Public scholarship flourishes at Emory. We know that public scholarship matters. It is about relevance, impact, and making connections. It is usually also about the public good.

While not overtly labeled as such, a commitment to public scholarship is etched into our university mission statement (“to create, preserve, teach, and apply knowledge in the service of humanity”) and vision statement (“[our members work collaboratively for positive transformation in the world”). Strikingly, however, there seems to be limited collective discussion at Emory about the definition of public scholarship, the various forms that public scholarship can take, and the value of public scholarship.

This issue of the Academic Exchange aims to fill that gap, or at least generate discussion in that direction. The subject of media, particularly how we communicate with media as experts, and how we can equip ourselves and our students with skills to better navigate our complex media environments, loom large in this debate and many of the essays here.

The questions abound: What is public scholarship, and what is its connection to the public sphere? How does public scholarship count—and how should it be counted—as part of the intellectual work and teaching effort of faculty? Is public scholarship an extra, optionally added on to the primary production of knowledge that we do as researchers? Or is it an intrinsic part of research—a way to apply research, disseminate results, and even create feedback loops where findings can be tested and refined? Is it—or should it be—an intrinsic part of teaching? Should it be...
a General Education Requirement? And where does public scholarship get listed on the CV? Are some forms of public scholarship viewed as taboo or “lesser than” in the academy? And if so, why and to what end?

The Center for the Study of Public Scholarship (1994-2009) was one of the pioneers at Emory in framing such questions and supporting public scholarship efforts. This work is currently being continued under the Center for Faculty Development and Excellence with a seminar series and a pilot Public Scholars Fellowship program (see the essays in this issue by 2010-2011 fellows Dwight Andrews and Tracy Yandle).

Many, if not most, faculty at Emory strive in some way or another to make their work relevant both in and out of the proverbial ivory tower. Many use the words “advocacy” and “applied” when framing “out of ivory tower” efforts. Others speak of “working for positive social change,” “collaborating with public agencies,” “informing policy,” “making a difference,” “connecting with the ‘real world,’” “outreach,” and “making community connections.” Some use the phrase “scholar-activist.” Some explicitly use the label “public scholarship.” Many do not. These phrases are also used to frame teaching goals. Others include “service learning” and “creating engaged and responsible citizens,” as well as that most elemental word: “relevance.” Few would argue that these things are not important, if not central, to the life and mission of the university.

Troubling binaries? Split identities?

At the same time, troubling binaries and metaphors percolate through some of these phrases. For example, when one speaks of “connecting with the ‘real world,’” does this mean that there is something to be taken as a “not-real” world? Does this mean there is an option? And does it imply that “the real world” is somewhere else, not within the buildings and green spaces of our campus? The phrase “Ivory Tower” continues this binary, with a protected and pristine image—even a potentially race- and class-charged image—of “the life of the mind.” Analogously, Emory students talk about “the Emory Bubble,” as opposed to the “outside” or “real” world. In my own research on young adults’ engagements with media and politics, I found that they often speak of their university “bubble” as a place of willed disengagement, willed retreat, or willed delay. For some this is seen as practical (about prioritizing attention); for others it is very problematic.

Perhaps it is time to rethink these phrases and what lies behind them. The idea of “the university world” versus “the real world” both serves us and potentially undermines us. Such phrases reveal entrenched forms of academic culture and academic value. They also reveal the mainstream culture’s views about intellectual pursuits: isolated, pointy-headed, privileged. This is, admittedly, a very anti-intellectual culture. Or at least anti- a certain kind of intellectual. While the U.S. is awash with “thought leaders,” “visionaries,” and pundits, few are based in universities. At least not full time. The best known are in the corporate world, in hip-hop, in journalism, in Hollywood or on TED videos.

Currently at Emory, some fields “do public scholarship” better than others. Some require it. For many, applied work is the defining core. Regardless of field, however, it is safe to say that we share common challenges of split labor, split identities, and the need to be multilingual— that is, fluent in more than one communication register and genre—as we conduct and communicate about our research.

RE-GENERATION: An experiment in scholar-activism

Last November, I struggled with this communication challenge as I undertook an experiment in scholar-activism. With the assistance of the Halle Institute, Center for Creativity & Arts, and Emory student group Generation Response, I wrote and produced a documentary theatrical work based on my University Research Committee-supported research into young adults’ engagements with media and politics in the United States. The play, titled “RE-GENERATION: A Play about Political Stances, Media Insanity, and Adult Responsibilities,” had three showings in the Schwartz Center for Performing Arts Theater Lab. Over the three days, 150 people attended. Each show was followed by audience discussion.

I took a lot of creative license with the work. In the early stages, I was assisted by Amy Ulan ‘07C, who worked with Theater Emory during her undergraduate years here. While the original research was based on interviews and participant observation with ninety individuals, the play contains fifteen pseudonymous characters, including Shockwave, a hip-hop artist who thinks the main route to political engagement is music and not the ballot box; Crystal, who feels she needs to hide her political viewpoints because she’s in the minority among her peers; Tina, who finds a million better things to do than pay attention to news and politics; Gianna, who starts out apathetic but then decides to get more informed after entering the workforce; and Jin, who works intensely on the Obama campaign. Approximately 80 percent of the play’s dialogues are verbatim material from the research. This veracity factor was powerful for audiences, but it also presented a challenge for building up characters and dramatic flow. Without my direct voice as narrator or professor, there was also the challenge of leaving people guessing how it all hung together: What is the main finding? Who is right? What do you think? How does this compare to other eras? Where are we headed? These and other questions came up repeatedly during audience discussion and on the feedback forms distributed at the end of the shows. Many still wanted to hear “the professor” from the proverbial ivory tower, while I was hoping they would talk more to each other than to me!

A theatrical work was not an anticipated outcome of the original research. I went down this path only after I realized how much might be gained from relaying and juxtaposing slices of conversation and from exposing audiences to the power of individual stories and dilemmas. I am energized by how the research results challenge existing conceptions of stereotyped apathy, as well as stereotyped activism. So I want to share that—to potentially shift conversations and bust stereotypes. I am also thinking about ways to instigate conversations that we were not having but that we need to have.
In the research, I was particularly struck by how the conversations people had with me were very different from the ones that they were having with each other. They shared uncertainties, struggles, and frustrations over our public life and our complicated media landscapes. They talked about the conflict avoidance, superficiality, and quick judgments that occur between peers when people find themselves on different sides of the political (or engagement) spectrum. My hope was, and continues to be, that this ongoing experiment in scholar-activism contributes to new insights and breakthroughs both within and across generations.

The case for critical media literacy

More broadly resonating with this effort is a concern widely shared across the faculty over how to best prepare students to be engaged and responsible citizens. We live in an unprecedented time of massive information flow, access, and connectivity. We also live in what are sometimes very subtle, toxic media environments. And we (or some of us) are now equipped with the ability to simultaneously be producers and consumers of media. Many of our students are digital natives.

Much of the conversation on media and technology across the university has been around the issues of “millennial learners,” “digital scholarship,” and integrating technology into teaching. These are crucial conversations. But there is also the less widely addressed issue of our relationship to media: as consumers and producers of information, as members of a society, as participants in a democracy, and as citizens of the world.

