PARTNERING FOR CHANGE IN DANCE HIGHER EDUCATION

by

IVAN PULINKALA

Committee

KARRI HOLLEY (Chair)

DAVID G. HARDY

JAMES E. MCLEAN

CLAIRE H. MAJOR

WAYNE URBAN

A DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Education in the
Department of Educational Leadership,
Policy and Technology Studies
in the Graduate School of
The University of Alabama

TUSCALOOSA, ALABAMA

2012

ABSTRACT

This case study evaluated the long-term viability of the community engagement partnerships within the Program in Dance at Kennesaw State University. Framed by *Social Exchange Theory*, data gathered from university and community stakeholders was synthesized to evaluate the experiences within these partnerships. The element of reciprocity was analyzed from multiple participant perspectives, to gain an understanding of how these partnerships can be developed and sustained in the future.

Keywords: Higher Education Dance Partnerships, Higher Education Dance Collaborations, Community Engagement in Dance.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My appreciation to all the participants in this empirical study conducted at Kennesaw State University. This dissertation would not be possible without the support of my parents, my partner, my family, and all my friends and colleagues. I would like to thank my dissertation chair, Dr. Karri Holley, the members of my dissertation committee, and the faculty in the higher education program at the University of Alabama, for preparing me to successfully complete my doctoral studies. I would also like to specially thank the Clendenin family and Kennesaw State University for financially supporting my graduate education.

DEDICATION

To the memory of my grandparents

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
DEDICATION	iv
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY	1
Background to the Study.....	3
Carnegie Community Engagement Classifications	7
The History of Dance in Higher Education	11
Community Engagement Partnerships in Dance	13
Conclusion	16
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	18
Synthesis Methods	18
Framework- Social Exchange Theory	19
Reciprocity	21
Distributive Justice.....	22
Criticisms of Social Exchange Theory	23
Study Implications	24
Summary of Articles	25
Findings.....	25
Reciprocal Benefits.....	26
Benefits to the Students	27

Benefits to the Faculty	29
Benefits to the Community Partner.....	31
Benefits to the University	34
Benefits to the Community	36
Benefits to the Profession	37
Challenges of Achieving Distributive Justice.....	39
Resource Problems.....	40
Communication Problems.....	42
Philosophical Differences	44
Time Constraints	46
Pedagogical Differences	48
Reciprocal Culture and Organizational Structure	50
Developing Structures and Resources	50
Philosophic Changes.....	53
Outcome Assessment	55
Summary of Synthesis Findings	57
Study of the University Partner Institution	57
Study of the Community Partner Institution.....	58
Study of Auxiliary Entities	58
Identification of the Gap in Research	59
Conclusion	60
CHAPTER III: METHODS	61
Qualitative Research	62

Case Study Research Design	64
Research Site- Kennesaw State University (Program in Dance)	66
Positionality	68
Reflexivity.....	69
Assumptions.....	69
Limitations	70
Sources of Evidence.....	71
Personal Interviews.....	71
Focus Groups	72
Document/Audiovisual Analysis	73
Direct Observations	74
Population	75
Research Design.....	77
Data Management and Analysis	79
Data Inventory	79
Coding.....	80
Member Checks	80
Peer Review	81
Conclusion	81
CHAPTER IV: FINDINGS	82
Partnership Development and Sustainment	84
Interaction with Community Partner Institutions	84
Overlapping Mission.....	85

Credibility to Partner Institution	86
Sharing Resources.....	87
Sharing Human Resources	88
Sharing Space.....	89
Challenges of Developing and Sustaining Reciprocity	89
Challenges of Developing Reciprocity	90
Partnership Development.....	91
Relationship Maintenance.....	92
Clarifying Expectations	93
Resource Limitations	93
Lack of Institutional Support	94
Limited Financial Support	95
Human Resource Limitations	95
Philosophical Challenges	96
Degree Pursuit in Direct Conflict with Professional Practice.....	97
Negative Perception of Collegiate Dance	98
Unrealized and Unexplored Partnership Opportunities	98
Lack of Partnership Awareness	98
Development of Master Classes, Workshops and Summer Programs.....	99
Expansion of Teaching Opportunities	100
Unexplored Funding Potential	101
Stakeholder Experiences	102
Student Development.....	102

Role Model for Students	103
Career Preparation	104
Training Opportunities	106
Resume Development	107
Performance Opportunities	108
Internship Opportunities	109
Choreographic Influence	110
Networking Opportunities	111
Student Challenges.....	112
Intimidation, Frustration, Demoralization	112
Unprepared for Technical Challenges	113
Pressure on Students to Participate	114
Competitive Environment Created	115
Need to Develop Deeper Experiences	116
Schedule/Time Conflicts.....	117
Fear of Derailing Student Focus	118
Faculty Perspectives.....	118
Faculty Role as Partnership Instigators.....	119
Faculty Scholarship Opportunities.....	120
Lack of Reward and Recognition	120
Personal Time Costs	122
Implications for Professional Dancers	122
Expanding Career Potentials.....	123

Teaching and Choreographic Opportunities	124
Opportunity to Pursue an Academic Degree	125
Challenges Faced by Student Professionals.....	127
Duality of Balancing Professional and Academic Careers	127
Lack of Financial Support for Professionals.....	128
Age Conflict and Social Barriers	128
Partnership Impact	129
Institutional Impact	129
Recruitment.....	130
Cross-Disciplinary Collaboration	132
Community Impact	132
Developing Community Connections.....	133
Community Enrichment.....	134
Economic Development.....	135
Impact on the Profession of Dance	137
Changing Professional Standards	137
Audience Development.....	138
Conclusion	139
CHAPTER V: CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS	140
Research Question 1	141
Student Experiences.....	141
Professional Dancer Experiences.....	143
KSU Faculty and Administrator Experiences.....	144

Community Partner Experiences	145
Experiences of the Community	146
Synthesis of Stakeholder Experiences	146
Research Question 2	147
Partnership Orientation for Students	147
Workshops and Master Classes	148
Partner Site Visits and Meetings	148
Peer Mentoring	149
Development of Richer Experiences	149
Performance Opportunities	149
Choreographic Opportunities	150
Pedagogical Opportunities	150
Research Opportunities	151
Communication and Advertising	151
Formalizing Partnerships	152
Partnership Screening	153
Developing Institutional Support Structures	153
Funding	154
Rewards and Incentives	154
Human Resource	154
Professional Expertise	155
Academic Credit Opportunities	155
Partnership Evaluation and Assessment	156

Study Implications	156
Development of Base Line Data for Future Research	156
Triangulation of Multiple Stakeholder Perspectives.....	157
Implications for Future Practice.....	158
Study Limitations.....	159
Lack of Comparative Data	159
Lack of Independent Partnership Evaluation	159
Lack of Generalizability	160
Impact of Researcher	160
Conclusion	161
REFERENCES	162
APPENDIX A: Summary of Research Articles.....	167
APPENDIX B: Analysis of Research Findings	180
APPENDIX C: Matrix of Research Findings	186
APPENDIX D: Literature Search Criteria	189
APPENDIX E: Interview Protocol	192
APPENDIX F: IRB Approval.....	201

TABLES

3.1	Research Design Summary	77
4.1	Research Findings	83
5.1	Recommendations to Support the Long-Term Viability of the Community Dance Partnerships at KSU	147

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

The development of dance as a field of study within higher education has been relatively recent, serving a pedagogical philosophy that combines creativity with an intellectual investigation of human physicality. Since the development of the first dance program at Teachers College at Columbia University in 1913, collegiate dance programs have continued to gain popularity and a legitimate place within the academy. Originating in physical education departments, dance in higher education has continued to gain autonomy as a valued art form within the academy (Hagood, 2000). Even though most collegiate dance programs are housed under the umbrella of other disciplines, and often struggle to garner the independent resources they need to grow and develop, dance has seemingly established a permanent place within higher education along with the other major art forms.

Collegiate dance has traditionally remained relatively insular from the profession, and developed a pedagogy that is often seen in conflict with the needs of the profession. Developed as a separate discipline in the 1920s by leading educators like Margaret H'Doubler at the University of Wisconsin, collegiate dance curriculum has traditionally emphasized the intellectual investigation of human physicality, over a focus on training the human instrument for the professional stage.

It is perhaps needless to say that if dancing is to hold a place of importance in an educational curriculum those who teach must have as broad a background of knowledge as possible. The better the background, the better the teacher. Those teaching this

activity should believe in its values, *not as a performance* [emphasis added] but as an educational influence of the finest type. (H'Doubler, 1921, p. 12)

As evidenced by the underlying philosophical premise for dance in higher education articulated above by one of its founding educators, the focus of dance in higher education goes beyond the physical training of the body to serve the intellectual development of the art form within the academy. While one could argue that the professional practice of dance is not completely devoid of intellectual content, the rigor of practice to prepare the physical instrument for the demands of the profession often leaves little room for the study of the historical, philosophical, scientific, and intellectual components of the art form. This issue is compounded by the fact that at an age when most professions encourage their practitioners to enter a collegiate environment to develop the skills and knowledge necessary for success in the field, dancers (particularly ballet dancers) are required to devote six to eight hours a day to the physical training of their instrument, which is critical for success in the professional world. A collegiate academic curriculum does not allow this level of intense physical training due to its focus on both the physical and intellectual components of the art form.

Despite the historical divide between dance in higher education and its professional practice, recent collaborations between the two entities warrant an intellectual investigation and study. Nationally recognized partnerships such as the one between the Alvin Ailey American Dance Theatre and Fordham University in New York provide a model for ways in which dance in academia and the profession can partner for change in higher education. These partnerships, though very few in number, mirror national trends in community engagement that are gaining popularity within the academy. As the American university of the 21st century continues to establish its legitimacy within society as an *engaged institution* of higher learning, these

community partnerships in dance serve as a way of engaging the academic and professional dance worlds. A study of these partnerships can provide a theoretical understanding of their mission, purpose, benefits, and challenges to inform their future growth and development within higher education.

This dissertation study gathered data from multiple participants within the collegiate community dance partnerships at Kennesaw State University (KSU.) An evaluative case study method was employed to analyze the experience of key stakeholders and develop recommendations to support the long-term viability of the collegiate community partnerships at KSU. The outcomes of this evaluative case study research serve as a framework for the future evaluation of community engagement in dance at KSU. This single-site case study provided an analysis of the benefits and challenges of the university dance partnerships being evaluated at KSU. This study added to the body of empirical literature surrounding campus collaborations and educational partnerships, focusing on the emerging relationship between dance in academia and the profession.

Background to the Study

The concept of the *engaged institution* of higher education has received a great deal of attention over the past decade. Colleges and universities across the country have increasingly adopted community engagement practices to serve educational, social, and political agenda. In a climate of accountability and discussions of academic relevance surrounding higher education, institutions are seeking ways of reducing town and gown tensions by becoming actively engaged within their communities. According to Ramaley (2001), who discusses the question of public engagement in her paper *Why do we engage in engagement*, key reasons for community engagement at institutions of higher education include:

1. A mutual desire to strengthen a democratic way of life, drawing upon the intellectual resources of campuses to define and address community problems;
2. A hope to encourage students to become involved in the public life of their communities and to be responsible citizens;
3. To practice what higher education would teach by modeling good civic responsibility in campus life and in relationships with neighbors;
4. To create a means to address serious public relations problems and town-gown tensions; and
5. To help revitalize the communities surrounding campuses in order to make campuses more attractive places to study. (p. 1)

Ramaley's perspective focused on the role institutions play in their communities and highlighted the benefits of civic engagement for both the university and community partners.

Central to the development and sustainability of community partnerships is the concept of reciprocity between the institutional partners (Bringle & Hatcher, 2002; Carriere, 2008). The success of a partnership is directly dependent on the perceived benefits to partnering entities. Irrespective of the impulse that guides the formation of an educational partnership, the sustainment of a partner relationship requires the effective evaluation, communication, and acknowledgement of anticipated benefits that must outweigh the relationship costs. Without perceived benefits to the partner organizations in excess of the perceived costs, no logical impetus exists for the development of a partnership. This dissertation used the theoretical framework of Homans' (1958) *Social Exchange Theory* to help analyze the importance of reciprocal relationships that serve as a basis for all university partnerships. This framework

guided the development of the research design for this case study, which was aimed at evaluating the reciprocity between the university and community partner institutions.

