was interesting that no one really mentioned anything about why people throw trash on Green Street, or why it's offensive to use profanity in public. Even the discussion board moderator never made an effort to get the discussion participants to focus on the campaign's other issues and in turn look at the campaign as a whole. The last thing I wanted to mention in relation to this discussion board is that readers should take a look at the "views" count for each topic posted. Even though there are only about 64 actual posts, there have been 2,820 views total. Clearly, from the "views" counts, students were paying attention to both the campaign and the discussion board. After considering that, not holding concurrent events makes even less sense.

This is my Inquiry Page #6, reflecting on the uses of a survey without actually having conducted one.

Conducting a survey for my particular project makes too much sense not to do one. It would not be my primary data, of course, but supplementary to the few interviews I have done so far. I liked Jennifer’s idea of using surveys to find potential interviewees outside of just using their straight data. I have a hard time seeing a survey as a tool for primary data collection. Then again, I have yet to see an anthropologist use a survey as their main source for an analysis. Even so, I personally feel it should be used only as a supplement, especially because it is often hard to find people willing to take a survey longer than a page, which does not generally allow for many detailed questions or answers. In addition, it is rather impersonal, which only compounds the above issues.

Beyond that, there are still other issues I’m concerned about in relation to surveys. One is deciding where to conduct the survey. For my particular project, I’m not sure it would matter very much as long as I did it on campus. However, I do think there are generally some places that would generate more opportunities for surveys (not necessarily better results). For example, since my project focuses on the civil campaign “I-Change,” the Quad or inside the Union would make the most sense, since those two areas were a major part of the campaign and are areas that tons of students pass through each day. In Jennifer’s case, using the basement of the Union seemed to work well but perhaps conducting a survey at an actual mall might be more beneficial to her particular project. For mine, the basement would not be my first choice simply because the majority of the
campaign involved posters and chalking, of which there is not much in the basement area where most students congregate. If, however, I didn’t succeed at finding enough people to participate outside the Union or on the first floor, I would probably go there next.

Another thing that bothers me about surveys, which I’m not sure how to work with, is what to do if you get answers you don’t expect. Clearly, it is not unusual to get unexpected answers. However, if the survey is anonymous, there is no opportunity to further explore the reasoning behind the answers. I guess that would be a reason to include contact information but that doesn’t necessarily guarantee an interview let alone multiple. At least in observing and other forms of direct verbal contact, the researcher would have some sort of chance to ask more when an answer surprises them, or even challenge the answer. Of course, that also does not always work, as my own interviews have demonstrated, so maybe that’s not a fair argument but it seems like it should be. Beyond just unexpected answers, what about if someone gives vague answers? Jennifer mentioned that with her survey experience there was a wide array of answer length and detail. If someone includes in their answer concerning where they shop that they often go to American Eagle, but doesn’t include anything about what they buy there, that answer doesn’t help very much. The person could be buying all of their clothing there or simply socks for all the researcher knows. I realize that a lot of this has to do with the type of survey one conducts and how once formulates the questions but it seems like it would take several versions of a survey to figure out what works best for your project. Let alone answers, you might not realize problems in the survey until after it’s been conducted. I guess the same can be true for any other form of data collection, since self-evaluations post-research often reveal unseen opportunities for improvement. However, at least with the others you can sometimes catch them as you go. With a survey, once it’s been filled out, your interaction with that person ends (at least until you contact them again if you have their permission).

So, I guess I’m finding that although I like the idea of a survey as a supplement, I’m nervous about conducting one myself, since there seem to be so many things to think about when writing the survey and then when conducting it, that I’m afraid of forgetting something or a lot of somethings.

I attached the links below as a source of background on the Penn State version of the “I-Change” campaign and as a sort of history of the origin of the Illinois version. After reading through them, I got the sense that not only was the Penn State campaign more thoroughly thought out and executed but also that it extended beyond the “shock and awe” stage, which I-Change never made it past, and actually tried to affect change on the campus. Furthermore, from what I can tell, the Penn State campaign was also given more guidance by university staff members rather than put together solely by students. That said, it is interesting to note that the Penn State Student Government is no longer considered as the Official voice of the student body. I’m not sure whether that has anything to do with their campaign or if those events were unrelated. I’m guessing they’re unrelated simply because the campaign lasted more than a year and was on-going as compared to I-Change’s month long campaign. I didn’t really want to do a comparison, since I don’t think it’s absolutely necessary but the more information I gather about Penn State’s campaign, which was I-Change’s model, it is at least helpful in analyzing I-Change in the sense that it really makes I-Change look poorly developed and pretty naive. Not to mention, poorly executed in relation to follow-up programs and discussion in general. This is not to say that Penn State’s campaign is not problematic but my focus is on Illinois not Penn State, currently anyway, so for the purposes of this project I won’t go into much more detail about Penn State. Instead, I decided to provide the links in case you deem it necessary to have more in depth background information as an aid for reviewing my work.
These are excerpts from my first real interview with one of the founding participants of the I-Change campaign started by the Illini Union Director’s Office. I’m not sure yet what I want to focus on, so I decided to go the Bourdieu route and type out a full transcription first, so I have something to work with later. Ideally, I would like to use Duneier’s method of intertwining quotes with his own arguments but I need my arguments first in order to do that. Nonetheless, these two excerpts alone are very telling of this campaign and what it’s all about. Unfortunately, at this point I am rather disappointed with it because it seems that, although the people involved are very well-intentioned, the whole project was poorly planned beyond marketing. I realized that I started this project almost after the campaign was over, so I hoped I might at least find that there had been some events to accompany the campaign (which I could then discuss with other interviewees) but that was not the case. I’m hesitant to critique their efforts because it seems they mean well but at the same time it the campaign was really the skeleton of what could have been a really great thing. I need to finish the transcript of my other interview because there is more information that helps this point in particular. However, before I critique it too much from personal opinion, I feel I need to use either a survey or a focus group (maybe multiple) to get at a better understanding of the student reactions and responses to this campaign.