How many of us have encountered among our students a lack of basic knowledge about world events? Geography? History? American civics? And this despite the fact that such information is at our fingertips at a level never before seen in history. There are many, many bright and highly engaged students at Emory who defy this trend. But I’ve been troubled by what seems to be a growing superficiality and diminished curiosity. Is it work overload? Media overload? Lack of time? Lack of skills? Is it to be blamed on what the recent Race to Nowhere document has pinpointed as our “academic achievement culture,” one that drives habits of cramming and the emphasis on short-term performance, rather than instilling longer-term internal motivations and structures? Many undergraduates seem to lack the initiative to deepen their learning about the world without the framework of a class assignment motivating them, without explicit instructions spelling out the steps, and without instructions about the specific locations where the information might be found.

There is no silver bullet solution here. But there is much to be learned from initiatives in critical media literacy. At base, critical media literacy is about the ability to “read” media. It is also about cultivating a more active and reflective approach to one’s relation to media. It is about the ability to comprehend overt content, as well as the framing around content. Being able to recognize how messages and images are framed, and how cultural, economic, and political interests and values are connected to them, leads to all kinds of breakthroughs — for citizenship, for scholarship, for self, for health and well-being. It could lead to greater understanding of eating disorders, violence, racism, and the war on terror. It could lead to understanding the value of Wikipedia over the New York Times, and vice-versa.

So how can the university contribute to the development of skills for navigating and “decoding” our complex media environments? What if, for example, we had more courses (and maybe even a requirement) that help students learn how to navigate, filter, and evaluate information? Or a Center for News Literacy, like SUNY Stony Brook? Related to news literacy (or information literacy) is the age-old liberal arts goal of teaching students how to discriminate between fact and opinion. Increasingly, in our current communication environment, there is the challenge of discerning between spin vs. opinion vs. fact. The newly renamed Department of Film and Media Studies, the Journalism Program, the Program in Linguistics, the Critical Media Literacy Group’s seminar series on Navigating Media Environments and Media Futures, and many other faculty who study rhetoric and the power of media, are stepping up and contributing in this regard—for example, to help students with tools for parsing public discourse, the politics of communication, and the various forms of advertising that surround us.

At its most ambitious, this approach could potentially shift our communication futures so that we are all more productive contributors to public debate and less derailed by spinmeisters, soundbites, and a polarized public sphere. I found in my own research that most young people do not know what to do with this level of heated rhetoric, except to hastily pick sides, tune out, or watch all the spin and punditry as a shooting sport, aka, entertainment. Cultivating critical media literacy might take the fun out of being a media spectator. But if indeed our lives are so thoroughly mediated and our outlets for the dissemination and production of knowledge increasingly rely on media (both new and old), it behooves us as teachers and scholars (“public” and otherwise) to meet this challenge.
The balancing act of the modern legal scholar

A...

The Clean Water Act battles have continued to be an area of scholarly interest and have prompted my involvement in yet more legislative battles, most recently over climate and health legislation. First, what are the policy implications and constitutional contours of separate and mutually exclusive federal and state policy making? What are the benefits and risks of the political norm of overlapping and concurrent state, federal, and local policy making turf? Second, how should policy makers establish the empirical foundations for their enactments, especially where the Supreme Court has made or may seek to assert contrary assertions about historical and scientific facts? Can congressional findings and policy statements shape and perhaps protect new laws from judicial invalidation? As I write this essay, legislators are pushing bills that would block US EPA from regulating greenhouse gases under the Clean Air Act and limit or even preclude state climate change-related actions. Federal judges are assessing constitutional challenges to new federal health care legislation, with the critical question, once again, about the limits of federal regulatory power.

A book and four law review articles later, I’m wondering if I should move on from analysis of regulatory federalism and preemption. But on the left side of my desk sits a stack of research regarding federalism or may seek to assert contrary assertions about historical and scientific facts? Can congressional findings and policy statements shape and perhaps protect new laws from judicial invalidation? As I write this essay, legislators are pushing bills that would block US EPA from regulating greenhouse gases under the Clean Air Act and limit or even preclude state climate change-related actions. Federal judges are assessing constitutional challenges to new federal health care legislation, with the critical question, once again, about the limits of federal regulatory power.

A book and four law review articles later, I’m wondering if I should move on from analysis of regulatory federalism and preemption. But on the left side of my desk sits a stack of research regarding federalism or may seek to assert contrary assertions about historical and scientific facts? Can congressional findings and policy statements shape and perhaps protect new laws from judicial invalidation? As I write this essay, legislators are pushing bills that would block US EPA from regulating greenhouse gases under the Clean Air Act and limit or even preclude state climate change-related actions. Federal judges are assessing constitutional challenges to new federal health care legislation, with the critical question, once again, about the limits of federal regulatory power.
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A book and four law review articles later, I’m wondering if I should move on from analysis of regulatory federalism and preemption. But on the left side of my desk sits a stack of research regarding federalism or may seek to assert contrary assertions about historical and scientific facts? Can congressional findings and policy statements shape and perhaps protect new laws from judicial invalidation? As I write this essay, legislators are pushing bills that would block US EPA from regulation...
Turning to Public Scholarship
Race and music

My work on music and race originally began with a simple question: “What is black music?” In my many years of teaching survey courses in the History of Jazz, African American Music, and the Music of the Harlem Renaissance, I always begin with two questions of my students. First, is there such a thing as black music? Second, what is black music? There is almost always agreement to the first question. My students readily affirm that black music exists, though few of them know why they answer so easily. The response to the second question is a bit more complicated, for myself as well as for my students. Although we share an intuition that black music exists, the question of what black music is (or isn’t) yields answers as varied as the number of students in the class.

Our answers seem only to lead to more questions. Is black music determined by style and form, or is its existence determined by the people who create it? Is it jazz and blues, but not the operas of Anthony Davis or William Grant Still? Do you have to be black to create black music, or is it an acknowledgment of something experiential—that is coming out of the “black experience.” And by the way, what is the black experience? Is the music of Dave Brubeck or Lee Konitz good jazz, but not “real” black music? How do we interpret Eminem or Justin Bieber? Do all blacks experience the same “black experience” or are we really describing the unfortunate but often shared experience of racism in our society? What do we mean by “black”? Who are black people? What constitutes “blackness”? Who defines such terms and their meanings?

Given our present understanding of both biology and genetics, why do we cling so tenaciously to ideas about race, especially the opposition of black and white?


Race, we all assume, is like all other concepts, constructed by metaphor and metonymy: it stands in metonymically, for the Other; it bears the weight, metaphorically, of other kinds of difference.

Yet, in our social lives away from the text-world of the academy, we take reference for granted too easily. Even if the concept of race is a structure of oppositions—white opposed to black (but also to yellow), Jew opposed to Gentile (but also to Arab)—it is a structure whose realization is, at best, problematic and, at worst, impossible. If we can hope to understand the concept embodied in this system of oppositions, we are nowhere near finding referents for it. The truth is that there are no races: there is nothing in the world that can do all we ask “race” to do for us. The evil that is done is done by the concept and by easy—yet impossible—assumptions as to its application. What we miss through our obsession with the structure of relations of concepts is simply, reality.

Appiah’s concept of “biologizing” culture and ideology rings in my ears when I explore those questions that come up with my students. And we can raise a few more questions: Is the sound of black music quantifiable? What does it sound like? Should we know it when we hear it? Is there a rhythmic, melodic, or textural essence that binds black music into a single sonic unity? Is the underlying unity of black music an aesthetic matter rather than a sonic one? Does it matter who controls the production and dissemination of the music? Do the issues of control and dissemination affect our understanding about the integrity of the musical expression itself? Are terms like integrity and authenticity even useful? All of these questions may be placed in an equally complicated web of ideas about the relationship between racial expectation and black music/cultural production. Just as important are the intersections of race, gender, sexuality, economics, and technology.