A growing body of research within the field of community engagement and educational partnership provides a context that enables a new generation of scholars to build upon existing knowledge surrounding higher education collaborations. While national community engagement trends are still in their relative infancy, they warrant careful assessment and consideration to evaluate their viability and possible diffusion within other communities. This dissertation helped contribute towards this assessment need within the field of dance. As higher education contextualizes and systematizes the development of its engagement mission in the community, careful assessment and study of these community partnerships can provide critical knowledge about their strengths and weaknesses.

Some existing studies have shown an imbalance in the reciprocal relationship within collegiate partnerships, observing that higher education can often gain more mileage out of these partnerships than their community partners. These trends can prove problematic, as they have the potential to ultimately destroy the reciprocity of the partner relationship, resulting in the eventual failure of a partnership. The existing research highlights cautionary trends that can easily impede the success of community engagement partnerships that fail to recognize the community voice. Other studies have demonstrated that higher education is becoming increasingly aware of the cost of unhealthy relationships with the community, and is therefore focused on developing effective community partnerships that can address town and gown tensions (Maurrasse, 2002). The assessment of progress and viability of these partnerships thus becomes critical to their future development and institutionalization. In an article by McLean and Behringer (2008), two models for the evaluation of partnerships were explored to increase an

“understanding of the dynamics of building stronger, more equity-based partnerships” (p. 66). The *Give-Get* model developed by McLean and Behringer was predicated on social exchange theory, aimed at evaluating the reciprocal nature of partner relationships. This dissertation study used the same theoretical framework to undertake a cost-benefit analysis of the community engagement partnerships in dance at KSU.

The emerging national trends in support of community engagement partnerships also emphasize the importance of the institutionalization of community engagement within higher education. Institutionalization provides legitimacy and the resources needed to develop and sustain these partnerships, often resulting in assessment studies that provide theoretical and empirical knowledge for the benefit of other institutions. A case study paper by Letvin, Ostheimer, and Statham (2001) focused on the institutionalization of community engagement at the University of Wisconsin-Parkside as it sought to distinguish itself as an *engaged university*. A careful examination of the experiences within this case study revealed significant challenges of institutionalization. In addition to the financial and resource challenges that surround contemporary higher education, other obstacles of cultural hesitance, unresponsive reward structures and the lack of individual commitment proved to be significant hurdles for institutionalizing community engagement. Despite the challenges articulated in the literature, the institutionalization of community engagement initiatives signifies a commitment of the highest form resulting in the resources and support needed to make these partnerships succeed within an organization.

This dissertation focused on a study of the potential benefits gained by higher education institutions and communities that engage in mutually beneficial partnerships. The emerging educational partnerships in dance provided the impetus for this case study research to determine

the potential these partnerships have in the future of dance in higher education. While a growing body of empirical research and scholarly opinion exists within the realm of community engagement, discipline-specific studies surrounding community engagement do not encompass the field of dance. This dissertation aimed at expanding the body of empirical knowledge within this field of study.

Carnegie Community Engagement Classifications

In December 2006, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching announced its first classification of 76 U.S. colleges and universities under its new Community Engagement Classifications. Based on the categories of (1) curricular engagement, (2) outreach and partnership, and (3) curricular engagement/outreach and partnership, the classifications recognized institutions of higher education for their work in the area of public engagement and scholarship. The popularity of the first round of classifications resulted in a second round of classification of 120 institutions in December 2008 (Carnegie, 2008). Since the Carnegie Classifications have come to serve as the basis of important national ranking systems such as the *U.S. News and World Report*, the new Community Engagement Classifications provide greater legitimacy to the scholarship of community engagement, and help institutionalize higher education engagement with the community. “The classifications further affirm that the practices of community engagement have been developed to the extent that they are aligned with the institutional identity and are an integral component of the institutional culture” (Driscoll, 2009, p. 1).

Despite the known assumptions in support of community engagement partnerships, the number of submissions for the elective Carnegie Community Engagement Classification suggests that community engagement partnerships are not widespread within higher education

(Beere, 2009). Identifying community partners and developing productive partnerships is typically a lengthy process that requires a focus and commitment that is often hard to develop and sustain within higher education institutions. Two important questions seem to be at the forefront of the discourse about the development of community engagement partnerships: (1) who is responsible for the development of these partnerships; and (2) how can these individuals or entities be incentivized to develop these partnerships? According to a study conducted by Ward and Wolf-Wendel (2005),

Faculty members, in their roles as arbiters of the curriculum, teachers, knowledge producers, and citizens, hold a prominent role in realizing the goal of making higher education more responsive to community and public welfare. For faculty to claim, own, and foster institutional efforts to connect the campus more meaningfully with society, calls for reward structures that clearly define and reward this type of work. (p. 775)

The development of these partnerships often result from individual faculty interactions within the community. Since the culture of research dominates the reward and evaluative structures within higher education, it is critical that the scholarship of engagement be recognized explicitly within tenure and promotion criteria, if it is to be institutionalized within faculty scholarship (Saltmarsh, Giles, Ward, & Buglione, 2009). A disconnect exists between the aspirations to become engaged institutions of higher learning, and the cultural and organizational shifts that are necessary to facilitate faculty engagement in partnership development, implementation, and sustainment.

The Carnegie Foundation stated that, “partnership focuses on collaborative interactions with community and related scholarship for the mutually beneficial exchange, exploration, and application of knowledge, information, and resources (research, capacity building, economic development, etc.)” (Carnegie, 2008). Beere (2009) defines the term “partnership” as “(1) a

relationship, characterized by mutuality, (2) involving two or more individuals, groups, or organizations, that share (3) a commitment to an agreed-on goal or purpose” (p. 55-56). The central focus on reciprocity between the two individuals or institutions is therefore pivotal to the success of the partnership. Not only is the evaluation of the institutional benefits important to this discourse, but a focus on the benefits to the individual participants within each organization also seems vital to the discussion. The Carnegie Community Classification application process highlights the centrality of this focus within its evaluative rubric that seeks to outline the fundamental elements of community engagement. After describing the partnerships, applicants are asked to respond to three yes-no questions and describe examples when clicking yes:

1. “Does the institution or do the departments work to promote the mutuality and reciprocity of the partnership?” This is a critical question, as mutuality is a defining characteristic of a true partnership;
2. “Are there mechanisms to systematically provide feedback and assessment to community partners?” Systematic feedback and assessment are part of the evaluation process, which is important to strengthening and sustaining a partnership; and
3. “Are there examples of faculty scholarship associated with their outreach and partnership activities (technical reports, curriculum, research reports, policy developments, journal publications, etc.)?” Evidence of faculty scholarship shows that partnerships are at least somewhat woven into the basic fabric of the institution. (Beere, 2009, p. 57)

This evaluation rubric serves more than basic criteria for the classification of institutions as *engaged institutions*. The rubric also provides an impetus for institutions to focus on the role

they play within their communities. The Carnegie classifications center their assessment on three important components of community partnerships in higher education: (1) the higher education institution; (2) the community partner institution; and (3) the faculty who are instrumental in developing these partnerships. As the interest in higher education community engagement continues to grow on a national level, the Carnegie Community Engagement Classifications reflect not only this growing interest, but also serve as a way of facilitating and encouraging this growth.

Insights from institutions that have been recently classified under the new Carnegie Community Engagement Classifications provide an understanding of the benefits garnered from being part of this elite group of institutions. A study by Driscoll (2008) evaluating the experiences of Carnegie classified community institutions, emphasized “alignment of mission, marketing, leadership, traditions, recognitions, budgetary support, infrastructure, faculty development, and strategic plans as foundational indicators of community engagement” (p. 40). The study looked at the experiences of individual institutions relative to their successful classification as *engaged institutions*, serving as a frame of reference for other institutions that aspire towards the classification. The documented successes of Carnegie classified engaged institutions provide valuable ideas for the successful implementation of community engagement activities at other institutions. Driscoll’s (2008) study noted that “community engagement in the area of outreach and partnership took multiple forms- cooperative education and extension coursework, learning centers, institutional resource sharing (libraries, technology and cultural offerings), student volunteerism, and professional-development centers” (p. 41). The data gathered by the assessment rubric developed by the Carnegie Foundation encourages reflective enquiry into individual community partnerships, and helps assess the viability of these reciprocal

relationships. The assessment data is a portrayal of organizational change in action, as institutions of higher learning develop a mission to transform their environments in support of community interactions and partnerships.

The History of Dance in Higher Education

[T]he art of dancing is the skill which performs the acts directed by science. Science...is systematized knowledge, so art in this sense means knowledge made efficient by skill. It does not go beyond skillful performance. But by dancing as an art, we mean something more, - dancing as an adequate and harmonious means of expressing our emotional life. (H'Doubler, 1925, pp. 7-8)

The history of dance in higher education has traditionally remained relatively insular in respect to community engagement, and in particular with regard to engagement with the profession. Since its historic roots at the University of Wisconsin, where the first degree-granting dance program was started in 1926 under the direction of dance scholar Margaret H'Doubler, dance in higher education has maintained a focus on the intellectual components of the art form over a focus on professional practice.

Most dancers enter the profession at a relatively young age. The physical demands in ballet, for instance, require dancers to enter an apprentice company by their late teenage years to prepare physically for a professional career. While modern dancers have slightly later peak performance years, the fact remains that dance is an art form where youth is celebrated. The physical demands of the art form require a physical virtuosity that can be more effectively accomplished with a younger physical instrument. The pursuit of a collegiate degree in dance is therefore not an ideal avenue for dancers focused on a performance career. A collegiate curriculum, however, has a great deal to offer professional dancers in terms of preparing them to

be successful within the field past their relatively short performance careers. The rigor of professional training fails to develop practitioners as teachers, scholars, choreographers, arts administrators, or entrepreneurs. These skills can be vital to a dancer's success in the field past a performance career, attainable most effectively through a collegiate education.

In his book *A History of Dance in American Higher Education*, Thomas K. Hagood studied the philosophies and historical context that have shaped the study of dance in American higher education. "They [referring to Margaret H'Doubler and her colleague Blanche Trilling] were interested in a kind of dance with vital meaning, dance as an art experience, and dance as an educational experience" (p. 87). Hagood focused his research on the connections between the development of dance in higher education and the development of modern dance in the first half of the twentieth century. Both entities were in many ways revolting against the strict physical conventions of the ballet world in search of an intellectual investigation of the art form. The traditional collegiate curriculum therefore adopted modern dance philosophies over ballet pedagogy that lacked a rigorous intellectual focus. While ballet programs have increasingly become a part of the collegiate environment, the theoretical content within collegiate dance programs continues to be dominated by modern dance theories and philosophies. The physical demands of the professional ballet world remains in conflict with the four-year commitment required for an undergraduate education. Ballet dancers in particular (more so than modern dancers) are called in their late teens/early twenties to make a choice about how they want to spend their peak performance years, either on stage or at an institution of higher learning.

The scholarly focus developed in academia has possibly also been the result of dance academics striving to gain a respected place within the academy, focusing on the intellectual components of the art form over its physical techniques. While the designation of dance as a fine

and performing art in academia eventually led to the redirection of its focus as both a physical and intellectual discipline (Hagood, 2000), the relationship between the academy and the profession have remained essentially separate. The demands of the profession require focused physical work, with the emphasis almost solely on the training of the physical instrument, aimed at preparing dancers for the professional stage. Since the pedagogical goals of training dancers within the academy have fundamentally remained in conflict with the success of dancers within the profession, the two entities have resisted collaboration and remained separate within the community.

Since the early years when dance programs were first introduced within the academy, there has been substantial growth of dance within the collegiate curriculum. Dance programs have emerged not only within colleges and universities across the nation, but also in many elementary and high schools (Carter, 1984). Additionally, the curricular offerings within the art form have benefited from increased specialization and intellectual investigation. Today, dance programs offer a variety of curricular perspectives that help students develop skills far beyond the performance arena. Despite these curricular developments, dance continues to occupy a somewhat subordinate place within higher education. Not being a high priority within the college curriculum, dance often does not receive the same resources as other disciplines in the arts and sciences, and often faces the brunt of economic cuts. Even with these challenges faced by dance as one of the youngest disciplines within the academy, dance has established its place in higher education and continues to grow as an academic field of study.