As for field notes beyond the transcription, I didn’t really write much down and I’m not sure why. I have a few other possible sources for information given to me by my informants. These include the Daily Illini, the Orange and Blue Observer, WCIA news channel, and Penn State’s website. I thought about taking notes on our settings – one was held at the ice arena and the other in the Illini Union Director’s office – but that information didn’t seem relevant to the overall topic for this project. Similarly, I decided that including opinions of the people I interviewed was not really necessary. I think I’d like to focus more on how students talk about this campaign and their reactions to it, so including non-verbal cues didn’t seem appropriate with these two because they were involved in the creation of the campaign, so their opinions are automatically biased toward “their” campaign. For the other students I interview, however, non-verbal cues may prove to be important, so I’ll probably need to rethink my field note methods.

Anyway, take a look at the two excerpts for now and hopefully I’ll have more to post soon.

Excerpt #1

Me: Are you trying to get more people involved in marketing or even just the campaign itself?

Amanda: Um, yeah, we definitely made it open to a ton of our close friends just cause we know, you know, they’re reliable people and I think he definitely wanted to get... Paul, definitely wants to get other organizations involved but, I mean, it’s always been a big problem whenever you get a lot of people involved that stuff doesn’t get done efficiently.

Me: Right.

Amanda: And so, we really wanted to focus on the posters and, um, he saw a great turnout from his friends so I guess he depended on them mostly for marketing and it was enough people because it was only like two people per, you know, stack of posters and so, you know, we had enough. Um, but he was definitely open for people to help out and
sometimes people would bring friends and stuff.

Me: I guess just for my benefit with this, um, I’ve looked at the website but can you give me a better explanation of what the goals are for the campaign?

Amanda: Yeah, it’s honestly just to get people to think. I mean, it’s not supposed to be making people go out and do something and change – if they do that’s great – but mostly it’s to be like to stop and think maybe I should think twice when I say “that’s so gay” or “that’s retarded”. So, you know, I... I think it was very subtle in some kind of ways minus the chalking I guess cause that really caused a stir but I really thought that people no matter if they hated it or liked it, they really thought about it and the fact that people responded to the website – and I don’t know if you checked out the discussion board.

Me: Yeah

Amanda: Yeah, I mean, people were obviously, some were pissed some were like loving it, so it’s like at least those people were thinking about it. So we hope to someday follow up programs but right now our focus was just the posters and the chalking.

Me: Ok, so there wasn’t a discussion forum or anything like that or –

Amanda: No, I mean, the discussion board was the discussion-

Me: Was the discussion forum-

Amanda: Yeah, yeah.

Excerpt #2

Amanda: ...and the chalking was done primarily on the quad just because, to me, it’s the most high traffic area.

Me: Right

Amanda: And out biggest portion of where we’d chalk was right in front of the Union

Me: Ok

Amanda: And I mean, we’re Union supported, so... we were like okay we’ll just take advantage of that. So, yeah, and um, I think the biggest problem with that was that people thought we were using spray paint and it was spray chalk and so that was what a big stir it was. And it was funny because we actually went to the dean of students to actually get it approved and they were actually really excited about it and, you know, the first time we did the marketing blitz with bigot, um, they had it removed, like they had people come out with sand blasters and remove it and it was inappropriate and all this kind of stuff, so it was kind of crazy to see the University, you know, get all stirred up about it.

Me: Well, I guess I did have a question, that was kind of how I got on this topic in the first place; I don’t know if you walk down fifth street, but on this block they have like written graffiti responses to the bigot-
Amanda: Oh really?

Me: And I have pictures I can show you-

Amanda: Oh, I’ve heard of some like verrry inappropriate words...