In my work and research on the intersection between race and music, I am particularly interested in the ways our thinking about music is racialized and the ends that are served by such racial thinking. I use the phrase “thinking about music” intentionally here because my sense is that there is no absolute or essentialist method of “hearing” music. We may replace or impose “race” in place of culture (or other frameworks) for specific purposes, but those purposes are secondary to the way music sounds or what music means in a given culture. This is what Appiah describes by “biologizing” culture or ideology.

This type of research, by its very nature, involves a variety of scientific, philosophical, political, musical, cultural, theoretical, and especially experiential perspectives. My formal training as a musician and music theorist provides me with powerful analytic tools and methods for music within the Western canon. Yet I well understand the limitations of such methods to my present subject. In order to expect a meaningful research result here I must acknowledge that the very idea of music and music making might require re-formation. The very questions I might ask of one cultural (not racial) tradition might be meaningless in another. For example, a person who sings the blues because of an internalized understanding of what the blues is might have little interest in the definition of a “blue note” or other abstractions of blues performance practice. Thus the researcher must be open to considering that the very idea of music may have more that one meaning.

This research literally requires a public scholarship platform in order to address the questions of how the idea of race continues to shape our understanding of music and those who create it.

To that end, I have created a more focused public scholarship project, titled Black Music: Race and Representation in Popular Music Culture. This project seeks to understand the relationship between popular music culture and prevailing understandings about race, sexuality, and power. It begins with the tacit assumptions that most people understand black music only in terms of popular culture and that pop culture is culture in America today. The project suggests that popular culture, rather than being a vehicle for social change and new understandings, often times serves to maintain the social status quo.

Through a series of multi-media presentations with guest scholars and artists from outside the Emory University community, I plan to offer a provocative conversation on music, race, and commerce; one that probes the musical and racial assumptions that often receive little attention within or outside of the academy. Special attention will be given to historical continuities and contradictions. For example, we will consider nineteenth-century portraits of African Americans in popular cultural expressions such as minstrelsy and sheet music. We will also compare and contrast contemporary images of African Americans in expressions such as hip-hop culture and its many manifestations. This project seeks to engage and involve the very community that is at once the subject, and the consumer of these popular culture formations.

These presentations will take place throughout the Atlanta community—on campus, in libraries, in churches, and in community centers. The hope is to create a rigorous and disciplined conversation about music that will reveal a deeper understanding of both the music and ourselves. The intent of this work is to uncover the limitations and particular expectations of our racial imagination when applied to the vast world of music in general, and popular music in particular.
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Teaching and Learning in the Public Realm

Lessons on effectiveness

At Oxford College, I teach writing and literature courses as an English department faculty member, and I organize a number of services and activities for faculty as Director of the Center for Academic Excellence. In both of these roles, my primary focus is how pedagogies enhance students’ learning. I recall studying intellectuals whose writings communicate with a larger audience. Three of my favorites are Henry Giroux, Martha Nussbaum, and C. S. Lewis. These academics have provided one kind of public engagement, and today, other kinds of conversations that bridge the imagined divide between the academy and the public are occurring in greater frequency and contexts as well.

The opportunities for public engagement have grown partly because the academic imperative for the most disciplined forms of inquiry can lead to insights and discoveries that address urgent public problems. For example, biological and chemical scientists, health scientists, environmental scientists, cultural anthropologists, linguists, sociologists, economists, and political scientists, to mention only a few, are called upon for their particular expertise and opinion.

Any exploration, then, of what it means for the university to engage the public realm must address all of those fields, plus some thorny issues, such as the corporatization of education, as Giroux points out, and the separation of academic discourse from public discourse, as Nussbaum has written much about. In this essay, I argue that scholars who engage the public realm can have a powerful social impact if they apply some of the best lessons the academic realm has to offer for teaching and learning.

Course design as an analogy for public engagement

Faculty study for years to master the content of their discipline, but teaching any discipline well requires another sort of journey—a lifelong excursion into such topics as pedagogy, course design, learning theory, and assessment. Barbara Walvoord, a former Notre Dame English professor turned assessment scholar, points to three criteria as the key ways to engage students meaningfully. She explains that well-designed courses are clear in what they seek to achieve in terms of the knowledge, skills, and attitudes and values of the students who take them. I think clearly conceived, significant moments of public engagement can possess the same possibilities of intention and design with respect to these three outcomes criteria. At the very least, this framework can provide a way of considering and assessing the effectiveness of the efforts.

Knowledge

As an English professor, I have ventured into teaching in the public realm. I have taught a number of programs for adult learners and written grants to the Louisiana Endowment for the Humanities to teach library reading programs, adult learner programs, and cultural studies programs. I have served on the board of a community civic center theater group. For many consecutive semesters I taught Elderhostel courses. And in all of those contexts, the same issues arose: course content, method of delivery, and the measurement of degree of success. What to include and what to leave out are not always self-evident. Answering these questions is time well spent.

I found that my experience with these questions—what knowledge are we delivering in this case, how will we deliver it, and how we know when we have been successful—transitioned easily from the university classroom to these more public settings. Transferring knowledge—through lecture or lab, general discussion, group work, or individual research projects—is what we do well in our courses, and the same concepts for rigor apply in these quasi-academic settings.

Skills

The transformative Theory-Practice/Service Learning (TPSL) program at Oxford College has long worked with community partners to provide learning experiences for students to apply new knowledge in performing key services to various institutions in the area. Patti Owen-Smith (professor of psychology) and Crystal McLaughlin (director of student development) have led a large cadre of faculty, students, and staff through a wide array of strong courses that engage the public in a number of contexts. Oxford College TPSL courses are thriving in a number of area institutions: the Psychology of Women and area agencies that serve women and families; teaching of Latin in the area high school; Social Gerontology and area agencies that serve older adults, to mention three examples of courses where service and learning are a collaboration.

While providing services like these is in itself a very good thing, to effect a deeper change in terms of knowledge or skills is profoundly better. In my own TPSL courses in English, for instance, I have seen first-year students produce a booklet of essays written from the perspectives of senior citizens whose stories our students were writing. I have overseen the creation, editing, and proofing of sets of essays written from the perspective of junior high nontraditional students. Through such courses, I have seen the narrative and editing skills of senior citizens, middle schoolers, and Oxford College students improve dramatically.

Attitudes and values

Many well-meaning, bright individuals hesitate to discuss this third learning outcome. On the one hand, they may argue that the university is not in the business of fostering values and certainly not examining them as any kind of outcome of the education process. Knowledge and skills, it is argued, are the primary goals of education. One should get an education, the argument goes, to be very good at a particular profession, to be successful in ways our society values. Yet we know this task avoids a key dimension of what it means to live a life beneficial to oneself and to others.

FURTHER READING


Shared Knowledge
Developing a public voice through the media

Death threats and a blog post proclaiming, “E... you Tom Russell” were definitely not the public response to his academic work that University of Denver law professor Tom Russell had anticipated back in graduate school at Stanford.

But perhaps the response was not so surprising given that his online published paper addressed segregation and a dormitory at the University of Texas that was named for a professor who had been an active member of the Ku Klux Klan in the late 1800s. A subsequent controversy over renaming the dormitory was covered in more than five hundred local, national, and international media outlets.