Community Engagement Partnerships in Dance

Campuses should be viewed by both students and professors not as isolated islands but as staging grounds for action. I have this growing conviction that what is needed is not just

more programs, but a larger purpose, a larger sense of mission, a larger clarity of direction in the nation's life as we move towards century twenty-one. Increasingly I am convinced that ultimately the scholarship of engagement also means creating a special climate in which the academic and civil cultures communicate more continuously and more creatively with each other; helping to enlarge what anthropologist Clifford Geertz describes as the universe of human discourse and enriching the quality of life. (Boyer, 1997)

The development of dance within the collegiate curriculum has resulted in a growing connection between dance in academia and professional community dance organizations. Boyer's scholarship of engagement referenced above, serves as a philosophical milestone in validating the importance of community engagement within academia. A few successful community partnerships that have developed between the academy and professional dance organizations in recent years exemplify the benefits of community engagement partnerships in dance. At Kennesaw State University (KSU), where I serve as the director of the Program in Dance, community partnerships have served as an effective way of increasing resources and pedagogical opportunities. Modeled after the nationally recognized partnership between Fordham University and the Alvin Ailey American Dance Theatre in New York, the partnerships at KSU connect the university with professional dance organizations in the community. A similar partnership between Seattle University and Pacific Northwest Ballet allows professional dancers to pursue a collegiate education alongside their demanding professional careers. While the partnerships mentioned above are few in number, they draw attention to the potential benefits and challenges of community engagement in dance.

In September 1997, a partnership between Birmingham Royal Ballet (BRB), UK's second largest ballet company and the University of Birmingham, led to the first customized higher education opportunity for professional ballet dancers (Benn, 2003). This partnership aimed at overcoming the limitations of professional practice that prevents ballet dancers from pursuing degrees in higher education. Through a customized delivery of the curriculum within a cohort model, company dancers were able to complete course work and also receive credit for professional life experience towards their undergraduate and graduate degrees. The partnership required both organizations to coordinate their individual schedules and curricula, in recognition of valuing and crediting the knowledge and experiences these professional dancers gain from being a part of both organizations. In a case study conducted to examine this partnership, Benn (2003) concluded that "outcomes indicate that the programme [Brit.] has made a positive difference to the Company, to the dancers and to the wider education and dance/arts world" (p. 7). This partnership has since served as a model that only a few other universities and professional dance companies have tried to replicate. At the core of this model is a sense of concern for the well being of the professional dancers, especially on the part of the professional dance/ballet company that employs them. Most professional dance companies are unfortunately not willing or able (due to financial limitations) to use precious rehearsal time for an experience that does not directly tie into their artistic and financial mission. Another limitation of the model is finding a cohort of students large enough from within one professional dance company to serve the financial and logistic viability of such a program. The professional world of dance tends to see a high turnover as dancers frequently enter and leave companies at the end of an artistic season.

Other collaborative educational models developed around the same philosophical premise (to serve the intellectual growth of professional dancers by providing them access to higher education) have sought to customize the experience for individual dancers based on their needs, abilities, and schedules. Models of such partnerships between professional dance companies and dance programs in higher education also strive to bridge the historic gaps between academia and the profession. These partnerships provide benefits for traditional dance students within the academy, by giving them access and exposure to professional dance that is often characteristically lacking or absent within higher education dance programs. In an art form that has traditionally lacked resources comparable to other disciplines, these partnerships between professional dance companies and higher education dance departments have provided the opportunity to share resources to the benefit of both organizations.

Conclusion

The development of the Program in Dance at KSU has been supported by strong community partnerships since its inception in 2005. These community partnerships have leveraged additional resources for the partner institutions and brought together the professional and collegiate worlds of dance. This dissertation case study evaluated the long-term viability of the community partnerships in the Program in Dance at KSU. This research site provided an ideal case study location, due to the multiple community partnerships that were in existence within this single university dance program. The partnerships developed within the Program in Dance at KSU, also represent a diverse array of partner institutions. Within this single university site, collegiate dance partnerships between large professional companies, as well as local dance studios and professional presenting venues were analyzed and synthesized. By evaluating the long-term viability of these community engagement partnerships at KSU from the perspective of

multiple stakeholders, this dissertation provided a comprehensive understanding of the structure and value of these partnerships.

Research Questions:

1. What are the experiences of stakeholders within the community dance partnerships at Kennesaw State University; and
2. What recommendations can support the long-term viability of the community dance partnerships at Kennesaw State University?

Stakeholders within the community dance partnerships at KSU are defined as

1. Dance students at KSU;
2. Professional dancers from community partner institutions;
3. Faculty and administrators at KSU;
4. Faculty and administrators at community partner institutions; and
5. The local dance community in the metro-Atlanta area.

This dissertation case study provided a cost-benefit evaluation of the reciprocal partner relationships within the community dance partnerships at KSU. By developing a comprehensive case study design using multiple sources of evidence, data gathered from multiple participants within these community partnerships was triangulated and analyzed. The perspective of professionals within the surrounding dance community was synthesized with the data gathered from the partner institutions, to evaluate the experiences of stakeholders and develop recommendations in support of the long-term viability of these community engagement partnerships in dance at KSU. Central to the investigation and framing of this study, was the element of reciprocity that is integral to social exchange theory.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The focus of this literature review was to identify and synthesize existing empirical research that examined educational partnerships between professional community organizations and collegiate institutions. A comprehensive synthesis of research pertaining to educational partnerships, service learning partnerships and community engagement, was developed to determine the need and focus of this dissertation study. This literature review provided a comprehensive understanding of the empirical literature within this area of study, and identified the gap in the literature pertaining to collegiate community engagement partnerships in dance. Using the theoretical framework provided by social exchange theory, this literature review synthesized existing empirical literature using a cost-benefit analysis. The research design for this dissertation study was also informed by successful research methodologies that have been effectively used to study community partnerships by other researchers and scholars. Landmark community engagement studies served as a focus of this research synthesis, while a comprehensive look at studies surrounding educational partnerships and service-learning partnerships provided a broader perspective of the research that has been conducted in the field of higher education partnerships.

Synthesis Methods

A comprehensive search for empirical studies surrounding university partnerships was conducted using the search criteria listed in Appendix D. Since very little research has been conducted specific to higher education community dance partnerships, the scope of this literature

search was expanded to include higher education partnerships that were not specific to the field of dance. A comprehensive body of literature within the areas of higher education collaborations, community engagement, and service learning partnerships, was synthesized to develop an understanding of the empirical literature that could most effectively inform this dissertation study. Social exchange theory guided the evaluation and synthesis of the literature that follows, and provided a framework for the development of the method section of this dissertation.

Framework- Social Exchange Theory

Social behavior is an exchange of goods, material goods but also non-material ones, such as the symbols of approval or prestige. Persons that give much to others try to get much from them, and persons that get much from others are under pressure to give much to them. This process of influence tends to work out at equilibrium to a balance in the exchange. (Homans, 1958, p. 606)

Social exchange theory is perpetuated on the logic that social behavior is the result of an exchange process, aimed at maximizing benefit and minimizing cost. The theory proposes that all social relationships are evaluated according to this cost-benefit ratio. When the costs outweigh the reward, the relationship is terminated. According to one of its founding theorists George C. Homans (1958), “for a person engaged in an exchange, what he gives may be a cost to him, just as what he gets may be a reward, and his behavior changes less as profit, that is, reward less cost, tends to a maximum” (p. 606). Homans thus attempted to use his theory to explain social behavior and not just describe it. An important component of his social exchange theory rests on the assumption that all behavior is *social*. This means that all exchange is rewarded or punished by a reciprocal action of the other party in the exchange.

During the 1970s and 1980s, two leading sociologists Richard Emerson and Karen Cook expanded upon Homans' social exchange theory by studying how interaction patterns are shaped by power relationships between individuals. In a study titled *Power, equity and commitment in exchange networks*, Cook and Emerson (1978) discussed the importance of commitment in distinguishing between economic and social exchange, and concluded the following:

1. Power is an attribute of position in a network structure observable in the occupant's behavior, even though the occupant does not know what position or what amount of power s/he possesses;
2. Equity or justice concerns constrain the use of that power;
3. Emergent interpersonal commitments impede the use of power; and
4. When power is unequally distributed among actors in a network, females form stronger commitments to their exchange partners than do males. (p. 721)

Emerson and Cook thus took Homans' theory and developed a frame of reference that could be applicable to organizational study. Reflecting on Homans' explanation of social exchange theory, Skidmore (1975) recognized the deductive nature of Homans' theorizing that "focused on how human beings behave towards each other in collective action situations" (p. 57). Skidmore pointed to the focus on social behavior rather than a focus on individual behavior, and evaluated the practice of participants within the social exchange calculating their profits "according to their own private criteria of value" (p. 56). In doing so, he found a contradiction in Homans' assumptions that "finds it necessary to account for the values which explain men's normative action by reference to the commonality of experience" (p. 56). Homans' analysis attempted to seek a more general theory of human behavior by referencing a commonality of experiences that result from a social exchange. Skidmore, on the other hand, followed Homans' theory of

personal profit and pointed out that the individual units derived *individual* benefits and values for a social exchange.

Skidmore (1975) also highlighted the importance of the concept of *value* to Homans' social exchange theory. "The term refers to the degree of reinforcement (or negative reinforcement- punishment) a man gets from a 'unit' of activity" (p. 35). He qualified the criteria for the calculation of *value* by stating, "He [meaning a party in the exchange] calculates, either consciously or not, the 'value' of the acts he will perform, and he behaves in ways that gain the valued aspects of the environment (human or non-human) which must please him" (p.35). The emphasis on *value* reiterated the dyadic nature of social exchange theory and the assumption that each party in the exchange was working towards the fulfillment of their individual goals.

Reciprocity

The concept of reciprocity is foundational to social exchange theory that assumes a return or cost on any form of social exchange. The theory proposes that everything has a cost (the goal of which is to be minimized) and a reward (the goal of which is to be maximized). The theory is also perpetuated on the assumption that every action is therefore necessarily counteracted with a reaction that forms the basis of the exchange. No actions are propounded without consequence. Thus, reciprocity provides a foundational framework for Homans' theory with two basic variables: frequency and value. *Frequency* refers to the counting of the exchange incidents. Chadwick-Jones (1976) cautioned, "Care should be taken to carry out observation by standard methods, to control observer bias or changes in an observer's attention" (p. 161). *Value* on the other hand is a more complex concept for calculation, as it refers to determining the value of the exchange to each party. According to Chadwick-Jones, "The second variable- *degree of value*,

presents difficulties both in the assessment of the value of a reward or a cost and because there may be fluctuations in value over time” (p. 161). The sharing of this *value* forms a reciprocity that is central to social exchange theory and provides a basis for evaluating the benefits derived from the exchange or partnership.

Distributive Justice

Distributive justice... refers to a person’s expectations of the reward due to him and costs which he may incur- the proportion of his rewards to his costs: that these should be seen to be distributed in a fair ratio to each other. (Chadwick-Jones, 1976, p. 161)

The *justice* or fairness of a social exchange is as important to social exchange theory, as the exchange itself. Once the *value* and *frequency* of the actions or exchange are determined, social exchange theory proposes that a natural balance is reached that stabilizes the relationship based on this reciprocity.

Men therefore learn to pursue activities which [sic] are rewarded by the attainment of justice and to avoid those that involve unjust exchanges. In this way justice becomes a value itself exchanged and efforts will be made by the participants in a social exchange to maintain a standard of distributive justice. (Chadwick-Jones, 1976, p.162)

The equilibrium of distributive justice proposed as part of social exchange theory was central to the evaluation of collegiate partnerships within this dissertation study. The cost-benefit ratio determined within each partnership exchange helped provide a lens through which each partnership was evaluated and analyzed. Successful partnerships are characterized within social exchange theory as being in a state of equilibrium. Participants in a relationship must be cognizant of the need to engage in a way that provides justice to their counterpart. Distributive justice within social exchange theory calls for an awareness from the partnering entities, to

ensure a just and equitable benefit to each other from the relationship. The perceived cost-benefit ratio serves as a standard that each partnering entity must ensure not only for themselves, but also for their counterpart.

Criticisms of Social Exchange Theory

Homans' social exchange theory provides an effective framework for the understanding of human interactions and partner relationships. However, the theory is not without its limitations, as discussed below.

Social exchange theory can be examined and criticized at two levels of analysis. The first level pertains to the treatment of human behavior or social life as exchange; the second to the reduction of social interaction or 'exchange' to economic transaction or psychological process.