Me: Well. Here. I’ve got them on my camera ‘cause I’m using them for part of the project anyway... But, um, where do you think that’s coming from? ‘Cause I was really confused cause I thought I understood the whole point of the-

Amanda: I don’t know, I just think it’s just a bunch... of people that obviously don’t understand the message that are trying, I guess, to upset the people that did it, which I think it’s just ridiculous and honestly the first time I saw it, it almost made me laugh because I thought it was so ridiculous that people actually took that amount of effort to go buy spray paint and go do that, but, I mean, I don’t know... I think that comes from... I know people think that that it’s a type of vandalism – what I-Change is doing – but, um, everyone chalks on the quad.

Me: Well I thought it was interesting - okay this is one that I found –

Amanda: Wow

Me: I think there are just three or four of them... and I thought it was interesting that, I found these on Fifth Street, but I only found one, like that, on the quad. I though that was weird, do you think that had anything to do with-

Amanda: I don’t know maybe the people doing it didn’t want to get caught-

Me: That’s what I wondered-

Amanda: I... I have no idea and honestly I think that’s just a waste of their time to do that, I mean if they want to do a message that’s fine, do the same thing, but they were obviously using spray paint instead of spray chalk, so, I mean... I guess what point are you trying to get across?

This interview was really my introduction to this I-change campaign altogether so I really didn't have anything to use to critique it outside of my own personal opinion, which at the time I did not think was appropriate. After reading the comments, I realize that maybe I should have included more of my personal opinion because I was not trying to defend this group. After looking at Penn State's "We Are" campaign (whose links are posted above and which is where I-Change got the idea), it seems to me that this I-Change campaign is incomplete and rather naive. These people so far seem well meaning but did not devote much time to planning or executing this campaign. Being that the available background information was not sufficient, I wanted to use these initial interviews to simply gather more information rather than begin my questioning of their campaign for fear of insulting or angering my informants from the beginning. That said, I plan to set up a second interview with both of these people as a follow up and as a chance to ask more probing questions.

As that follow up interview never happened, there is more to say on this particular interview...
Amanda clearly misses the point of the spray painted responses, which could also transfer to misunderstanding the discussion board responses, in that the point of these responses is that there are people that clearly do not like this campaign and especially do not like its advertising methods if only because they felt "attacked". Whether or not the responders understand the project is irrelevant since there was not an effort to really explain it beyond the small blurb on the discussion board. In not truly trying to affect change, the campaign irritated many people and their responses are now semi-permanently marked on 5th street as well as online.

As a disclaimer for this interview, I changed topics yesterday and didn’t have time to find someone related to my new topic, so I just asked someone that I knew would let me interview her. For out purposes, I will use the pseudonym Sarah in reference to her. Sarah is a junior in Business and lives here on Campus. She is also an active member of the Greek community on Campus. I’ve known her for about two and a half years.

At the beginning of our interview I wasn’t sure what to focus on, so I began noting our setting and what she was wearing and doing as we spoke. We sat in her living room of her apartment on her couch looking out to her balcony and outside each of us with a Fresca in hand. She has three other roommates, two of which were at home during our interview and both of which continually moved about the apartment but did not really interrupt our interview although you can hear background noise on the recording. Sarah was in her pajama pants and a gray hoodie sweatshirt, apologizing that she was going to take a nap when we finished but she didn’t think I’d mind. We sat cross-legged on her big couch across from each other with the tape recorder between our drinks on the table.

My first question “how did you get to the U of I?” received an answer that immediately made me realize that I had already influenced her answers. Her immediate response was “I go into the U of I by applying first… do you mean how did I pick the U of I?” and once I explained “how did you end up here?” she explained, “Well I applied at like six schools… and … I was definitely going for a big school, so I… chose - I was trying to decide between here and Madison and my Dad said I’d have to pay the difference between in-state and out of state, so…” Her response to me seems typical, but I also realized that because Sarah is my friend, I had explained probably more about the project than I had originally intended. She knew that it was a class project and that I had changed topics so that this interview was more of an exercise. I tried to explain before I started recording that we should treat it more like a conversation than like an interview but it was still apparent that it had the feeling of an interview when questions like “am I being a bad interviewee?” came up after a brief period of silence. I was honest and replied, “No, I’m not sure what to include” but then asked, “What’s your favorite part of being on campus?”. From this small section, I realized that I’d influenced what she was telling me, since she knew it was for class but didn’t know what I was looking for as an answer from her. This definitely made me realize how much more difficult interviewing is than I realized. I didn’t like the feeling that I could possibly be generating her answers based on what I was asking her. It also made me think more about the trust factor in interviews even among friends. Everything suddenly was slightly more formal when I interviewed Sarah. We sat down together on her couch across from each other, when we normally are either at work together talking or out eating together. I rarely go to her apartment to hang out with her. I guess that’s another point – interview setting also can have a direct effect on the direction an interview goes and probably even an indirect effect on the discussion you have with your informants.