Speaking of his experience at the recent Slavery and the University conference at Emory, Russell offered sage advice: “Be ready for it—if you are doing public scholarship, this is what to expect.” Although Russell’s situation is an extreme and hits multiple hot-button social issues, he is absolutely right. But I would argue that in this media age, all scholarship is public. That is, it is readily accessible, all too easily parsed and parcelled for general consumption—and for the laser focus of special interest groups—in ways that scholars never imagined when they turned in their manuscripts for publication as little as five years ago.

The decision to enter the public sphere used to be deliberate. In my work with Emory faculty and graduate students across all disciplines over the past twenty years, we would discuss whether she or he wanted to reach the public through the media, and if the topic of research would be “of media interest.” If so, we would prepare a news release, promote the story to selected media representatives, and collect the resulting clips.

Today there is no choice to make. Boundaries between academia and broader society have blurred considerably. Within academia, the pace of dissemination of scholarly work has quickened with the proliferation of electronic and open-access publication, coupled with the tremendous growth of social media and Internet channels of dissemination and the transformation of the still influential and far-reaching mainstream media. Although issues of race, sex, and religion always will be flashpoints within the public realm, in today’s media world, any topic, any piece of scholarly work, can become a focal point for intense scrutiny and possible misinterpretation. Too often we are put in a defensive position, called upon to respond to challenges about the validity of scholarship and research through new media. For information about future workshops, please contact Nancy Seideman at nseidem@emory.edu.

“Meaning something,” after all, can take many forms: inviting people to share in the thrill of discovery, unearthing the brittle piece of paper in an archive that provides a clue in an historical mystery, uncovering a family ledger that reveals how a famous author developed his characters, identifying a molecule that just might have help in treatment of an intractable disease. People hunger for knowledge, for experiencing that rare moment when a family, friends, and even strangers all share in the thrill of discovery, unearthing the brittle piece of paper for general consumption—and for the laser focus of special interest groups—in ways that scholars never imagined when they turned in their manuscripts for publication as little as five years ago.

The decision to enter the public sphere used to be deliberate. In my work with Emory faculty and graduate students across all disciplines over the past twenty years, we would discuss whether she or he wanted to reach the public through the media, and if the topic of research would be “of media interest.” If so, we would prepare a news release, promote the story to selected media representatives, and collect the resulting clips.

Today there is no choice to make. Boundaries between academia and broader society have blurred considerably. Within academia, the pace of dissemination of scholarly work has quickened with the proliferation of electronic and open-access publication, coupled with the tremendous growth of social media and Internet channels of dissemination and the transformation of the still influential and far-reaching mainstream media. Although issues of race, sex, and religion always will be flashpoints within the public realm, in today’s media world, any topic, any piece of scholarly work, can become a focal point for intense scrutiny and possible misinterpretation. Too often we are put in a defensive position, called upon to respond to challenges about the validity of scholarship and research through new media. For information about future workshops, please contact Nancy Seideman at nseidem@emory.edu.

I would argue that in this media age, all scholarship is public.

Media Strategies for Faculty

This semester the Communications and Marketing Division in partnership with the Office of the Provost sponsored a pilot workshop series, “Experts Guiding Experts: Navigating Today’s Media,” to provide select faculty with information on communications strategies they can employ to raise awareness of their scholarship and research with all audiences and to increase visibility of their scholarship and research through new and existing media. For information about future workshops, please contact Nancy Seideman at nseidem@emory.edu.

www.emory.edu/acad_exchange

Spring 2011

The Academic Exchange
Often, when academics are not involved in [media] conversations, people rely on short-term generalizations to explain the world.”

Andra Gillespie
Assistant Professor of Political Science

Academic Exchange: Talk about your research focus and how it led you into public scholarship.

Andra Gillespie: I was hired at Emory with the expectation that I was going to publish a book on black voter turnout. It turns out that the research site where I worked, Newark, New Jersey, raised more interesting questions about generational succession in African-American leadership. So I ended up shifting my research agenda entirely in my second year here. That’s a really risky proposition, and my department very realistically and wisely had concerns about my decision.

My transition from studying black voter mobilization to black leadership has everything to do with the fact that I did my first voter mobilization experiment in Newark in 2002 when Cory Booker challenged Sharpe James for mayor. Had I not been in Newark in 2002, I wouldn’t be doing this work today. And had I not started doing work on Cory Booker in Newark I wouldn’t have branched out to look at other young black politicians. And had I not started working in those areas I seriously doubt journalists would have been interested in the work that I do. Everything came together at the right time, and I’m pretty thankful for it.

AE: In your view, why should the university engage in the public realm?

AG: There are two components. The first is that a university needs to be a good neighbor. It shouldn’t just be . . . separated from the community of which it is a part. Universities should engage the community and offer their resources to help. If there are problems, they should contribute to the solutions, not ignore them or contribute to the problem.

The second part is that our research should be relevant and applicable to people in the outside world. Oftentimes, our work as scholars is geared toward a very narrow audience that is highly specialized and has a deep understanding and knowledge of the things we’re studying. But we lose a trend so they could say that in 2011 everybody was talking about China, Brazil, Russia, and India, but Professor Rosensweig was saying, “What about Indonesia, Turkey, Poland, Vietnam, Nigeria, South Africa, Chile, Mexico, and Colombia?” Portraying trends can help them think in less myopic terms. I also try to teach them things that will make them better citizens. We have had such a decline of an intelligent kind of citizenship.

AE: From an institutional standpoint, why do you think it’s important for faculty who have these gifts to exercise them in the public sphere?

JR: I think we have to do some deep thinking about the university as it is currently constituted—is it really ideally suited for twenty-first century pressures? Increasingly, astute analysts are thinking that the traditional university is too expensive and isn’t really serving society’s needs. Probably, as many people get educated through TED [Technology, Entertainment, Design] talks and through other modes, there’s going to be a diminution of the number of universities and colleges in the more traditional trends so they could say that in 2011 everybody was talking about China, Brazil, Russia, and India, but Professor Rosensweig was saying, “What about Indonesia, Turkey, Poland, Vietnam, Nigeria, South Africa, Chile, Mexico, and Colombia?” Portraying trends can help them think in less myopic terms. I also try to teach them things that will make them better citizens. We have had such a decline of an intelligent kind of citizenship.

AE: As a public scholar with expertise in the global economy, what are your goals?

JR: I try to lengthen people’s time horizon. Often, especially because we’ve been through this great recession worldwide, much deeper than a normal downturn in the economy, they want to know, “Are we out of the recession? What’s going to happen in the next year? Are we going to start creating jobs?” Such concerns are very important, so I try to work that in, but also as an educator I want to show them some historical or more recent trends that seem enduring, so they can get an idea of what the world could look like in 2020 or 2030. I try to get them away from helicopter economics or elevator finance: this is why the stock market went up yesterday; this is why it came down today. Focusing on that isn’t really going to lead to some deeper learning. However, showing them some
lot of credibility in the outside world when people don’t see the practical applications of what we do. My role is not just to teach my students and not just to exhort some type of scholarly discussion; it’s also to get non-academics to read my work, gain some insight from it, and be able to apply it in their own lives.

AE: How can academics responsibly contribute to public scholarship?

AG: The first thing is educating journalists and therefore educating readers, viewers, or listeners about the salient issues of the day. We look around and see media personalities, not journalists, who know just enough to be dangerous, and they’re teaching others. Often, when academics are not involved in those conversations, people rely on short-term generalizations to explain the world. The media usually doesn’t provide enough context and generally relies on anecdotes, not empiricism, to make claims. The job of the scholar is to provide balance and context, because journalists don’t have time to do that type of meaty, weighty, in-depth research. We can provide the public with explanations that heighten the discourse.