1. Social exchange theory assumes that humans act rationally when deciding on an exchange. In most social or business exchanges, the rewards of an exchange are not always based on rational logic.
2. Social exchange theory values self-interest as the primary motivation of all forms of exchange. Altruism for instance is hard to account for using social exchange theory.
3. Homans' theory is focused on dyadic relationships and fails in its application to organizational theory, due to its social focus on human interaction.
4. The theory is also propounded on the assumption that the goal of a relationship is intimacy, which may not always be the case.
5. Social exchange theory reduces human interaction to purely a rational process based on economic exchange theory. However, not all forms of social exchange

can be viewed in an economic framework, and thus not all forms of exchange can be effectively rationalized and reciprocated. (Zafirovski, 2005)

Despite the limitations and criticisms referenced above, social exchange theory provides a valuable lens to understand and evaluate the reciprocity within any kind of partner exchange. Since the focus of this dissertation study was aimed at the evaluation of the experiences of stakeholders, to determine recommendations in support of the long-term viability of the collegiate community partnerships in dance at KSU, social exchange theory provides an effective method of understanding partner relationships and evaluating the reciprocity that is integral to their success.

Study Implications

Social exchange theory in its original form seeks to explain the reciprocity in dyadic relationships resulting from their successful balance of power and exchange. A number of social scientists have since taken Homans' original theory and rationalized its validity to group behavior and organizational exchange. Thibaut and Kelley (1959) stated, "Consider situations where several persons combine to take action as two partners or coalitions" (p. 125), and thus mirror the dyadic relationship explored in Homans' original theory. They use the framework of social exchange theory to derive an explanation of organizational behavior and relationships, developing an understanding of how and why partnerships between organizations work based on the reciprocity of benefits against cost.

The framework provided by social exchange theory in support of a reciprocal relationship between two partnering entities helped with an understanding of the cost-benefit ratio that is central to the development of these partnerships. The research synthesis that follows provides an understanding of the studies that have been conducted to determine the *value* educational

partnerships have for the partner institutions, auxiliary bodies (such as the community and profession) and the participants within the partner organizations.

Summary of Articles

The body of literature reviewed in this synthesis was selected for its close relevance to dance partnerships in higher education, since very little empirical literature exists specific to the field of dance. The empirical research studies selected for this synthesis were analyzed to appraise their quality and validity. The selected articles were then summarized to extract their findings, and analyzed for similarities and thematic elements. The summary of articles along with the analysis of findings is appended (see Appendix B) to this dissertation. To ensure plausibility, each article was analyzed to determine credibility based on the strength of the data generated in the research. The plausibility was also evaluated on the basis of the number of data gathering techniques employed. The studies that had findings supported with multiple sources of evidence were included as either confirmed or credible, while others were excluded from the research synthesis that follows.

Findings

The literature was synthesized using the framework provided by social exchange theory, to reveal three broad themes that were central to the literature on higher education community partnerships. Within these three broad themes emerged sub-themes that divided the synthesis into silos of knowledge pertaining to particular groups or areas of study. Each of the themes and sub-themes were analyzed to gain a comprehensive understanding of the existing literature surrounding higher education community partnerships. The synthesized knowledge helped inform the development of the research design for this dissertation and determine the gap in the existing literature on higher education community engagement partnerships in dance.

Reciprocal Benefits

Central to the framework provided by social exchange theory, is the concept of reciprocity. Social exchange theory is propounded on the philosophical premise that partner relationships cannot be developed without a reciprocal exchange of value derived by each partnering entity. University partnerships have resulted in benefits for participants at both the institution of higher education and within the university partner organization. For example, a number of research studies present data to support the benefits these partnerships have on students within the institution of higher education. Astin, Vogelgesang, Ikeda, and Yee (2000) looked at higher education partnerships developed to provide service-learning opportunities for students and reported, “Service participation appear[ed] to have its strongest effect on the student’s decision to pursue a career in a service field” (p. 1). Beck and Appel (2003) found, “Students reported a better understanding of the theory and technique of [the field]” (p. 112), with an “Enhanced appreciation and understanding of cultural and intellectual diversity” (p. 112). Other studies conducted on university partnerships evaluate the benefits to other groups involved in the partnerships such as the faculty, the institutions, the community, and the profession. In a study conducted by Basinger and Bartholomew (2006), community partnerships in higher education were evaluated from the perspective of the community partner. The study concluded, “Community partner motivation is guided by both altruistic and self-serving factors. The results suggest that service learning should be viewed as reciprocal in nature, as with other donor recipient situations” (p. 25). A study conducted by Akdere and Egan (2005) concluded, “These partnerships focus on the outcomes as a measurement of success and improvement” (p. 1227). The participants and institutions evaluate the success of a partnership based on the outcomes and benefits they derive from the relationship.

An evaluation of the benefits sustained from higher education partnerships can be synthesized based on the codification of different constituents who benefit from these partnerships. This form of synthesis helps with an in-depth evaluation of each constituent, and develops an understanding of their reciprocal motivations for engagement with partner organizations. The following sub-section synthesizes the reciprocal benefits derived from collegiate partnerships based on the individual constituents involved.

Benefits to the students. A majority of the research surrounding higher education partnerships focuses on the benefits for the student participants. The pedagogical values are evaluated and articulated in several research studies, that not only define the immediate benefits for students, but also the impact on career preparation and success. A number of these empirical studies conducted to evaluate the importance of university partnerships on student populations, look at partnerships developed through service learning initiatives.

In a study conducted by Joseph, Stone, Grantham, Harmancioglu, and Ibrahim (2007), 76 males and 83 females were administered questionnaires developed from the Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) to determine the “benefits/factors attributable to service learning/community service projects” (p. 318). The results confirmed, “Students believe that their college experience is preparing them for the job market, that critical thinking has been enhanced by service learning.” A study by Keen and Hall (2009) evaluated a similar area to determine if co-curricular service learning partnerships had an impact on desired outcomes of the college experience. The results reported a “Positive effect of sustained service learning on liberal arts campuses” (p. 318). A study conducted by Prentice (2007) evaluated the impact of service learning partnerships on student civic engagement to find that student participation in

service learning projects “may have an influence on increasing students’ civic engagement levels” (p. 142).

A study conducted by Tushnet and Southwest (1994) used the metaphor of “Does it really take a whole village to raise a child” to study the impact of institutionalization of higher education partnerships (p. 3). The study found that “The types of projects resulting in the greatest impact on students were those that involved school-to-work transition activities” (p. 13). The study also found that “Equally successful, but on a smaller scale, were dropout prevention and reclamation programs” (p. 13). In another study conducted by O’Meara and Niehaus (2009) it was determined that faculty view service learning partnerships as a “model of teaching and learning” (p. 17) and evaluate the benefits to students as including:

1. Strategy to learn disciplinary knowledge and skills;
2. A form of experiential learning;
3. A way to share civic and moral dispositions; and
4. An exposure to diversity. (p. 24-25)

The literature reviewed for this study focuses on the impact university partnerships have on student learning and growth. Since a number of these partnerships manifest in the form of service learning initiatives, the literature evaluating service learning partnerships was used to inform this dissertation study. The structure and methodology used by these empirical studies serve the development of this dissertation as the benefits to the student participants within a higher education dance partnership can be contextualized and studied from similar theoretical perspectives. Student development is central to the focus of any higher education institution, and the literature highlighted below provides an empirical understanding of the reciprocal benefits derived by university partner institutions that engage with community organizations.

Benefits to the faculty. Another major group evaluated in the research on higher education partnerships are the faculty. This group is key to the development, implementation, and success of higher education partnerships. The research (Bloomgarden & O'Meara, 2007; Harwood et al., 2005; McKay & Rozee, 2007; Pribbenow, 2005) analyzes their motivations to engage and develop community partnerships, based on the benefits they derive from the process and projects. Most university partnerships are started by faculty initiatives and community connections. As faculty engage with community organizations, they do so for several reasons and benefits- personal, professional, and communal. Social exchange theory can therefore be applied to gain an understanding of the reciprocal benefits derived by individual faculty who are instrumental in developing partnerships within the collegiate institution.

A number of research studies discussed below have been conducted to evaluate the faculty perspective and experience surrounding higher education partnerships. A study conducted by Bloomgarden and O'Meara (2007) aimed at studying the role faculty play in developing and sustaining university partnerships. The research question posed by the study asked if “those who pursue civic teaching and/or research find integration and overlap among their roles?” (p. 6). After an evaluation of data collected from 29 semi-structured interviews, it was concluded that “intentional integration of roles teaching, research, and community engagement may facilitate and improve faculty research and teaching, as well as the impact on the community” (p. 5). The study went on to categorize faculty integration of roles with community engagement partnerships as:

1. An “Integrated view”: “Teaching and research are fundamentally interrelated forms of scholarly work, and this group viewed community work as embedded and integrated within teaching and research roles.” (p. 9)

2. An “If only...view”: “Roles were separate but that they sometimes overlapped or would have benefitted from overlap.” (p. 9)
3. A “Non-integrated view”: “Roles were and should remain disparate, compartmentalized, and perhaps inherently competing.” (p. 9)

A study conducted by Harwood et al. (2005) evaluated the barriers that prevent the development and implementation of service learning partnerships. The study considered “how might participation in a structured program [related to the development of service learning partnerships] help faculty examine their pedagogy and scholarship, contribute to faculty development” (p. 42). The results of this study identified the benefits to faculty as being inclusive of “scholarly professional development and enhanced personal growth” (p. 46).

Another study conducted by McKay and Rozee (2007) evaluated faculty characteristics and benefits from involvement in service learning partnerships. The study found that “faculty view benefits from the perspective of satisfying faculty/teaching, student/learning, community/non-profit needs” (p. 21). The study also concluded that “a learning-driven model enables a self-perpetuating process that increases faculty numbers in service learning partnerships” (p. 21).

Another important study conducted by Pribbenow (2005) was based on semi-structured interviews with 35 faculty and concluded that the following six benefits were derived by faculty engaged in community partnerships:

1. More meaningful engagement in and commitment to teaching;
2. Deeper connections and relationships with students as learners and individuals;
3. Enhanced knowledge of student learning processes and outcomes;
4. Increased use of constructivist teaching and learning approaches;
5. Improved communication of theoretical concepts; and

6. Greater involvement in a community of teachers and learners. (p. 28- 33)

A synthesis of the research conducted on higher education partnerships, focused on the benefits derived by the faculty, emphasizes the important role faculty play in the development of collegiate partnerships. It is critical that faculty perceive professional benefit (i.e. reciprocity) from engaging in community partnerships to ensure their personal interest in developing and sustaining these partnerships.

Benefits to the community partner. The motivations of the community partners are integral to the development and sustainment of any form of university partnership. Limited research has been conducted from their perspective, though the existent studies articulate the reciprocal benefits derived by the community partners (Siegel, 2008). The framework of social exchange theory offers an understanding of the reciprocity that is essential to the successful development and sustainment of partner relations. The body of research (Ferman & Hill, 2004; Miron & Moely, 2004; Worrall, 2007; Sandy & Holland, 2006) conducted from the perspective of the community partner, provides an empirical understanding of these benefits that serve as a primary motivation for these partnerships.

A study conducted by Ferman and Hill (2004) asked the question, “what are the motivations for and experiences of participating in higher education community research partnerships” (p. 241). Based on semi-structured interviews conducted with 17 community leaders from 14 organizations involved in partnerships with higher education institutions, this study found the following four principle motivations for community partners:

1. Obtaining project-related resources;
2. Leveraging further resources;
3. Gaining access to networks; and

4. Increasing legitimacy. (p. 245)

Other studies, such as the one conducted by Miron and Moely (2004), evaluated and compared the benefits derived by the higher education institution with the benefits derived by the community partner. This study was also framed by social exchange theory and guided by the assumption that all partnerships develop out of reciprocity between the partner organizations or individuals. The Miron and Moely (2004) study concluded that “agency members indicating more voice in program planning saw more benefits to their agency” (p. 27). The study also found that “the perception of benefits predicted agency members’ positive perceptions of the university as a whole” (p. 27). Additionally, the study framed the benefits to the community partner from two perspectives. The “*agency voice* was defined as the extent of contributions made by agency members to the planning and implementation of the service-learning program” (p.28) while the “*agency benefit* was defined as economic, social, or other gains that members of the community agencies see their agency obtaining by participating in the service-learning program” (p. 28). A study conducted by Worrall (2007) evaluated how community based organizations (CBO’s) interacted with the Steans Center at De-Paul University, to gain an understanding of the motivations and perspectives of the community partners. In addition to confirming a high level of engagement between the community-based organizations at the Steans Center, the community organizations focused on the quality of the partner relationship, confirming that the benefits outweigh the challenges. The study also found that “crossing boundaries is a significant motivator in CBO’s participation in service-learning partnerships” (p. 14). These findings once again confirm the tenets of social exchange theory and help provide a theoretical understanding of the reciprocal nature of collaborative educational partnerships.