The trust factor also had an effect on what Sarah did and did not talk about on the tape even though she knew no one else would hear the recording and that I would be using a pseudonym for her name. In one part of our conversation we were discussing our friend
Joe and his fraternity. She interrupted me and quickly said “Oh, and P.S. Joe’s gonna get screwed this year. You know he’s going to get hazed, right?” in reference to the known fact that his fraternity has been on probation with the University in the last five years for hazing, but she said, “Well, I don’t want to say the frat’s name since we’re being recorded and I don’t want Jane to find out either since that’s why she was kicked out of her sorority”.

One part of the interview that was more productive, I felt, was when I asked Sarah what her favorite part about being on campus was and the following dialogue ensued:

"Oooh... Bars."

"What's you're favorite bare other than Kam's?"
"Other than Kam's? ... depends because if I want to go out and be all Greek and stuff, then I guess it'd be Station or Clybourne depending on the night. If I want to be chill and Real then it would be Brother's."

"What does it mean ti be Greek?"
"Well cause Greek people are always so cliquey and like 'I think I'm better than you because I'm in this house"

"Do they really do that in Bars?"
"Oh Yeah.."

"Really?"

"Like if you go to Brother's like everyone else is nicer... because they're all older, they're I mean juniors and seniors, um grad students... people - you'll bump into someone and they're like 'i'm sorry!'... You bump into someone at Kam's and they're like 'ugh!'"

Although I'm not exactly sure I can agree with her argument that the social atmosphere in Kam's differs from that of bars like Brother's, Station, or Clybourne's, based solely on the number of Greek members present, I still found this tid bit pretty interesting and I wish now that I had thought to start with that question after I asked how Sarah came to the U of I, because the first 15 minutes of our conversation involved stuff that didn't relate to campus because I wasn't really sure what to talk about without being too direct in my questioning. This section of the conversation was easy, though, and seemed to flow on it's own.

The other part that was hard, was thinking about how to write about this interview in a lively manner - which I seem to have failed to do - as Emerson's chapter suggests. In this case, I felt like I didn't really know how to present the material because I wasn't even sure what to do when I did the interview. I thought about trying to provide more of a transcript like Bourdieu but since I didn't really have a focused interview or focused points to make about the content of the interview, I have been at a loss as far as how to present this data. With my new topic, I doubt this will be as much of a problem. In the end, however, I am still glad that I conducted this interview simply because I hope that my next few will be slightly more productive since I think I have a better idea of what to do.

To begin my inquiry, then, I decided to look at a document provided by the Office of the Provost concerning Appointments of Faculty and Academic Professionals, which is
labelled “Communication No. 3” and can be found at http://www.provost.uiuc.edu/communication/appointments.html. In addition to this document are a number of other "communications" which explain in detail the University's policies concerning faculty and staff in various situations.

Upon reviewing this document, it is clear that these “communications” are not necessarily supposed to be easily deciphered by someone unfamiliar with our University’s inner workings since it does not explain in definite terms what the exact difference is between each position available. In fact, it doesn’t really even explain what the difference between an academic and an academic professional is. Of course, this is an assumption that those at the university will understand that an academic is a professor and an academic professional is an administrator of some sort. Furthermore, “communication” seems an odd choice for a title as the tone of the document is more of a mandate than an open dialogue, so perhaps an analysis of that word and its use within this particular document is needed. Finally, there are numerous jargon terms used that are not explicitly explained which can make the document difficult to understand at times.

Returning to the explanations of positions, it is clear that the document expects the reader to understand what is meant by the term academic professional and how that position differs from an academic. This is obvious to those of us within the University setting but may not be to those outside. The Communication begins with an explanation of how the Provost is allowed to oversee appointments “The President has delegated administrative authority over academic appointments on this campus to the Chancellor, who has in turn delegated it to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs” (1). It then immediately turns to explaining the types of appointments requiring prior approval by the provost (1) in which is mentions “An academic professional appointment with an annual salary over $90,000” but it never explains the description of that position. In similar circumstances, the Communication mentions procedures for untenured professors – which are labelled “Q appointees” – and special situations involving the waiving of tenure – which are “W appointments”. Additionally, the list of the appointments requiring prior approval includes “any other appointments, as needed, to preserve the principle of two-level review” but it never explains what two-level review entails. In fact, I think that will be one of my next steps because I don’t know what two-level review means, although I think I have an idea.

This Communication, while it seems like it would be helpful to those who understand what it says because it lays out the necessary procedures very clearly, is sort of confusing to someone like myself since I don’t understand what two-level review is, or why they felt the need to label untenured academics as “Q appointees”. What seems odd to me regarding the title of this document is that it is more of a mandated policy rather than a dialogue and it has since made me wonder about the understanding of the word itself both for me personally and for the university. I understand that a monologue or a mandate can be a form communication but at the same time I have generally seen such things given different labels, such as a “policy” or a “plan” or “procedure”. So, it is interesting to me that the Office of the Provost considers such a document to be a good way to communicate with the rest of the University – and perhaps it is, since the Provost can’t very well meet with all of the different departments to outline in detail the procedures for appointing new faculty members.