AE: What are the risks to junior scholars who put themselves in the public eye?

AG: There is an example of somebody at another school who’s done this incorrectly. The person, who happens to be black, ingratiated himself with television and radio producers and found a platform from which to talk about things related to race that are not related to his training. He was on television all the time talking about things that were outside his area of expertise. He had a verbal altercation on air with a prominent newscaster, and when he didn’t get tenure he blamed the newscaster. The reality was he may not have had enough journal articles. He had written four or five books, but they were tangential to his research expertise and were self-published. He seemed more interested in being a television personality than in being a scholar, and I think that’s what his department saw.

AE: How do you approach media literacy in your classes?

AG: I taught a class in Fall 2008 called Race in the 2008 Election, for example. The whole purpose of the class was to make sure that my freshmen were literate consumers of what was going on, so that they weren’t so enamored with Obama and therefore would support him no matter what. I wanted them to think critically about race. I wanted them to understand what deracialization was and how that’s a much more useful theoretical construct than postracialism, so they could understand why Obama was the one who ended up being nominated for president and not somebody like, say, Jesse Jackson. Often, the reason why we like the Barack Obamas or Harold Fords of the world has nothing to do with anything they say, it’s because they make us feel good and project a certain image.

THOUGHTWORK OUTLOUD
PODCASTS AVAILABLE ON ITUNESU

ThoughtWork OutLoud is a podcast series on iTunesU about emerging knowledge and news from Emory’s intellectual community. The series is produced by the Academic Exchange on behalf of the Office of the Provost.

The first installment explores the Predictive Health Institute at Emory and its implications for health care, research, and education. It features a visit to the Institute’s Center for Health Discovery and Well Being and interviews with Ken Brigham, director of the institute, and Michelle Lampl, its associate director. To listen to the podcast, please visit http://tinyurl.com/2wtvflt.

A second installment of ThoughtWork Outloud, on Slavery and the University, is coming soon.

www.emory.edu/acad_exchange
Reflections on a Tragedy
The media and the public stigma around mental illness

On January 8, 2011, Jared Lee Loughner opened fire at a Tucson political rally, leaving six people dead and fourteen others, including U.S. Representative Gabrielle Giffords, seriously injured. In the days following the shooting, it became evident that Loughner suffered from a serious mental disorder that had never been formally diagnosed or treated, and that became the primary focus of media reports. Many articles presented sensationalized portrayals of his mental illness: “Psycho killer Jared Lee Loughner’s eyes look ‘dead—he’s pure evil,’” reported a New York Post article describing the incident.

Violent incidents like the ones in Tucson, Fort Hood, Virginia Tech, and Columbine have raised a series of questions, including tightening (or loosening) gun control, addressing the failure of public systems to identify suspects, and requiring mandatory treatment for those with mental illnesses. In the wake of the Tucson shooting, mental health advocates framed the events as a failure of the mental health system to identify and provide treatment to Loughner, even though he never was engaged with the public system. The Congressional Mental Health Caucus went further to call for hearings on the state of U.S. mental health care. A serious analysis of these arguments and mandates, however, might show that at the crux is the issue of how best to protect “us” from the collective “them” in the face of the unpredictability of life.

Washington Post journalist and former Rosalynn Carter Fellow for Mental Health Journalism Shankar Vedantam, in his timely book The Hidden Brain, suggests that it is basic human behavior, when confronted with fear and the unknown, to jump to mental shortcuts that build a framework for understanding the stimulus of the fear, even if the shortcuts may not be logical. Such mental shortcuts, intended to “protect” one from future unpredictable events, can play a key role in building and further perpetuating stereotypes. These stereotypes are often at the heart of stigma and the resulting discrimination associated with the targeted groups.

The media can play a powerful role in shaping public response either by perpetuating stereotypes and supporting the mental shortcuts or by providing accurate information and context about events that shape attitudes and beliefs about groups in question. In the case of Tucson, articles countering the initial sensational reports presented evidence documenting that people with schizophrenia rarely commit violent acts, and, as in the case of Jared Loughner, violence among persons with schizophrenia is largely seen among those who also abuse alcohol and illegal substances. The deeper and more interesting questions not being asked are, What protective factors are in place so that the vast majority of people with serious mental illnesses do not commit these crimes? What role do we as a community play in this, and how can we build on these successes?

Journalists know that facts are not enough to touch the hearts and minds of readers. At its core, journalism is about telling stories; told correctly, these narratives can replace stereotypes about mental disorders with an understanding of actual people with those conditions. To promote more widespread treatment and reduce stigma, advocates have increasingly emphasized the neurobiological roots of mental disorders. During the 1990s, the growth of neuroscience helped undergird these biologically based approaches and transform the nature of mental health service delivery in the United States. During that era, the number of Americans in mental health treatment rose from 30.3 to 56.5 million, with more than a fifth of Americans receiving some sort of mental health care by the 2003.

This medical model has proven to be a powerful tool not only for increasing treatment rates but also for moving mental health into the mainstream of health policy. There is evidence, however, that while the biological model may help make certain forms of treatment more acceptable, it leaves other aspects of stigma unaddressed. In a study published this year in the American Journal of Psychiatry, authors used two national surveys to compare Americans’ attitudes towards mental illnesses between 1996 and 2006. The study found that during that decade, the public increasingly saw mental disorders as caused by neurobiological mechanisms and believed that treatment for those conditions was appropriate. But they found few changes in the proportion of respondents who would be willing to have someone with a mental disorder as a friend, coworker, or neighbor.

At its core, journalism is about telling stories; told correctly, these narratives can replace stereotypes about mental disorders with an understanding of actual people with those conditions.
Once again, and for the fifth year in a row, the Gallup poll has reported that nursing is the most trusted profession in the United States. As nurses with more than twenty-five years of experience—and hence, a deep collective memory—our conversations about the problems the profession faces circle around a persistent theme: how do people perceive us, and how can that perception be translated into better working conditions, respect on the job, and improved patient care?

Despite some improvements, most bedside nurses still have working conditions that include physically demanding and long hours, mandatory holiday and weekend work, understaffing, disrespectful treatment by other members of the healthcare team without consequence or administrative support, and such blue collar conditions as the inability to control breaks and mealtimes, make a phone call, or sit down to eat a meal without the pressure to return to work as fast as possible. Nursing schools struggle to stay open with tuition pressures, lack of faculty, and diminutive endowments compared to medical schools. But the public loves us.

In 2009 the journal Nursing Economics published a survey examining public perceptions of nursing compared to other occupations and factors (including media) influencing these attitudes. The single biggest influence on public perceptions about nursing was “personal experiences with nurses as a patient or family member.” The study found that nurses were highly valued professionals. Indeed, the public describes nurses as “caring” but also as “overworked,” yet the vast majority of respondents reported that they would recommend nursing to young people thinking about a career. Interestingly, 66 percent reported that negative media images of nurses on television did not influence their opinion of the value of nursing but that news programs showing nurses helping in disasters increased their respect.

The same study found that healthcare professionals (the doctors and nurses who know the work nurses do and the conditions in which they do it) were significantly less likely than the general public to recommend returning to work as fast as possible. Nursing schools struggle to stay open with tuition pressures, lack of faculty, and diminutive endowments compared to medical schools. But the public loves us.

It’s a great career with potential for advancement and diverse role opportunities (including advanced practice, bedside nursing, community health, teaching, and research), but it isn’t for the faint of heart.