A study conducted by Sandy and Holland (2006) categorized the benefits derived by the community partner as:

1) Direct Impact

- a. Impact on client outcomes: “Positive impact on client outcomes, such as youth, English learners, the elderly, homeless, and disabled.” (p. 35)
- b. Sustaining and enhancing organizational capacity: “Service learners are a critical part of the workforce of some partner organizations and help sustain and extend capacity... enabling them to take on new projects.” (p. 35)

2) Enrichment

- a. Staff and organizational development: “Gain from the intellectual assets of the academic institution by learning new information from students and obtaining greater access to academic research.” (p. 36)
- b. Increasing community capacity: Increasing social capital by “Fostering linkages among community partners with whom they are affiliated.” (p. 36)

3) Social justice

- a. Motivated by the common good: motivated by “A common struggle for social justice and equity, a way to strengthen common values, build the community, and impact the greater good.” (p. 36)
- b. Transformational learning: “Transforming knowledge by bridging the gap between theory and practice.” (p.36)

While the research conducted from the perspective of the community partner organization is somewhat limited, it does provide the impetus for future studies and a general understanding of the perspectives of the community partner institutions. The development of this dissertation is

foreshadowed by a historic divide between dance in higher education and the profession. The development of higher education dance partnerships can be successful only with an understanding of the perspectives and potential reciprocal benefits to the professional dance organizations that engage with higher education. This synthesis helps develop an understanding of the potential benefits that can serve as a motivating factor for professional dance organizations to partner with collegiate dance programs.

Benefits to the university. Several studies discussed in this section, underscore the institutional benefits of community engagement partnerships in higher education. The term *engaged university* has grown out of several recent national developments, such as the new Carnegie Community Engagement Classifications, and focused research on the *value* these partnerships bring to the higher education institution. The increasing trends towards public accountability in higher education, call for a tangible demonstration of community service and engagement with the local community. Community partnerships are opportunities to not only bring together universities and their communities, but also to demonstrate the relevance of higher education to the local communities that support them. The reciprocal benefits derived by higher education institutions engaged in community partnerships thus have both tangible and social outcomes.

A study conducted by Buys and Bursnall (2007) examined “the process by which partnerships are established and implemented” (p. 73). The study “explor[ed] the perceived benefits of partnerships to the academics and the university” (p. 73). Analysis of the data generated from this study revealed that “university community partnerships provide many benefits to university research, teaching and learning, community recognition and status” (p. 82). Buys and Bursnall (2007) explained the premise of the study by stating, “With an increasingly

challenging social and economic environment, and scarcity of resources, it is even more important that communities, including universities, reach out to one another in an effort to build social capital” (p. 73). The study confirmed the following institutional benefits to higher education that earlier studies (prior to 2000) synthesize

1. New insights and learning;
2. Better informed community practice;
3. Career enhancement for individuals involved with the partnerships;
4. Improvement in the quality of teaching and learning;
5. Increased opportunity for student employment;
6. Additional funding and access to information;
7. More frequent and higher quality publications; and
8. More rapid speed of internationalization. (Buys & Bursnall, 2007, p. 74)

Other studies such as the ones conducted by Chadwick and Pawlowski (2007) and O’Meara and Niehaus (2009) focused on an understanding of how community engagement and service learning partnerships can drive institutional change. The Chadwick and Pawlowski (2007) study found that institutions benefit from “strategically using assessment data to drive organizational change” (p. 31). Therefore, institutional advancement can often be made possible by community engagement projects. The O’Meara and Niehaus (2009) study focused on faculty motivations towards community engagement projects, but found that apart from the projects being “an expression of personal [i.e. the faculty] identity” (p. 17), they also served as “an expression of institutional context and mission” (p. 17), and therefore served as a benefit to the public image of the university.

A study conducted by Sandmann, Williams, and Abrams (2009) considered issues of accreditation and institutionalization of educational partnerships, and evaluated their institutional benefits. The study found that “leaders can make opportunistic use of documentation and data gathering processes associated with institutional engagement” (p. 25), and that “engagement must be strategically linked to top priorities and linked to the institutional mission” (p. 24) to enable its strategic effectiveness. The study highlighted the “development of engagement champions via community practices [as] an important strategy for long term viability of engagement priorities” (p. 24). The authors also concluded that institutions benefit from “community-based data gathering” (p. 25) that can “provide grant opportunities and validation for new engagement initiatives” (p. 25). Focusing on an accreditation perspective, the study found that “accreditation process can provide legitimacy towards reshaping the institutional culture to support engagement” (p.25), and that “the accreditation process can be used to connect engagement to the strategic plan” (p. 25). The study urged institutional leaders to “link accreditation to engagement whenever possible, but [to] plan for adjustment over time” (p. 25). A study by Tushnet and Southwest (1994) found that when it comes to the institutionalization of community engagement, schools tend to institutionalize, whereas, community partners tend not to over time. The research clearly points to the institutional benefits community partnerships can provide for higher education institutions, and helps with an understanding of the recent trends of institutionalization of community engagement and partnership within academia.

Benefits to the community. Higher education has increasingly been held accountable to serve the communities that support and fund its existence (Adere & Egan, 2005). These trends have served as an impetus for increasing community engagement activities that serve the local community. Higher education has often also been criticized for its failure to contribute to the

development of the local community, and is often considered out of touch with local problems. The literature discussed within this section that evaluates the benefits derived by the local community from educational partnerships highlights the role these partnerships can play in resolving historic town and gown divides. While the body of research from this perspective is very limited, it provides an understanding of the responsibilities universities have to their local communities and the effects these partnerships have on the economic, political, and social growth of the community. The concept of reciprocity based on social exchange theory can thus be applied to the experiences of auxiliary entities like the community that gains value from community engagement partnerships.

A study conducted by Akdere and Egan (2005) assessed the impact higher education community partnerships have on neighborhood organizations. The study found that the development of “human capital and social capital are important themes in these partnerships” (p. 1227), and that “partners often aim to improve the community organizations through bringing change” (p. 1228). Another study conducted by Bond and Paterson (2001) found that “academics exhibit a strong commitment to engagement and interaction with their communities both in principle and practice” (p. 331). Using the principle of *academic universalism* to the discourse about community benefits, the research found that “civic engagement was an important means of justifying public expenditure on higher education” (p. 340) as its benefits to the community are often tangible and result in productive outcomes. The findings point to a greater awareness of community impact from the perspective of academia and enumerate the reciprocal benefits these forms of engagement have for the local communities.

Benefits to the profession. As evidenced by the discussion evaluating the historic relationship between dance in academia and the profession in Chapter I, educational partnerships

have not traditionally served to benefit the dance profession. A review of existing literature found that only one empirical study conducted in the UK within the last ten years studied the impact of educational partnerships on the profession of dance. It is clear that very limited empirical studies have been conducted within the field of dance educational partnership and that the body of existing knowledge is extremely limited. Since the perspective needed to study the impact on the profession is discipline-specific, it did not serve this section of the literature review to investigate empirical literature in other fields, as was done within other sections. The existing study by Benn (2003) highlighted the reciprocal benefits to the profession of dance developed through collegiate community dance partnerships with professional dance organizations.

The Benn (2003) study was conducted to evaluate the experiences and perceptions of the first five years of an educational collaboration between UK's Birmingham Royal Ballet and the University of Birmingham. The case study focused on evaluating the impact the program had on its participants, the institutions, and the profession. Through a customized program delivery for professional dancers in a cohort model, the partnership allowed the dancers to “dovetail studies around rehearsals, performance, and touring schedules” (p. 5). The study recognized that “the importance of this initiative for the development of dance in Britain. The study evaluated the development of ballet as an art form... as an agent of learning and of personal development” (p. 7). The study highlighted the following benefits to the profession of dance that were outcomes of the educational partnership:

1. Stimulating breadth and depth of original research from practitioners;
2. Recognition for the art form within the arts and local community;
3. A cultural shift in terms of the status and value afforded to educational work in dance- pioneering a higher education study model which has been successful;

4. Additional employment opportunities developed within the art form;
5. Additional resources to develop the profession of dance; and
6. Contributing more critical thinkers to the world of professional dance (Benn, 2003, p. 15)

Challenges of Achieving Distributive Justice

The benefits derived from university partnerships, provides an understanding of the impact these partnerships can have on the participants, the institution, the community, and the profession. The empirical studies conducted within existing educational partnerships, also shed light on the issues that impede their development and success. Homans' social exchange theory highlights the importance of distributive justice achieved through an egalitarian distribution of benefits among the partnering entities. The development and sustainment of educational partnerships are dependent on achieving distributive justice, which is often difficult to accomplish within higher education institutions. Challenges associated with turf and territorial issues, partner communication, differences in philosophies and organizational goals, organizational autonomy, and resources limitations are some of the general problems identified by the existing literature (Akdere & Egan, 2005; Bushouse, 2005; Tyron et al., 2008; Bringle & Plater, 2008; Sandy & Holland, 2006; Cohen, 2002) discussed below. A synthesis of this aspect of the literature can provide an understanding of the problems that often hinder the development of educational partnerships. Learning from the experiences of the past, can provide the ability to manage the future development and growth of community dance partnerships in higher education. The following section synthesizes the existing literature on university partnerships to develop a frame of reference about the problems and challenges associated with the implementation, development, and sustainment of higher education community partnerships.

According to social exchange theory, distributive justice provides an understanding of the cost-benefit ratio that is integral to developing reciprocity within any relationship. When one partner institution is unable to provide reciprocal benefits to the other due to limitations such as the ones discussed below, distributive justice cannot be effectively achieved, negatively impacting the development and sustainment of the partnership.

Resource problems. A great deal of empirical research on university partnerships identifies limited resources as a central area of concern for both the university and community partner. Limited resources are identified as both financial and human resources necessary to administer these partnerships and supervise the student participants. Community partners in particular seem to articulate trends of concern in this area as their staff often feels ill equipped to manage university participants. In a study conducted by Akdere and Egan (2005), the challenge of developing human resource competency was cited as a central concern in developing and sustaining community engagement educational partnerships. The study revealed that “the challenge of competency is significant in higher education and community partnerships” (p. 1227) and that the development of “human capital and social capital are important themes in these [community-based educational] partnerships” (p. 1227).

In a study conducted by Bushouse (2005), “Community partners indicated that they would like to interact with the university in the future, however half indicated that they only wanted project-specific interaction” (p. 38). A further investigation of this outcome of the study revealed that the reason for this desired form of interaction was “mainly due to internal constraints within the organization” (p. 38) such as “the lack of staff resources to manage students” (p. 38). Bushouse further concluded that “CNO’s [community non-profit organizations] placed a premium on their staff time. Any reallocation of staff to relationships

with universities necessarily entail[ed] shifting staff away from other important tasks” (p. 38).

Thus, the cost of the partnership was evaluated in terms of limited economic resources associated with staff time and salaries. The study concluded that transactional relationships are preferred by CNO’s as “they are perceived as having potentially low economic risk (opportunity cost of staff time) and yielding high benefit” (p. 32).

An important study conducted by Tyron et al. (2008) evaluated the challenges of short-term service learning projects and found that resource limitation was a key challenge identified by university and community partners. The study found that “many nonprofits are operating with tight or precarious budgets and can’t afford to spend a lot of time and energy planning and implementing service learning projects that do not give them good return” (p. 18-19). One respondent stated that

The whole thing [referring to the service learning project] takes time and investment in that person [referring to the student participant], and if we know they are going to go away in a semester then frankly it might not be worth our time if we are super-busy, which we often are. (p. 19)

The financial challenges articulated in the existing research are presented mostly from the perspective of the community partner. There are financial implications for the university partner in developing community-based educational partnerships; however, these resource limitations seem to manifest in issues related to developing a campus infrastructure to support these partnerships as well as in faculty time. Since the mission of the university partner is not profit generating, the resource challenges are usually not presented from a financial perspective as is the case with the community partner. Nonetheless, the resource limitations can prove

problematic in achieving distributive justice. When one partner does not perceive reciprocity in benefits from the other, the partnership can potentially fail.