In an attempt to better understand this document, I feel it is necessary for me to find explanations of several jargon terms that it assumes the reader understands – which I don’t. The most important of these terms is the 0% faculty position. This position is mentioned over twenty times in this 18 page document and I have no idea what is mean by it. It also mentions Academic professional positions that include a 0% faculty position.
Outside of that particular term, the Communication also assumes that the reader is familiar with the other communications and attachments provided by the Office of the Provost and continually refers to them for further detail and explanation, so perhaps I will begin with those.

In the end, this Communication did not really help me understand the qualifications for academic professionals but it did help me to understand the hiring process a little more. I do think that it has given me a better idea of where to go next. However, if the others are as jargon filled as this one, then they may not be any help.

DISCUSS

Discuss your inquiry, taking care to separate speculation from fact or data

My findings on this I-Change campaign were, quite honestly, less than satisfactory. I was only able to conduct two interviews and the focus group idea never came to be, since no one replied to my emails. I ended up having to use the student responses from the online I-Change discussion board in place of actual interviews with students not directly involved in I-Change. However, I was at least able to find significant background information on both the I-Change campaign and the Penn State version, from which I-Change borrowed. Based on all of this acquired information, the interviews, and the student responses on the discussion board, I came to the basic conclusion that while this campaign seemed well-intended, it was not well developed or executed and fell short in many aspects. Mainly, though, it seems that it needed to have included other events surrounding the campaign to have any real effect.

Let’s return to my first interview, with Amanda, and then also discuss a second interview not yet introduced with a student we will call Bruce. There are really two comments that Amanda made which continue to confuse me. The first is as follows:

“Yeah, it’s honestly just to get people to think. I mean, it’s not supposed to be making people go out and do something and change – if they do that’s great – but mostly it’s to be like to stop and think maybe I should think twice when I say “that’s so gay,” or “that’s retarded.”

While I think I understand the idea of just wanting people to think about what they do and say in general – simply following the ideals of civility – I don’t understand why one would choose to organize and support a campaign that does not attempt to truly change anything. The organizers clearly think that these issues mentioned are valid problems on campus, so it is confusing as to why they stopped at just marketing. Additionally, both people that I interviewed seemed to focus a lot on the issues listed on the posters “bigot” and “ugly” but seemed less concerned about those on “rude” and stupid”. If this campaign was truly supposed to encompass civility in general, it makes no sense to focus so much attention on only half of what was marketed as the whole campaign. On the other hand, if the organizers were actually only concerned with the issues on the posters “bigot” and “ugly,” then why bring up the other two at all? Moving onto the other comment Amanda made;

“I really thought that people no matter if they hated it or liked it, they really thought about it... and the fact that people responded to the website...”

After looking at the discussion board postings, I cannot honestly say that I agree that students “really thought about it”. There was a lot of arguing, attacking, and poorly written comments but not much true discussion, which would indicate actual thinking
about the campaign rather than defending themselves against the other participants. If the true intention was to make students simply react, then it would seem that the campaign achieved its goal – whether or not I agreed with the goal. Several students, including Amanda and Bruce, explained that they realized posters and chalk advertisements alone were not going to change anyone’s opinions or actions but that they weren’t trying to change them anyway. However, by using a marketing method such as the one I-Change chose, and proclaiming to want people to just think about it and “get the idea out there” (Bruce), the organizers clearly do want people to change; they just want people to change themselves. The implied next step after reading the “Bigot” poster is to stop and think hm, maybe I shouldn’t use the word retarded, and then next time you begin to say the word, you force yourself to stop and choose a different word. Or the next time you start to litter on Green Street, or anything else, the implied desired result is still change.

Moving on, the interview with Bruce was less helpful but still worth mentioning. Bruce was one of the founders of the campaign; a senior white male. He explained a lot of the basics of the campaign, including that they had taken the idea from the Penn State campaign, titled “We are...Penn State.” He also clarified that the I-Change campaign was “a program from the Union Director’s office and then [he’s] just coordinating it”. The most interesting part of this interview, though, was when I began to ask why racism was not a more prevalent issue in the campaign. I pointed to the “Bigot” poster sitting on the table in between us and said;

CV: “You kind of touched on the issue of race on campus with the interracial couple but I was surprised it wasn’t more... um, direct.”

Bruce: “That was also intentional”

CV: (overlap) “Intentional?”

Bruce: “Because, you know, uh, one of the uh, another one of the ideas the whole campaign was based on was that the only time that we do talk about a lot of these things is always in the context of race... and it’s always about the (indistinct), it’s always about hate crimes and there are all these hates crimes that are racist. And that’s something worthy of addressing but we thought that for a lot of people, for most students it just goes above your head. I know I don’t commit any hate crimes against anyone and I don’t judge people on their color, so that’s fine and we don’t have to worry about that. But we thought that that didn’t mean there weren’t actions that we should all think about addressing...”