It has been well established that nurses are key players in health care reform and in the safety of patients in health care settings. A 2009 study published in Health Affairs projects an alarming crisis by 2025, when the shortage of nurses will grow to 260,000 registered nurses. This deficit will be twice as large as any nursing shortage in the U.S. since the 1960s, occurring just as 7,000 U.S. citizens will be turning 65 every day. This dynamic shift in demographics is a major factor contributing to the impending nursing shortage. At the same time, however, it creates new opportunities for individuals seeking a dynamic career that improves healthcare access, quality, and safety. As mothers whose children have not followed us into nursing, we can only speculate that maybe we were too tired, worked too many hours, missed too many soccer games, or complained too much to inspire them to join us. Another possibility, at least for our sons, is that they are not particularly interested in entering a profession that is dominated by white (79 percent), middle-aged (average age is 44) women (91 percent).

Lack of respect on the job may be a problem that exists for other white, middle-aged women in the workforce, but nursing seems to have unique image problems. Media portrayals of nursing have typically been within four major archetypes: the virtuous and selfless ministering angel exemplified by the Johnson & Johnson television campaign “We Dare to Care”; the doctor’s handmaiden, dutifully taking orders and enjoying the Cherry Ames sidekick role; the dangerous and unfeeling nurse made famous by Nurse Ratched in One Flew Over the Cuckoo’s Nest; and finally the naughty, sexy nurse, exemplified by “Hotlips” Hoolihan and conspicuous at Halloween if you peruse the Party City costume aisle.

Linda McCauley, dean of the nursing school at Emory University, sees the image problem as “not directed solely to our profession, but directed towards women. Unfortunately our society still has a long way to go in respecting women.” And the chief nursing officer at Emory Healthcare, Susan Grant, concurs. She points out that there is an image problem for male nurses as well. She explains, “When it comes to the individual considering nursing as an occupation, the media has subtle and not-so-subtle effects. The media portrays most nurses as women (generally white), which indicates that most nurses are not men. . . . People are influenced by what they see and also by what they don’t see. What people don’t see in the media causes them to come to their own conclusions.”

The few contemporary images of male nurses are cartoonish. Consider Ben Stiller as Greg Focker, the bumbling and emasculated nurse in the Parents, or the sexy, gay nurse Mo-Mo on Showtime’s Nurse Jackie.
The Public Scholars of the Future
Preparing undergraduates with skills and experiences for public service

I am a public scholar. My work focuses on commercial fishermen’s decisions about participating in fishery management efforts. If I want fisheries policy makers to pay attention to my findings, I must be very thoughtful about both my analysis and how I communicate. They are busy and distracted people, so concise and compelling works best for them. And these analyses must be accessible to them in sources they read. So while the publication in top journals earned me tenure, it was lesser known journals and hard-fought discussions that earned me credibility as a public scholar.

I grasped those lessons in a painful learning curve. My education did not prepare me for this kind of public work. Similarly, my friends now working in government, non-profits, and business had difficult transitions from their training in research and writing to the methods they now must use to investigate, analyze, and communicate information.

Now as a teacher, I craft my curriculum to pass on these lessons to my undergraduate students. They are the next generation of public scholars. Inside or outside of academia, they will be professionals who touch public service in some aspect of their lives. How then do we train undergraduates to be effective in their life’s work? Our students already have the fundamentals: sharp minds and academic discipline. What they need are skills to be effective public scholars. What our students need are skills and experiences immediately transferable to their lives. These include

Exposure to practical issues: Our students crave knowledge about the challenges they will face when they enter the workforce. In every field, understanding key problems and potential solutions empowers students by helping them figure out how to take action. This exposure also can help them identify their vocations.

Opportunities to analyze issues: Our students are well trained in analyzing theory. But the challenging leap from theory to practice requires opportunities to examine problems and offer potential solutions. By guiding students through this process we provide a chance for them to gain experience and confidence before they face these tasks in their first job or as citizens engaged in civic discourse.

Practice in applied research: Our students are extraordinarily well-equipped researchers. But usually they are trained in classical scholarly research. Once they leave school, few will need to refer to the key academic journals or latest monographs relevant to their major. Instead, they need to know how to find and critically assess recent analyses and data about the issues they will work on.

Synthesizing diverse information and opinions: This is the skill of sorting through competing claims of knowledge and authority. We already teach this skill as it applies to theory, but many recent graduates find it difficult to apply it to specific issues. Guided opportunities to practice this skill are invaluable.

Professional writing: There are important differences between traditional academic and professional writing. The manager who will wade through a classic ten- to twenty-page research paper is as rare as a wizard outside of a Harry Potter movie. We keep this assignment as a mainstay of how we teach writing, even though it handicaps our students as they enter the workforce only to find that the writing style they spent years perfecting is obsolete.

Oral communication: As they become professionals, our students must communicate authoritatively in a variety of settings. Whether speaking with peers or supervisors, making presentations, or using video, persuasive oral communication is a vital tool that requires practice.

Some but not all of these skills are addressed in a traditional academic curriculum. Below are some tools for teaching these skills. These tools offer experiences, or approximations of experiences, students may face in the future. They thus offer guided opportunities for students to build their problem-solving skills. These teaching tools are not new, but when we apply them with an eye toward training the future public scholar, they can be very powerful. The table summarizes which skills each teaching tool addresses.

Case Studies: A mainstay of graduate professional education. They present a dilemma then stop at a key decision point, leaving the students...

---

### Public Scholarship Skills and Teaching Tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Tools</th>
<th>Exposure</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Synthesis</th>
<th>Oral Communication</th>
<th>Written Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case Studies</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simulations</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Class Discussion</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Videos</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memos</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Research</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internships</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lives Steeped in Stories
Teaching students to become critical consumers of media

When students arrive for the first day of the semester to one of my courses about media, they come with a lifetime of experience. Their existence has been steeped in mediated stories. They have a cache of knowledge relevant to the serious study of media. So on the first day of my classes, I tell students that through their everyday exposure to media they and others already know quite a lot about the material we will wrestle with in the course. Part of my task is to help them unearth what they already know and provide a structure to help them organize that information, so that they can bring it to bear on the course and build on it. I aim to have students become critical consumers of media—to understand that media systems and the dominant ideas conveyed via media may seem natural but are actually socially constructed. This ability to discern is critical to becoming an active citizen in a democracy.

For these reasons, I encourage students to be aware of items in the popular press that have connections to the course topics. The themes that have recur throughout media history continue to resonate today. For example, in my History of American Television course, the news about media’s vital role in the unfolding of the political uprising in Egypt had relevance with discussions of media and political change on the one hand. On the flip side, the attempts to stifle Internet access and control television coverage are connected to the recurring issue of censorship. Another example involves the aftermath of the Arizona shootings, which stirred up public debates on civil discourse, echoing similar conversations following other national tragedies. Students begin to see these connections on their own and even bring them to my attention to share with the class.

Several assignments bridge the space between the classroom and students’ lives outside the university. In courses in my specialty area—children, youth, and media—a first assignment is a kind of autobiography or auto-ethnography around media, a reflection on the student’s personal history with media. They are asked to think and write about, for example, their earliest memories of using media, their family’s attitudes about media technologies and texts, and the role media played in the home. Then they are to synthesize their reflections and draw some conclusions about the role of media in their early lives and how it connects to their media use and attitudes today.