Communication problems. The research identified communication between the community partner and university partner as a key area of concern when developing and sustaining a partnership. Poor communication results in low productivity, often resulting in a failure of the partnership. Social exchange theory highlights the significance and importance of a reciprocal exchange. This exchange is not effectively achieved without proper communication and a shared understanding of reciprocity. In a study conducted by Bringle and Plater (2008), the authors concluded, “If community leaders and residents do not have good information about civic engagement activities in their communities, then these activities will be undervalued” (p. 36). The study suggested that “higher education can improve the understanding of the general public for how service learning contributes to these three objectives [higher education’s role in career preparation, developing future leaders and citizens] which, in turn, can build greater support for civic engagement and community-based learning” (p. 25). The study sheds light on the communication gaps that are problematic within service learning partnerships. Better communication can help not only achieve the immediate goals of the partnership initiative but can also serve as a means of dissemination of the benefits to other constituents who are impacted by the community partnership.

Another study conducted by Sandy and Holland (2006) focused on the communication gaps that are often cause for concern between the community and educational partner. The study emphasized the need to “hold conversations regularly about partnership process and outcomes” (p. 40). The study found that the communication among the partner organizations was identified

as a key problematic concern, and that ongoing, accessible lines of communication could help resolve issues related to clearly defining roles and responsibilities. The study concluded

The research team recommends that higher education institutions consider sponsoring or participating in conversations among all partners to reflect on their formal partnership arrangements, informal communication links, critique current practices, and collectively identify ways to strengthen partnerships, document impacts, celebrate achievements, and build networks. (p. 40)

While the studies referenced above highlight communication problems as key factors negatively impacting the development and sustainment of educational partnerships, a number of other factors seemed responsible for causing a lack of communication. Issues related to time conflicts, pedagogical differences, and philosophical differences are cited as other concerns in the development of educational partnerships; however, these issues were cited in the literature as often being the underlying cause of a breakdown of communication between the community partner and higher education institution.

A study conducted by Cohen (2002) listed the following reasons for a lack of communication between private dance schools and institutions of higher education. They include

1. Differences in the terminology, or the labels each group uses to describe itself professionally;
2. The differences in the educational backgrounds and status of the practitioners in each sector;
3. Professional and private dance schools and higher education have a minimal understanding of each other's goals for dance training and education; and

4. Attempts at crossover between sectors have been minimal, and when attempted, they have been poorly conceived and planned. (p. 50)

This study found that “many agencies and institutions stressed the need for better communication infrastructure that was sensitive to their particular workplace culture and organizational infrastructure” (p. 50). The communication problems that result from these differences often have a negative impact on the sustainability of educational partnerships. Communication between partners is vital to the development of distributive justice and the longevity of the partner relationship.

Philosophical differences. An important area of concern identified in the research focuses on the philosophical differences between institutions of higher education and their community partners. Motivated by economic circumstances, the focus of the community partner is often very different when compared to the educational mission of the university partner. Philosophical differences can prove to be problematic as they undermine the relationship between the participants and have a negative effect on the pedagogical experience of the students. Social exchange theory is predicated on a shared understanding of reciprocity that is undermined by philosophical differences between partner groups and institutions.

In the study conducted by Cohen (2002), dance partnerships were examined to determine the “factors that facilitate or prevent successful interaction” (p. 51) among the university and community partners. “The disconnect between studios and universities seemed to be related in part to the desire to impose goals without accounting for differences in value systems” (p. 60). The study found that when the philosophical differences between the partner organizations were not addressed with understanding and respect, distributive justice could not be achieved. Another study conducted by Sandy and Holland (2006) articulated the challenges and concerns

of the community partners by recommending that “higher educational partners transform service learning partnership relationships to bridge their ‘different worlds,’ and enhance learning, reciprocity and sustainability” (p. 30).

In a study conducted by Tyron et al. (2008), community organization staff members were interviewed to evaluate their experience with service learning partnerships. The study concluded that while most organizations valued their interactions with higher education institutions, they hoped that their “community standards... [would be] taken up by faculty and administrators and used to help prepare and implement better service learning projects” (p. 24). The respondents felt that the higher education institutions needed to “Incorporate some of their suggestions and internalize organizations’ preferences in their course planning, relationship building, and preparation of service learners” (p. 24) to help bridge the philosophical divide between the two organizations. Additionally, the study also found that “the often mandatory nature of short-term service learning requires the organization to deal with the potential for student resistance or resentment and less-than-quality performance” (p. 18). The research thus pointed to the disparity in the philosophical understanding of the value and motivations between participants in service learning partnerships.

The existing research surrounding the philosophical differences between partner organizations is limited in scope and tends to focus more on the practical issues that result from this philosophical divide. There seems to be a gap in the literature in researching the core philosophical differences in values that prevent the successful development of educational partnerships. This dissertation study acknowledges the philosophical divide between dance in academia and the profession as outlined in Chapter I and uses this historic context as a way of

understanding the challenges associated with the implementation, development, and sustainment of educational partnerships in dance.

Time constraints. The limitations associated with the academic calendar often prove problematic for developing and sustaining community partnerships. Faculty and students tend to only be available and actively involved in partnerships during the course of an academic semester. This schedule can be problematic when a community partnership requires a commitment that extends beyond the time confines of the academic calendar. Research conducted from the perspective of the community partner tends to highlight the incompatibility of schedules as a concern for the wellbeing of the partnership project (Bordelon & Phillips. 2006; Harwood et al., 2005; Sandy & Holland, 2006; Tyron et al., 2008.) When the community partner institution perceives a lack of commitment on the part of the university participants, the value of reciprocity in the relationship is diminished and distributive justice is compromised.

In a study conducted by Bordelon and Phillips (2006), time constraints were cited as one of the two major findings in the study that evaluated the perspective of students in service learning partnerships. The student respondents found it challenging to manage an academic schedule in tandem with the schedule demanded by the community partner organization. A study conducted by Harwood et al. (2005) found that challenges associated with time, were the most frequently cited barrier in the development of educational partnerships. The faculty researched in this study were “concerned about the shortage of time ... and its impact on students and faculty” (p. 47). One faculty expressed “huge concerns about how much time this could consume [referring to the community partner project]” (p. 43). Another expressed concern that faculty, “feel strapped for time already” (p. 43) and that it was challenging to serve community partner projects that required major time commitments. Focusing on the time limitations for

students, a faculty member researched in this study stated, “students need time to gain experience in scientific studies and adequately assist local organizations” (p. 44). This portion of the research pointed to the time limitations from the perspective of the participants within higher education, highlighting the frustrations they felt in balancing an academic schedule with the demands placed on their time by the community partner.

Other studies conducted from the perspective of the community partner found similar challenges in adapting to the academic calendar that often dictates the availability of the university participants. In the study conducted by Sandy and Holland (2006), “community partners expressed a high level of frustration with mandatory hour requirements and did not feel that this was a particularly useful indication of student achievement or impact on the community partner site” (p. 39). One of the respondents in this study stated, “I’m very concerned about the students that just want to get their hours done” (p. 39) feeling that a number of students involved with community service learning projects were only interested in completing their minimal academic hour requirement and lacked a real connection to the organization or project. Others felt that “the time required for training, orientation, and background checks is sometimes longer than the service learning commitment” (p. 39). Consequentially, “while tracking hours has been a favored way for higher education to document accountability and impact, community partners often [saw] this as an impediment” (p. 40).

The study by Tyron et al. (2008) looked at the challenges associated with short-term service learning partnerships and found that “brief service learning relationships lacked continuity, and thus [were] sometimes a poor time investment for the agency” (p. 18). The respondents “express[ed] frustration at training students who did not follow through on the time commitments originally agreed upon” (p. 19). Another issue that emerged in the study

associated with time constraints had to do with the “difficulty of designing a meaningful service learning project to fit a semester-long or shorter period,” recognizing “that campus and community calendars don’t correspond very well” (p. 21). The study found that

The breaks in the academic calendar can create real burdens for organizations. Agencies have to find ways to fill in during those times when students are not technically in session and don’t feel any obligation to work at their service learning sites. (p. 21)

The research showed that the problems discussed above are exacerbated in short-term partnerships and perhaps less so with longer partnership commitments. Irrespective, the community partner has to accommodate the absence of the university participants during holiday breaks, exams, and mid-semester breaks creating interruptions to the partnership project. These shortfalls negatively impact the value of reciprocity perceived by the community partner and unbalance the distributive justice within the relationship.

Pedagogical differences. Research also identified pedagogical differences as a concern when developing and sustaining community partnerships (Bennett, 2009; Cohen, 2002; Harwood et al., 2005.) The different philosophical perspectives between partners often result in a difference in the way each partner mentors the student participants. In many cases, these pedagogical differences can result in conflicts that undermine the productivity within the partnership and therefore the distributive justice within the relationship. A study conducted by Bennett (2009) aimed at identifying the professional skills needed in the performing arts, relative to career preparation in higher education. The study found “a disparity between undergraduate curricula, the career expectations of students and the realities of professional practice” (p. 309). The study also found that “providing a realistic worldview is essential to students’ career development” (p. 325). A similar study conducted by Cohen (2002) found that even though

“certain universities seem to operate much like conservatories, in that they prepare students for professional careers in ballet or modern dance performance and/or choreography... most support a broader view of dance” (p. 54) that does not prepare students to be competitive within the professional environment. The study confirmed the “long standing animosity between private dance schools and higher education communities” (p. 60) and found this animosity the reason these groups have historically “worked against establishing interactions that would benefit both professionals and their students” (p. 60). The study concluded that “disconnect between studios and universities seems to be related in part to the desire to impose goals without accounting for differences in value systems” (p. 60). While this study looked at educational partnerships specific to universities and dance studios, it provided a frame of reference closely tied to the scope of this dissertation.

In a study aimed at assessing the barriers faced by faculty as they engage in community partnerships, Harwood et al. (2005) found that it was important to “provide consistently scheduled time and space for faculty to meet and discuss teaching challenges” (p. 45) associated with community partnership pedagogical opportunities that impact the curriculum. “Navigating the murky waters of a teaching pedagogy that can be impacted by others poses many challenges” (p. 48). The study also found that “adopting innovative pedagogy such as service learning is a challenging prospect for many faculty. It is therefore imperative they be given support to develop and refine their teaching practice, philosophy, and scholarship” (p. 48). The study also concluded that “elements of implementing the pedagogy and working effectively with community partners and students were recurring concerns” (p. 48). The existing literature that focused on the pedagogical challenges of educational partnerships highlighted the need to develop a collaborative understanding between the partners about the educational goals of the

student participants. The distributive justice is challenged when communication, resource, and time constraints impede the development of reciprocal relationships within the partnership.

Reciprocal Culture and Organizational Structures

A review of the existing literature surrounding university community partnerships identifies some key organizational structures and cultural shifts that are integral to the successful implementation, development, and sustainment of educational partnerships. This section synthesizes this literature into four sub-themes to gain an understanding of the key values and resources that contribute to the development of the organizational structures and culture that supports the development of reciprocity within educational partnerships.

Developing structures and resources. Research conducted on community engagement and service-learning partnerships commonly identifies the importance of developing administrative structures within organizations to effectively support the development and sustainment of community partnerships in higher education (Bringle & Hatcher, 2000; Kezar, 2005; Sandmann, Williams, & Abrams, 2009.) A lack of resources often results in low productivity within the partnership and hinders a partners' ability to reciprocate. Organizations can also partner to share resources and develop better opportunities for the participants within the organizations. The study conducted by Bringle and Hatcher (2000) evaluated the institutionalization of service learning partnerships within higher education institutions. The study found that "some institutions (e.g., private liberal arts colleges, religious colleges, commuter campuses, metropolitan universities) are positioned to accomplish institutionalization more easily than others" (p. 282). Evaluating methods of supporting the institutionalization of service learning partnerships, the study concluded that "institutionalization appears to benefit

from deliberate institutional planning and the development of certain infrastructures such as a centralized office of service learning” (p. 282). The study suggested that

Institutionalization can be represented at the institutional level in a campus mission statement, presidential leadership, policy, publicity, budget allocations, broad administrative and staff understanding of and support for service learning, infrastructure, faculty roles and rewards, and service learning integrated with other aspects of institutional work (e.g., admissions, student affairs, financial aid, general education, long-term planning, institutional assessment). (p. 275)

Organizational structures provide the support the participants need to effectively function, both within their own institution and within the partner organization. Along with providing the structures that support community engagement, both partner organizations need to develop resources to sustain partnership projects.