This was perplexing, since I failed to ask for a definition of what “these things” includes. It seems odd to group issues such as littering and profanity under the umbrella of race and hate crimes. In addition, the campaign did attempt to address other types of prejudice, which are obviously larger issues than littering, so it is naive to intentionally avoid race and claim to focus on smaller issues. Another student on the discussion board made a similar comment:

“Obviously there are more severe problems, but that doesn't mean that the small prejudices have no effect. In fact, I think they have MORE of an aggregate affect on this campus than the big prejudices. There are few David Duke's or Louis Farrakhan's on this campus, but all of us do things that keep ourselves self-segregated. These small actions work toward that end. By addressing or least discussing them, we move in the right direction.”

In placing this next to my argument regarding Bruce’s statement, I am not trying to
suggest that the other issues are not valid. However, the issue of race on campus is another area in which the campaign was lacking. In regards to the above student comment, it still seems strange that such a widely publicized campaign would choose to ignore this particular larger issue, yet include others in its “move toward the middle ground” as Bruce explained.

This idea of moving towards the middle ground, to me, also implied some degree of change. In returning to this argument over whether change was the implied desired result, one should also take into account two other things; the first being the campaign’s name, I-Change – case in point. Furthermore, the history behind the formation of the campaign is crucial and also helps in discussion of the success of the I-Change version. Penn State’s campaign, “We Are Changing... Penn State, Are You?” began when the student government president at the time was asked to help find a way to get students to stop harassing the bus drivers and has evolved into a campus-wide social civility campaign. This campaign, however, had two parts – a wave of negative ads like “Are you a Bigot?” and a positive ad wave such as “Be Open-Minded” (see link below titled "Penn State Pulse Survey"). It also continued on into the following school year and continues to have annual events such as trash clean ups. More interestingly, the administration decided to conduct a campus wide survey to determine the success of the campaign. Survey results were posted online and I have listed the link in the “Link” section of this page. With such a successful campaign as a model for I-Change, it is hard to understand why the Illini Union Board chose to let the Union Director’s office handle this campaign rather than make I-Change a larger and more developed program. According to both Bruce and Amanda, it was too much work, but how and why that was the case was not made clear.

In order to move beyond this basic discussion of the I-Change campaign and my findings, I would need to complete much more extensive research. Without going into too much detail, I would at least need more of the basic research methods. I certainly need more interviews. Bruce suggested talking to Scola (a student news channel) that did an interview on I-Change. A survey would be nice. I would probably target undergraduates and maybe people in the Union. I would also like to take more time to discuss the photographs of the spray-painted responses that I found. Lastly, I would have liked to observe the campus community in general to look for occurrences of the issues I-Change focused on, such as students walking in front of cars and buses, using profanity in public, or littering Green Street. I have, of course, seen some of these things in passing but would like to take time to observe while keeping this project in mind.

REFLECT

Link

Connect with other resources and materials.
Orange and Blue Observer article on I-Change campaign
<http://illiniobo.com/content/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=15&Itemid=1>

Another Article in the DI

Daily Illini column article on I-Change campaign
I attached the links below as a source of background on the Penn State version of the “I-Change” campaign and as a sort of history of the origin of the Illinois version. After reading through them, I got the sense that not only was the Penn State campaign more thoroughly thought out and executed but also that it extended beyond the “shock and awe” stage, which I-Change never made it past, and actually tried to affect change on the campus. Furthermore, from what I can tell, the Penn State campaign was also given more guidance by university staff members rather than put together solely by students. That said, it is interesting to note that the Penn State Student Government is no longer considered as the Official voice of the student body. I’m not sure whether that has anything to do with their campaign or if those events were unrelated. I’m guessing they’re unrelated simply because the campaign lasted more than a year and was on-going as compared to I-Change’s month long campaign. I didn’t really want to do a comparison, since I don’t think it’s absolutely necessary but the more information I gather about Penn State’s campaign, which was I-Change’s model, it is at least helpful in analyzing I-Change in the sense that it really makes I-Change look poorly developed and pretty naive. Not to mention, poorly executed in relation to follow-up programs and discussion in general. This is not to say that Penn State’s campaign is not problematic but my focus is on Illinois not Penn State, currently anyway, so for the purposes of this project I won’t go into much more detail about Penn State. Instead, I decided to provide the links in case you deem it necessary to have more in depth background information as an aid for reviewing my work.