In many cases students mention that they called their parents to discuss their memories and to acquire additional information. Many have told me that they spent a good deal of time thinking about the assignment before they actually start to write. They have to create their own story, and they say that in remembering and reflecting, they come to new realizations about their own lives. On the day the assignment is due, all students report to the class on what they have discovered through investigating their own experiences. What results from these reports and subsequent discussion every semester is fascinating for me and the students in both the similarities and diversity of experience. If I simply collected the papers to read and grade, the students would miss out on hearing about their peers’ experiences and would not realize the complexities and variety of factors involved when we study the role of media in the lives of children.

With this importance of historical memory and media in mind, this semester for the History of Television class I devised a new exercise that took students outside of the classroom to learn about television history. They were to conduct an interview with a person who is at least fifty-five years old—whether a parent or other relative, friend, or acquaintance. I provided an interview script as a guide and encouraged students to follow up on their answers and probe more deeply. The goal was to conduct a conversation with the person, which would help them access their memories and opinions about television and provide insights into how television history has unfolded in individual lives. The students interviewed parents, grandparents, other relatives, friends of parents, and even a professor. When it was not possible to conduct an interview face to face, I encouraged them to use a technology that would allow them to view the interviewee (Skype or other video chat). An interesting side value of this assignment was the cross-generational conversation on a neutral topic in which both parties were interested. Students were excited about this assignment and enjoyed talking about their elders’ memories and opinions in class. It helped bring the history home for them.

I also lead students to think about their current media habits. And they begin to imagine themselves as potential parents and ask themselves how they will handle media in the lives of their own children. They know this issue will confront them in their possible future role as parents or caregivers of children.

To drive this point home, I have assigned students to conduct an observation of a child (up to age sixteen) using media. The idea is to spend at least an hour unobtrusively observing a child involved in a media-related activity. This might be watching television or a movie, playing a video or computer game, or using the Internet. Students are to observe the child’s involvement with the medium and note such factors as other simultaneously occurring activities, the kind of content being used, the child’s emotional state, and the space and other contextual factors in which the activity occurs. If the child is old enough, students are encouraged to talk with them about what they were doing (after the observation period) or to talk with parents or caregivers. The idea is to describe and interpret the interplay between the medium, the content, the child, and the context. As with the autobiography assignment, students bring their findings to class and summarize their experiences for another. Again the complexities of studying children and media are revealed when hearing all of the students’ reports.

For the students these exercises result in an intimate involvement in the study of media and boost their critical thinking about media. Bringing the world outside the university into the classroom and into students’ consideration of the course material gives extra power, relevance, and immediacy to issues that are integral to our culture and our democracy. Above all, these strategies help students, at least momentarily, decentralize themselves and the present and allow them to situate their own generation in history.
"The Bible in one hand, the newspaper in the other"  
Cultivating public theologians in the Youth Theological Initiative

"Muslim, Christian, Jew, Baha'i—YTI Diversify! Go justice, go peace!"

chanting these words as they walked down Peachtree Street with thousands of others in the Martin Luther King Jr. Day March, high school, college, and graduate students of diverse ethnic and religious backgrounds held signs with quotations from Mohandas Gandhi, Martin Luther King, and Abraham Joshua Heschel, as well as slogans proclaiming their commitment to interfaith cooperation for social justice and peace. In between their chants, they broke into song, ranging from the South African freedom hymn “Siyahamba” to the civil rights classic “We Shall Overcome.” The group of marchers behind and ahead of them thrilled at the sight of so many young people joyously singing and chanting their vision of a better world—a world in which people of all faiths can draw on the richness of their different traditions not only to support their work together, but also to encourage each other to become more faithful practitioners of their own traditions. These students marched into the public sphere—a sphere shaped by the shootings in Tucson only a week prior and by Qur’an burnings only a few months before that—and made their voices heard. They embodied what we at the Youth Theological Initiative call “public theology.”

The Youth Theological Initiative (YTI) began in 1993 as an experiment in theological education with high school students at Candler School of Theology. Funded by the Lilly Endowment, Inc., the designers envisioned an intellectually rigorous, spiritually rich experience, in which youth from around the country would live in community with adult mentors, including Emory faculty and graduate students, activists, artists, and church leaders. From the beginning, the program sought to embody a radical pedagogy, one in which young people—and their questions about faith and the world—would be taken seriously and engaged critically. Based on the assumption that young people have been “domesticated” and ignored, not only by the Church but also by schools and society, this pedagogy sought to empower young people to speak prophetically to the world. By bringing one’s faith commitments into conversation with the needs of a broken world, YTI set out to “cultivate public theologians.” According to Duncan Forrester in his 2000 book Truthful Action: Explorations in Practical Theology, Christian public theology seeks “to contribute to public discussion by witnessing to a truth which is relevant to what is going on in the world and to the pressing issues facing people and societies today.” In doing so, “it offers convictions, challenges and insights derived from the tradition of which it is a steward” and “attends to the Bible and the tradition of faith at the same time as it attempts to discern the signs of the times and understand what is going on in the light of the gospel.”

At YTI, we begin to explore what this means very concretely. In one of our first classes, students pick up sections of the daily newspaper and skim through the pages looking for an image or story that draws their attention, makes them upset, or gives them inspiration. After identifying something, students open their Bibles and look for stories, images, or passages that seem to “speak” to what they’ve found in the newspaper. Through discussion, students then share with each other insights gained by putting these two sources into conversation. Only after completing this activity do I share with them the oft-cited saying of theologian Karl Barth that one must “do theology with the Bible in one hand, and the newspaper in the other.” This helps us begin to understand ourselves as “public theologians.”

Students spend time in the classroom developing some of the skills needed to “do public theology,” exploring historical examples such as the church’s role in the U.S. civil rights movement and the South African anti-Apartheid struggle, and identifying contemporary forms of public theology in youth culture. But their learning also extends into the Atlanta community. For example, through the “Faith, Ethics and the City” curriculum, students focus on three different contemporary issues facing Atlanta—environmental justice, racism and civil rights, and immigration and labor—by working with and learning from organizations engaged in organic farming, addressing homelessness, and fighting sex trafficking. After each trip, students return to the classroom to reflect on their experiences in light of theological and ethical perspectives.

Although our program is rooted in the Christian tradition, YTI has evolved over the years to include a significant interfaith component—an addition requested by the youth themselves, who are eager to find ways to develop their own faith authentically while understanding and appreciating the faith traditions of others. In addition to attending Shabbat services at The Temple and Jumma prayers at the Atlanta Masjid of Al-Islam, YTI hosts a “Day of Interfaith Youth Service” in which Atlanta area youth from the Muslim, Jewish, Buddhist, Hindu, Baha’i, and Sikh traditions join them in service and dialogue, culminating in a picnic on Emory’s quadrangle. It was this experience that led to the participation in the MLK Day March. Passionate about the experience of interfaith dialogue and collaboration, these youth sought to proclaim this publicly as they walked down Peachtree Street chanting and singing.

As students develop the habits of mind of public theologians, they also begin to learn strategies for articulating their convictions and insights in the public sphere—the habits of action of public theologians. Drawing on the work of Mohandas Gandhi and Gene Sharp, we introduce both the theories and methods of nonviolent social change. Returning to the historical examples of public theology such as the German Confessing Church’s Barmen Declaration and the South African Kairos Document as models, students break into groups focused on issues they’ve identified as important and work together to develop their own “Kairos Documents.” Finally, students are invited to develop projects to make changes back in their home communities and apply for mini-grants that can support them in this work.