A study published by Kezar (2005) using the same data, investigated the organizational changes that are necessary to support the development of university collaborations. The study looked at collaboration among four campuses to evaluate “how colleges and universities move from bureaucratic structures and silod [sic] disciplinary units to an organizational context that supports collaborations” (Kezar, 2005, p. 52). The studies found that each campus had established a central unit or initiative for collaboration, developed a sense of centers and institutes across campus, and revamped their accounting, computer, and budgetary systems to provide the structural support for the development of collaborative partnerships (p. 54). The study concluded that “integrating infrastructures were important across all the campuses and served to support efforts people rallied behind that were focused on the institutional mission” (p. 821). Kezar stated that “sustained collaboration seems highly dependent on redesigning campus

structures, from computing systems to divisional meetings to the creation of new structures such as institutes” (p. 821). The study also concluded that “with an idea (mission/philosophy) and people on board (network), structures were important to sustaining collaboration” (p. 822). Through her studies, Kezar suggested the following key recommendations related to the development of structures and resources in support of collaborative partnerships in higher education:

1. Examine and build campus networks. Be savvy in using networks to build momentum for change and in troubleshooting problems;
2. Rethink traditional structures and add new ones such as cross-disciplinary institutes and centers;
3. Revise computing and accounting systems to support collaboration. In general, review campus systems and processes;
4. Alter reward structures to support collaborative work using discretion and care;
5. Obtain support for senior executives and recommend that they publicly model collaboration;
6. Build collaboration into all major campus documents such as strategic plans, accreditation reports, and board memoranda;
7. Capitalize on external pressures for collaboration in speeches and announcements on campus; and
8. Provide sessions to inform individuals about the benefits of collaboration and get faculty from multiple disciplines to be spokespersons. (p. 831)

Researching university engagement from the perspective of accreditation, a study by Sandmann, Williams, and Abrams (2009) found that the “accreditation process can be used to

provide legitimacy and ‘cover’ for leaders to open the dialogue and move towards reshaping the institutional culture to support engagement” (p. 25). The study looked at collaborative partnerships as a way of developing infrastructure that could support the future development of community engagement activities.

Extant research clearly suggests the importance of a campus structure to support the development of collaborative partnerships. Since very limited research exists from the perspective of the community partner organization, it is not known how effective structures within community organizations are in supporting and sustaining educational partnerships within higher education.

Philosophic changes. A key ingredient for the success of a partnership is the development of a philosophical commonality between the partners. This shared vision often serves as the underlying premise that supports the development of the reciprocity within a partnership. Philosophical shifts within each partner institution are also essential to provide a supportive environment for the development and recognition of successful educational partnerships. The research discussed below identified successful partners as being philosophically committed to achieving a desired set of outcomes from the partnership. In a study conducted by Bond and Paterson (2005), the philosophic motivations of faculty to collaborate with community organizations were concluded with positive outcomes. The study found that

Academics exhibit a strong commitment to engagement and interaction with their communities both in principle and practice; that such interaction often takes place at a variety of geographic levels; and that it is often accomplished under less than propitious circumstances. (p. 331)

Studies conducted by Harwood et al. (2005) and Jenkins (2001) reported that “the supportive culture created through the program was central to its powerful impact; other positive outcomes were grounded in the sense of community that developed” (Harwood et al., 2005, p. 41) as well as that changes in philosophy needed to include a “commitment to vision” (Jenkins, 2001, p. 1) in support of educational collaborations.

A study published by Kezar (2006) emphasized the importance of “a well articulated mission that was known by everyone, which tended to bring people together” (p. 817). Kezar noted that “with a collaborative philosophy of learning in place, the core activities of the institution- teaching and learning- and all employees’ work became related to working collaboratively” (p. 817).

One distinction that emerged ... that most of these campuses had redesigned to enable collaborative work, but three of the four campuses had visions of being collaborative organizations or having a collaborative culture. The difference is that redesigning for collaborative work means that the organization rewards and facilitates the work of those who want to conduct collaborative work. However, some individuals wanted to create a culture of collaboration on campuses where the expectation is that people collaborate and that it is the norm for institutional work. (p. 827)

The study highlighted an important philosophical difference that should be considered in developing and changing the organizational environment. These changes can often provide the necessary climate to develop reciprocal relationships that can result in long-term educational partnerships for the institution.

Other studies, such as ones by Miron and Moely (2006), also emphasized the importance of philosophical changes in support of educational partnerships. The study reported that “the

perception of benefits predicted agency members' positive perceptions of the university as a whole" (p. 27). The research conducted on educational partnerships underlined the importance of the philosophical balances that support the development of educational partnerships. As articulated in the introductory sections of this dissertation study, the philosophical divide between dance in academia and the profession is a key factor that has traditionally prevented the development of educational community partnerships in dance.

Outcome assessment. The outcomes of a successful partnership serve both partnering organizations by providing validity to the engagement activity and contribute to the organizational objectives. The discernable outcomes of a partnership often serve as parameters to evaluate the success of the partnership. Without a determination of the value gained (benefits minus cost), the distributive justice cannot be evaluated within the partner relationship. Organizations use partnership outcome assessment data to inform the future diffusion of the partnership, both within the organization and to external organizations. The research conducted in this area provides a framework that is relevant to this dissertation study, as it highlights the usefulness of the outputs generated from educational partnerships and helps provide a format for the evaluation of the long-term viability of the dance partnerships that were studied through this dissertation (Benn, 2003; Dickie & Dickie, 2009; Kezar, 2005; Sandmann et al., 2009.)

A study conducted by Benn (2003) evaluated the effectiveness of an educational dance partnership between Birmingham Royal Ballet and the University of Birmingham. As cited earlier in this literature review, this study is the most closely related empirical study to this dissertation. The findings from this study focused on the "changes in higher education that have allowed this degree [for professional dancers] to be developed" (p. 7) within the collegiate system. The findings highlighted the changes in academia, focusing on how "higher education

has grown to embrace dance as a vital and valuable part of human knowledge” (p. 7). Another study conducted by Dickie and Dickie (2009) also highlighted the usefulness of an assessment study centered on educational partnerships, and concluded that “partnership success can be addressed in relation to: shared values, capacity building and alliance management” (p. 25-26). The assessment data from the study provided a useful framework for the evaluation and development of similar educational partnerships. Other studies conducted by Kezar (2005, 2006) underscored the outcomes of the assessment of educational collaborations, to develop a structure for the evaluation and development of similar partnerships.

The accreditation-based study conducted by Sandmann et al. (2009) evaluated the use of assessment data on institutional engagement to advance the accreditation initiatives at two institutions. As referenced earlier in this literature review, one of the findings from this study highlighted the effectiveness of how “leaders can make opportunistic use of documentation and data gathering process associated with institutional engagement” (p. 25). Studies by Shrader, Saunders, Marullo, Benatti, and Weigert (2008); Worrall (2007); and Miron and Moely (2004) looked at the implication of assessment data from the perspective of the community partner organization and found that its usefulness informs the development of future educational partnerships, as well as an assessment of organizational impact.

Even though the studies included within this body of literature differ in scope and methodology, their synthesis provides knowledge about the organizational impact and long-term viability of educational partnerships. The literature not only provided a frame of reference for the assessment of the educational partnerships in dance, but also highlighted the gap that warrants the need for this dissertation study. The outcomes provided a valuable understanding of

the benefits that result in the development of reciprocal relationships between university and community partner institutions.

Summary of Synthesis Findings

The empirical research synthesized above, provides a comprehensive overview of the literature that investigates partnerships between collegiate institutions and community organizations. The themes and sub themes discussed in the synthesis offers an understanding of the areas researched, and contextualize the existing knowledge related to the field of educational partnerships. The following section discusses the synthesis from three distinct perspectives.

Study of the University Partner institution

A large body of existing research on university educational partnerships has been conducted from the perspective of the university partner. It seems logical that the researchers, who primarily belong to academia, are more interested in the perspectives that impact them as educators. Several studies referenced in the above synthesis, evaluated the benefits, challenges, and perspectives of academic institutions as they engage with community organizations. Some of the studies treated the higher educational institutions as separate from the university participants and evaluated the benefits and challenges faced in the institutionalization of educational partnerships. Only one empirical study conducted in the UK (Benn, 2003) evaluated the perspective of a university partner engaged in an educational dance partnership. The lack of empirical research on community educational partnerships in dance served as the impetus for conducting this dissertation study. This dissertation used the university partner institution as a primary site for conducting this evaluative case study research.

Study of the Community Partner Institution

Some of the studies referenced in the above synthesis evaluated the long-term viability and effectiveness of educational partnerships from the perspective of the community partner organization. The perspective of the community partner is often not comprehensively evaluated in the existing research that often tends to be conducted from the perspective of the university partner institution. While the research conducted from the community partner perspective is somewhat limited, it provided a frame of reference that this dissertation study was able to expand and develop within the field of dance. No existing empirical literature evaluated educational partnerships in dance from the perspective of the community partner. This dissertation sought to gain an understanding of the long-term viability of educational partnerships in dance from the perspective of community partner institutions and their membership.

Study of Auxiliary Entities

The existing empirical research on educational partnerships between higher education and community organizations often alluded to the auxiliary parties affected by the development of these partnerships. Auxiliary parties include the local community, the profession, and other institutions and organizations that are impacted by a community partnership. The community perspective was minimally researched, even though there seemed to be an awareness of the need for higher education to be responsive to the needs of the community. Almost no empirical studies evaluated the impact of educational partnerships on the growth of the professions they serve. This dissertation study was informed by these missing perspectives that were considered in the development of the research method selected for this study. This dissertation used a research design that evaluated multiple participants within a single case study to gain a holistic

perspective of the long-term viability of the dance partnerships developed within the Program in Dance at KSU.

Identification of the Gap in Research

A careful analysis and synthesis of the existing research surrounding community educational partnerships in higher education, provided a comprehensive understanding of the silos of knowledge that exist within the field of study. The gap in empirical literature surrounding collegiate dance partnerships was extremely wide, as very little research had been conducted within this field of study. This dissertation addressed two critical perspectives within the gaps of knowledge identified in the above synthesis:

1. Very little empirical research evaluates the effectiveness and long-term viability of educational partnerships between collegiate dance programs and professional dance companies. This gap in the literature served as a primary impetus for undertaking this dissertation study. This dissertation study empirically evaluated the existing community engagement partnerships in dance at KSU; and
2. No existing empirical research evaluates the perspectives of all three groups of participants referenced above in the summary of synthesis findings. This dissertation study developed knowledge about dance educational partnerships within a single case study from the perspectives of (a) the university partner (b) the community partner (c) auxiliary entities such as the community and the profession.

Research Questions:

1. What are the experiences of stakeholders within the community dance partnerships at Kennesaw State University; and

2. What recommendations can support the long-term viability of the community dance partnerships at Kennesaw State University?

Conclusion

The above research synthesis provided a comprehensive understanding of the existing empirical literature surrounding collegiate educational and community partnerships. The synthesis confirmed the lack of knowledge specific to dance educational partnerships. An analysis of the perspectives within the existing research also revealed the lack of studies conducted from multiple participant perspectives. Social exchange theory provided a theoretical lens for developing the research methods that follow. Central to this case study were the principles of reciprocity and distributive justice that were empirically evaluated within the research questions posed by this dissertation.

CHAPTER III

METHODS

Applied forms of research are undertaken by practitioners to improve the quality of practice within a discipline (Creswell, 2008). These forms of research provide evaluative data to help understand phenomena that guide the effective administration of programs and organizations. Taking an *interpretivist* perspective, this study developed knowledge through a dialogue between the researcher and participants. I entered the world of the social subjects to create a cognitive association with the subjects and gain an understanding of their individual and shared experiences. The intrinsic nature of this study was rooted in my vested interest within the institution and program being evaluated. As the founding director of the Program in Dance at KSU and the instigator of the community partnerships being evaluated, I was positioned in the center of this empirical investigation, not as a generator of data, but rather as an analyst. Data gathered from multiple participants using a variety of research techniques, was analyzed and triangulated to negotiate the evolution of knowledge. The outcomes of this empirical study aimed at improving community engagement practices at KSU and provided a framework for the future development of academic partnerships in dance. An analysis of multiple community partnerships within one collegiate dance program provided an in-depth understanding of the element of reciprocity that contributes to the successful exchange of resources and knowledge between partner institutions.