Article of reflection on Penn State's "We Are" Campaign:  
<http://live.psu.edu/index.php?sec=vs&story=7356&pf=1>

Penn State Newspaper article on trash clean-up and "We Are"  
<http://www.collegian.psu.edu/archive/2005/03/03-28-05tdc/03-28-05dnews-02.asp>

Student Affairs' fosters USG civility campaign  
<http://www.sa.psu.edu/insights/sep04/weare.shtml>

Cached website for "We Are" Campaign  
<http://search-results.aset.psu.edu/search?q=cache:BKzi2MG8cbUJ:www.changingpsu.psu.edu/+%22We+Are...+Changing+Penn+State%22&access=p&output=xml_no_dtd&ie=UTF-8&client=PennState&site=PennState&proxystylesheet=PennState&oe=ISO-8859-1>

Penn State Undergrad Student Government Page  
<http://www.clubs.psu.edu/up/usg/>

Penn State Pulse Survey Results concerning their "We Are" Campaign  
<http://www.sa.psu.edu/sara/pulse.shtml>

I-Change Website:  
<http://www.union.uiuc.edu/involvement/i-change.htm>
Implications

Could your findings have broader implications beyond this inquiry?

Well, clearly chalking the quad is an effective method for advertising if the target viewer is a college student. Looking at I-Change itself and how the whole campaign was handled, it seems that perhaps a larger scale civility campaign is necessary when considering the content of the majority of the discussion board postings. It seems that most really missed the point. Seriously, though, I think in general this project has shown me that if a civil campaign is to succeed in affecting change on a large scale, it needs to involve more than simple advertisement methods and needs to have real substance (i.e. events and discussions). Additionally, the focus needs to start small. As seen in the excerpts from the discussion board and my two interviews, most people took different aspects of the campaign and began discussing them out of context which led to much heated debate about a tangent topic rather than the actual campaign itself. This is important when thinking of participant observers as potential instigators for change, whether economic, social, political, or otherwise. Also, if a civil campaign is to be successful, it first must clearly define its own definition of civility along with the campaign's mission statement. It seems as though this particular campaign got lost in a multitude of ideas of how to be civil - everything from not stealing from bars and throwing trash on the street to not using terms such as "gay" or "retarded" - and in its confusion the message was diluted, making the whole campaign seem rather naive.

OTHER

A space for other notes, findings, comments, etc.

In promoting a social civility campaign, such as I-Change, what exactly are we working towards within the campus community? What is the end result and why do university campuses such as Penn State deem it necessary to create campus-wide campaigns? Furthermore, what makes these campaigns either successful or unsuccessful? These are the questions driving the research I am proposing. For clarification, I-Change was a social civility marketing campaign started by students previously involved with the Illini Union Board, using Penn State’s “We Are” campaign as a model. Penn State’s campaign originated from an effort to get students to stop harassing bus drivers, which then evolved into a campus-wide civility campaign. The campaign involved two major marketing waves alongside several campus events; one wave involving negative advertisements with bold statements such as ‘Are you a Bigot?’ and then a second with more positive advertisements such as ‘Be Open-Minded!’ which were intended to inspire change among the student body. I-Change, on the other hand was simply a marketing campaign used to “get people to think twice” and only used one series of campaign advertisements characterized by their negative words in bold, capital, red, such as “BIGOT”.

Initially, I wanted to focus on the I-Change campaign alone but the time has passed in which that would have been an appropriate subject for a participant observation study. I am still interested in what I perceive as a disconnect between the two campuses but now instead, propose to use both the Penn State and I-Change campaigns as case studies for an analysis of social civility campaigns in general. I would still like to focus on what the implied end results are for such campaigns and what makes or breaks them. I hope to find a few more potential case studies as I search, and perhaps one that is currently in effect. In my initial research to aid in the proposal, I came across several points of interest; the first being that I-Change organizers intentionally avoided discussing racism as a campaign topic yet deemed other forms of prejudice appropriate for discussion – something which I think could be essential in understanding the difference between the two campaigns. In contrast to Penn State which used a specific bold marketing technique
in conjunction with a series of campus wide events including discussion forums, I-Change used only negative marketing angles and stopped the campaign at using posters, wristbands, and sidewalk chalk advertisements. While I-Change did introduce an online discussion board, it was only intended as a place for opponents to vent – as explained by one of my informants, Bruce, who was one of the two head organizers. However, these two campaigns had distinctly different proclaimed missions; Penn State wanted to increase civility on campus, while I-Change simply wanted “to get the idea out there” as Bruce commented. These intentions became more and more important to my understanding and opinion of both these campaigns and, perhaps, ultimately to their degree of success.