The Youth Theological Initiative exemplifies one way that the academy, the church, and the local community can come together to contribute to the training of public scholars. The staff members of the community organizations we work with help us to deepen our curriculum with their expertise and perspectives on the social issues they work to address. The leaders of our interfaith partner organizations see the Day of Interfaith Youth Service as a way to engage their own youth in articulating and embodying their beliefs and practices with others. Teachers and pastors in the home communities of our students provide the local support and guidance needed to help our students’ projects make a meaningful impact beyond the Atlanta context. Finally, the staff members of YTI, typically graduate students, learn an innovative form of teaching and ministry that they later apply in a variety of settings, including secondary and higher education, campus and church ministry, and non-profit work.

At its establishment, the designers of YTI knew they were creating a “laboratory” in which to engage in an experiment in religious education with youth. The “laboratory” has now extended beyond the classroom into Atlanta and beyond, and “experimenters” have grown to include not only YTI staff, but pastors, teachers, activists, religious and civic leaders, and, most important, the youth themselves.
Nursing in the Media

Missing from media portrayals are images of nurses influencing critical patient care decisions as members of collaborative healthcare teams. Does Dr. House practice in a hospital that even employs nurses? Does Nurse Jackie, with her questionable code of ethics, trust that she can involve her physician colleagues collaboratively in her “heroic” attempts to save lives and render justice in the ER?

Nursing is now challenged to respond quickly to address the social changes shaping health care delivery. The 2010 Institute of Medicine report on the future of nursing concludes that nurses will play a key role in transforming health care delivery. To attract the type of individual who will contribute to such a transformation, the profession needs improved images of nurses. The right images could go a long way toward educating the public about the rigorous preparation nurses undertake to understand and work within complex systems. Real contemporary nurses have leadership, scholarship, and management skills that enable them to contribute innovative solutions that improve the care of patients within the community and hospital setting.

The university, as the setting for public scholarship, has a responsibility to insist that nurses are included in conversations about health care and reform. Nurses are the largest group of workers in health care, and as business and medicine are called on to heal our failing system, it behooves us as scientists and intellectuals to resist the notion that a fix can be achieved without including nurses in the conversation. Policy wonks can scratch their heads, but if nurses tire of being overlooked, underpaid, and ignored, no one is going to show up to do the work.

The future of nursing demands that we attract intelligent, compassionate individuals who perceive nursing as a satisfying, lifelong career. Outdated images need to change to ensure the health and safety of the public in the twenty-first century. We speculate that this will not only improve working conditions for all healthcare workers, but will attract men, minorities and those contemplating nursing as a second career to join us in improving health care within and beyond our nation.

Teaching and Learning in the Public Realm

In fact, universities possess and profess core values; they spend much time and effort developing mission and vision statements, and they develop strategic plans. To say values are not central to what we do in academia is to obscure a vital reality. Engagement in the public realm can include open discussions of the ethical dimension of current issues, and in this area universities can provide contexts within which public constituencies can explore values.

Conclusion

The notion of “public scholarship” has necessarily deepened and broadened in meaning and impact through the years. Meaningful engagement that leads to transformative change is not limited to the models provided by the likes of Nussbaum and Giroux—insightful books or research findings sent out from the academic enclave. When a university professor’s expertise meets with some vital need, change can occur just as profoundly, if more humbly, in small groups, within one’s local community and within the ever-expanding digital communities on the internet. But how do we know if we are meeting that need and having an impact on knowledge, skills, and values in the public realm? If we borrow the pedagogical components of course design—course content, goals/objectives, and learning outcomes—and apply them to public activities, very useful kinds of conversation might occur in terms that professors already know. To employ the same serious consideration of learning outcomes to public conversations as we already apply in our course development is to broaden our devotion to teaching and learning.

Mental Illness Stigma

There still is a great deal of work to be done in stigma reduction and improving the reporting of mental illnesses. To be certain, Emory University and The Carter Center will remain at the forefront. In one of the most powerful pieces responding to the Tucson shootings, Andrea Ball, a 2006-07 Carter Center journalism fellow, “came out” for the first time to her readers as having bipolar disorder. In a personal description of her own experience living with a mental illness, she wrote, “I’m not doing this to garner sympathy or kudos, I’m doing it to add to the chorus of voices out there saying that people with mental illness can live healthy, productive lives. And the fact is, the vast majority of us are not out to kill you.” In fact, what most people dealing with mental illnesses want is what we all want—a full and rich life filled with friends, family, work, and meaning.
[At the beginning of the financial crisis], you had a stage that was a total meltdown, where there was a raw panic: something had to be done in terms of a bailout and the question of who was selected to be bailed out. . . . Unfortunately, when something really goes wrong I think you need a little bit of a public hanging once in a while. So what I would have done is that if you wanted money from the government, I would have treated you the way a venture capital firm would have treated a bankrupt operation that looked like it had promise but needed money. Because the companies who gained from TARP [Troubled Assets Relief Program], with the possible exception of J.P. Morgan and maybe one other, couldn't open their doors on that Tuesday in September. . . . If they were broke and the only money they could get was from the government, the government should have done two things. First they should have given the money for a much higher price and should have gotten much more for it. So [for] Goldman Sachs or Lehman Brothers, or anybody who went to TARP, the government should have owned 75 or 80 percent of those companies then resold them later on because those companies couldn't have gotten that money anywhere else. It should have wiped out their shareholders and probably their bondholders.

After the Second Great Awakening that took place from the early 1800s into the 1830s, reform movements spread across the country, as Christians attempted to perfect themselves and society. You may be familiar with some of these reforms: temperance, women’s rights, healthy eating—this is when Mr. Graham developed his Graham cracker—and the call for the abolition of slavery. Colleges were not immune from this reforming zeal. For example, in the North, Oberlin College, founded in the 1830s, embraced many of these reforms. In 1848, Asa Mahan, Oberlin’s president, published Science of Moral Philosophy, and in this book he criticized slavery as morally wrong. He based his conclusion on biblical texts from Paul’s first letter to the Corinthians, chapter nine, verses nine and ten, that “He that ploweth should plow in hope, and that he that threshes in hope should be a partaker in his hope.” He drew from this point that for the entire people of God, this one principal, that labor without wages should never, under any circumstances, be permitted among men. In the South, and especially in Georgia and South Carolina, the reforming zeal took on the characteristics of the region. Instead of criticizing slavery, reformers sought to make slavery more humane. . . . Slavery and its defense stood as important pillars of the Southern Methodist Church in the decades before the Civil War. . . . As an institution supported by Methodist Episcopal Church South, Emory College in Oxford, Georgia, adopted the ideology of paternalism and its defense of slavery.
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Do we really know what’s going on in North Korea? I don’t think the U.S. intelligence community, nor for that matter the Chinese intelligence community, nor for that matter even WikiLeaks provides sufficient answers to some of these questions that have been raised about North Korea. What does North Korea stand to gain [from military attacks]? You would think that these sorts of provocative behaviors are detrimental to the national interests of North Korea. Obviously Pyongyang doesn’t think so. . . . Will North Korea escalate from brinksmanship to actual war? My brief answer would be no, because North Korea is not interested in war. This is something that many people are concerned about: what if we respond too rigidly to North Korean attacks? Would that not lead to war? North Korea would like most people to think that there’s that possibility. But I don’t think so, because North Korea’s interest is not war; North Korea’s interest is regime survival. . . . Will there be further provocations? Most certainly. Possibly further attacks on Yeonpyeong island, a third nuclear test. In whatever form it may be, we have not seen the last of North Korean provocation.