In conducting this proposed study, I have several research methods in mind that I would like to use. The first, and primary method, would be voluntary individual interviews, which I would record and transcribe. I have specific people in mind for this aspect. For example, in the case studies, I would need to interview both of the Deans of students at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and at Penn State. I also want to interview the student government that initiated the Penn State campaign as well as the others involved in I-Change. I feel these particular interviews are crucial pieces to this study’s history, which I currently only vaguely understand. However, I would also like to interview individual students that are not necessarily connected with either campaign to discover whether they view their campus the same way those involved with each campaign do. In addition to these interviews, it seems that a survey would be an appropriate quantitative compliment to my qualitative data. I would only use this survey at UIUC, though, because the Penn State administration already conducted a similar survey at the end of their campaign and that seems sufficient. I have included the basic survey in the spot underneath this entry. As you will see, it includes some questions on civility in general and then more specifically on the I-Change program. In addition to these fieldwork methods, I would, of course, need to complete extensive searches for contemporary studies on civility and its history as well as other social civility campaigns with which to aide my research. In addition, I would like to attempt to map time allocations for both campaigns in order to more fully discuss their success. Other information that seems important includes the costs of both campaigns, as well as the number of students involved in each, along with the demographics of each group. All of that, however, should be available through an online search. Most importantly, as a rookie in this field, I would need to utilize my resources within the Anthropology department including other experts. I imagine that both Professor Nancy Abelmann and Professor Ellen Moodie would point me in the correct direction if they did not know an answer themselves.

There is one point to this study which already looks as though it could prove to be a difficulty; namely that if I were to conduct any sort of “campus observation” with civility in mind, I’m not sure I would be able to produce all the proper consent documentation. This is one area in which I will need the most suggestions and guidance. It seems like it would be a good idea to observe these campuses, looking for instances where civility would be an issue. At this point, however, I am not quite sure how to go about that ethically. Perhaps a start might include reviewing the campus police blogs in the daily papers. I do not, however, foresee any problems with individual interviews or surveys. Of course, in general, this project should not raise any issues with most human subject populations since I do not plan to interview any special populations. Other potential problems include not being able to find the Penn State student government from two years ago, or even getting them to agree to an interview. I am also unsure of how to account for validity in certain respects such as whether the civility campaign at UIUC was actually necessary or whether the information given to me by my informants is actually true. Another problem is that I am an outsider in both situations in that I was not
a participant in either campaign. That said, I do think I could rely partially on another classmate’s work as an aid for the UIUC aspect, especially in regard to student responses, which could relieve a small amount of stress here.

Based upon articles read thus far, I have several scholars in mind whose work might help me at least with my methodologies, since I have yet to find contemporary research in my limited time prior to this proposal. Those scholars include Norman Fairclough and his article titled, “Analysing Discourse; Textual Analysis for Social Research,” in which he states that

“Implicitness is a pervasive property of texts and a property of considerable social importance. All forms of fellowship, community and solidarity depend on meanings which are shared and can be take as given, and no form of social communication or interaction is conceivable without some such ‘common ground’” (Fairclough, 2003, pp.55).

This may seem odd at first when discussing civility campaigns but since each has their own proclaimed mission statement along with other official documents, this article and Fairclough’s ideas will be most helpful in my analysis, especially since, unlike the I-Change discussion board posts, I intend to analyze these campaigns and their issues in context rather than out. Additionally, Claudia Strauss’s article on “Analyzing Discourse for Cultural Complexity” will be helpful because of her section “How to Find Traces of Social Discourses,” since the majority of what I will be analyzing first are different forms of social discourses revolving around civility (Strauss, 2005, pp. 221). As far as models for writing, I have found that I like two very different methods, and might like to try to use both; the first being Bourdieu’s classic method of transcribing the entire interview and making the whole transcription available to the reader. I would like to try to do that but at times, in order to decongest my textual arguments, would like to try to imitate Mitchell Duneier’s writing style by incorporating my interview excerpts into my actual analysis. In regards to actual interviewing methodology, I have already used Charles Brigg’s article, “Interview,” as a field tool and likely will continue to use it. However, Robert Weiss’s article, “Interviewing,” was also helpful.

While I cannot predict my findings, I do think it is important to look critically upon any campaign before deciding to join or promote it. I want to discuss what it is that we’re agreeing to when we participate in a campaign like I-Change or “We Are”. Students on both campuses clearly see the need for such a campaign. Or, in the case of Penn State, it is interesting that both the administration along with the students decided to collaborate on such an extensive project. As potential future leaders, it seems worthwhile to understand what they deem important and to consider how and why they concluded that. I feel that through my proposed study I could find very intriguing answers to these questions.

WORKS CITED


Here is the survey I would have liked to use:
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------
---
CONFIDENTIAL STUDENT SURVEY DO NOT WRITE YOUR NAME

Please mark Yes or No and explain your answers in the space provided.

1. Do you think this campus is a generally rude place? Y / N

2. Are you offended by profanity or litter? Y / N

3. Do you or anyone you know use terms such as “gay” or “retarded”? Y / N

4. In your experience, is this campus a racist environment? Y / N

5. In your opinion, is this campus hostile towards minorities? Y / N

6. Is walking in front of traffic considered rude? Y / N

7. Have you ever heard of I-Change? Y / N

8. Do you think I-Change was successful? Y / N

Demographic information:
Please list the race/ethnicity you identify with most closely:_________________

Gender: M / F
Year in School:____________________