Qualitative Research

Qualitative research developed in the late 1800s and early 1900s as a way of understanding a central phenomenon within a field of research (Creswell, 2008). Decades before qualitative research was recognized as a valid and vital form of educational research, anthropologists and sociologists were actively involved with the study of social and cultural phenomenon that guided human existence and behavior (Merriam, 2009). Written accounts of these studies described the interactions of subjects within the field of research, and the data collected was recorded and interpreted by the researchers to understand the central phenomenon. This form of investigation eventually developed into qualitative research, a technique that emphasized the recording and interpretation of data gathered from the individual perspective of research subjects to gain an understanding of their experiences and belief systems.

Qualitative research is a type of educational research in which the researcher relies on the views of the participants; asks broad, general questions; collects data consisting largely of words (or text) from participants; describes and analyzes these words for themes; and conducts the enquiry in a subjective, biased manner. (Creswell, 2008, p. 46)

Qualitative research thus emphasizes the need to focus on the views and experiences of the participants within a study, as a means of understanding common practice and advocating for change. The researcher involved with qualitative data gathering techniques tries to unearth the experiences of their subjects, gaining an understanding of how these experiences construct their worlds.

They say that qualitative research (a) is naturalistic, (b) draws on multiple methods that respect the humanity of participants in the study, (c) focuses on content, (d) is emergent and evolving, (e) is fundamentally interpretive. Qualitative researchers... (a) view social

worlds as holistic, (b) engage in systematic reflection on the conduct of the research, (c) remain sensitive to their own biographies/social identities and how these shape the study, and (d) rely on complex reasoning that moves dialectically between deduction and induction. (Marshall & Rossman, 2006, p. 2)

Qualitative research thus involves a complex technique of collecting, analyzing, and interpreting the perspective of the research subject through the personal lens of the researcher. It is a broad interpretative approach to the evaluation of social phenomenon.

This empirical study focused on evaluating and understanding the central phenomena within the collegiate community dance partnerships at KSU. This dissertation was intended to gain an understanding of the critical components that contribute to the development of reciprocity and distributive justice within the partner organizations. A study of the long-term viability of the collegiate community engagement dance partnerships at KSU was aimed at developing an understanding of their benefits and challenges intended to develop recommendations for future practice. An understanding of the central phenomena characteristic to these collegiate dance partnerships was effectively analyzed through a qualitative research method. Gathering and analyzing the perspectives of participants within these partnerships provided an in-depth understanding of their experiences, intended to inform the development of future practice. Given the focus of this dissertation study to evaluate the long-term viability of reciprocal partner relations within the existing collegiate dance partnerships at KSU, a qualitative research design provided the ideal system of enquiry into the experiences within these partnerships.

Case Study Research Design

Case study research design has evolved from the fields of psychology, sociology, anthropology, political science, and business as a method of in-depth study of a bounded system (Yin, 2009). The researcher serves as the primary data collector, entering the bounded research site and gathering evidence of the experiences of the subjects being evaluated.

A case study is an empirical inquiry that

1. investigates a contemporary phenomenon in depth and with its real-life context, especially when; and
2. the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident.

The case study inquiry

1. copes with the technically distinctive situation in which there will be many more variables of interest than data points, and as one result;
2. relies on multiple sources of evidence, with data needing to converge in a triangulating fashion, and as another result; and
3. benefits from the prior development of theoretical propositions to guide data collection and analysis. (Yin, 2009, p.18)

A case study is therefore characteristically bounded and defined in scope; relies on the expertise of the researcher; and produces rich thick data that can be analyzed to determine common trends that inform the research purpose. Case studies are *particularistic* as they are focused within a particular situation, event, organization, or phenomenon (Merriam, 2009). The finite scope of a case study allows the researcher to investigate multiple constituents and components within a single research site and helps develop an in-depth understanding of experiences within the bounded parameters. Multiple sources of information gathered through methods such as

observation studies, personal interviews, document/audiovisual analysis, and focus group interviews provide descriptive evidence of the case being studied allowing the researcher to gain a synthesized understanding of participant experiences by triangulating the data gathered.

Case study research is also characteristically *heuristic* (Merriam, 2009). The descriptive data extends the reader's understanding of the phenomenon being studied or confirms an existing theory. "Previously unknown relationships and variables can be expected to emerge from case studies leading to a rethinking of the phenomenon being studied," suggested Stake (as cited in Merriam, 2009, p. 44). The researcher's analysis of the qualitative data provides an interpretive generalization of broad themes that inform the cognitive understanding of the phenomenon being studied.

Case studies by definition, get as close to the subject of interest as they possibly can, partly by means of direct observation in natural settings, partly by their access to subjective factors (thoughts, feelings, and desires)... Also, case studies tend to spread the net for evidence widely. (Bromley as cited in Merriam, 2009, p. 46)

This dissertation study evaluated the community engagement partnerships that exist within the Program in Dance at KSU. The focus of this research was intended to determine the benefits and challenges of these partnerships for the participants, institutions, community, and profession. The study was intended to gain an understanding of the elements of reciprocity that exist between the partner institutions as well as evaluate the elements of distributive justice that provide a successful cost-benefit balance between the partner organizations. The research questions also examined the limitations and challenges associated with developing and sustaining collegiate dance partnerships with community organizations intended to develop recommendations in support of the long-term viability of these partnerships. Case study research

serves as an ideal methodology to gain an understanding of the experiences of the participants within these partner organizations. This study was bound within the three formal partnerships in the Program in Dance at KSU. The literature synthesis highlighted the need for conducting empirical research on community engagement partnerships in dance. The synthesis also highlighted the need for studies that combined the perspectives of both community and university partners. An in-depth evaluation of the experiences of the participants within the community dance partnerships at KSU conducted from both the community and university partner perspectives helped fill the existing gap in the literature within this field of study.

Research Site- Kennesaw State University (Program in Dance)

Founded in 1963, Kennesaw State University (KSU) is the third-largest university in Georgia, with more than 24,000 students. Located 20 miles northwest of Atlanta, the 384-acre campus is home to students representing 142 countries. KSU is accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) and offers 70 bachelors, masters, and doctoral degree programs in education, science, math, business, humanities, and the arts. Kennesaw State University was originally established as Kennesaw Junior College in 1963. The two-year institution was expanded into a four-year institution in 1976 and renamed Kennesaw College in 1977. In 1988, the institution was named Kennesaw State College before it became Kennesaw State University in 1996. As one of Georgia's premiere comprehensive universities, KSU is quickly becoming a destination campus for students across the southeast. Through the expansion of its academic, co-curricular, and community engagement activities, KSU is focused on achieving regional and national recognition for educational excellence. The university launched its "Get Global" initiative in 2007 as part of its Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP). This global learning initiative is focused on expanding opportunities for international learning for faculty,

staff, and students. Every year KSU celebrates and focuses global learning on a strategically selected country providing the impetus for curricular development, study abroad initiatives, and cultural activities. The university's QEP *Global Learning for Engaged Citizenship* has become a defining characteristic of the institution (Kennesaw State University, 2011).

The Program in Dance at Kennesaw State University was started as a dance minor in 2005. The enrollment of more than 140 dance minors by 2007, led to the development of a dance major in January 2009. The dance major quickly developed into the largest collegiate dance program in the state of Georgia, and the program developed a regional and national reputation at the American College Dance Festival. The KSU Dance Company was selected for the American College Dance Festival regional gala concert for four successive years from 2007-2010. The Company is also one of the few collegiate dance companies in the nation to be selected in successive national years to perform at the National American College Dance Festival. In 2008, the KSU Dance Company performed at the Miller Theatre in New York City, and in 2010 and 2012, the Company performed at the Kennedy Center in Washington, D.C. The performances brought regional and national attention to the KSU Program in Dance and garnered features in leading publications in the field such as *Dance Magazine* and *Dance Spirit Magazine*.

The rapid growth and success of the KSU Program in Dance has been achieved in part due to several highly successful community partnerships developed since its inception in 2005. An educational partnership with Atlanta Ballet serves as a notable model of engagement between a collegiate dance program and a professional ballet company. Through this partnership, professional ballet dancers are able to pursue collegiate undergraduate degrees at KSU while traditional-age university students are able to benefit from interactions with the region's leading professional ballet company. This nationally recognized partnership strives to break down the

historical divide between dance in academia and the profession. Based on a philosophy of collaborative education between the two institutions, the partnership provides students with the benefits of both a professional and an intellectual experience of dance. Another artistic partnership with Atlanta-based contemporary modern company gloATL provides a platform for collaborative performance bringing together community professionals and university student performers. This partnership allows university students to perform on a professional stage and gain practical performance experiences that a traditional collegiate education often cannot provide. Another similar outreach partnership with the educational wing of the Cobb Energy Performing Arts Center, a premier professional performance venue in Atlanta provides opportunities for an annual outreach performance benefiting more than 2,000 Atlanta-area high school students. The KSU Program in Dance has also benefited from several other community collaborations with local dance studios. These partnerships have resulted in a sharing of resources and the development of concert dance within the metro-Atlanta community. These partnerships and collaborations between the Program in Dance at KSU and local professional dance organizations provide a unique opportunity to study their reciprocal structure and develop empirical knowledge within this field of study.

Positionality

I currently serve as an associate professor and the founding director of the Program in Dance at Kennesaw State University. My connection to this research site provided access to gather data from both the university and community partner institutions. The results of this case study served the Program in Dance at KSU by providing a comprehensive empirical understanding of the long-term viability of the community partnerships being evaluated. My active involvement in the initial creation and development of these community partnerships

provided me with knowledge and a background that strategically served this research agenda. This intrinsic case study was guided by my vested interest in the community dance partnerships being evaluated. Taking an interpretivist perspective, this study focused on the evolution of knowledge based on a dialogue with the participants. I acknowledged the centrality of my relationship to the site being studied, and viewed this connection as a benefit in gaining a deeper understanding of this empirical investigation.

Reflexivity

As a researcher involved in case study research at my own institution, I acknowledged the need to take precautionary measures to ensure a high level of trustworthiness in the data gathering and analysis. A number of techniques, such as *member checks*, *adequate data collection*, *audit trail*, *multiple source data triangulation*, and *peer examination*, ensured a high level of validity to this study. Data gathered from community professionals in the field of dance, external to the partner organizations, served as a way of providing a peer evaluation of these partnerships and the research findings. These professionals also provided an understanding of the impact these collegiate community dance partnerships have on the profession of dance. The data gathered within this study from multiple sources of evidence, was triangulated and checked to ensure an accurate representation of the experiences of the individuals within the collegiate dance partnerships at KSU.

Assumptions

1. Data collected from multiple perspectives provided knowledge about the trends associated with collegiate community engagement partnerships in the field of dance.

2. The researcher took precautions to maintain a stance of neutrality while gathering, recording, and interpreting the data.
3. The respondents accurately reflected their experiences within the community partnerships established in the Program in Dance at KSU.
4. The community professionals selected to provide an external evaluation of the KSU community dance partnerships, provided an informed and experienced perspective as experts in the field of dance.
5. The identity of all the participants was kept strictly confidential in accordance with Institutional Review Board (IRB) regulations, and adequate measures were taken to ensure that their participation did not have any negative personal implications.

Limitations

1. This single site case study provided an evaluation of the collegiate dance partnerships at KSU. However, the findings of this study may not be generalizable to other collegiate dance institutions.
2. The role of the researcher as the founding director of the KSU Program in Dance had an impact on the data collected from the respondents. Measures were taken to minimize this impact and maintain a high level of trustworthiness with the research procedures.
3. The expertise of most respondents was limited to their scope of experience within the community dance partnerships established at KSU. Their perspectives were not necessarily informed by community engagement experiences at other institutions.

Sources of Evidence

The richness and diversity of the data collected within a case study will have a direct impact on its effectiveness and validity (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). The study of organizational strategy and culture can effectively be studied through a triangulation of multiple sources of evidence. The use of varied sources and perspectives helps provide an in-depth understanding of the phenomena being researched and ensures that the triangulated findings are not skewed by the weakness in any one data source.

This dissertation gathered data from multiple sources within the partner institutions and surrounding community. A unique strength of this dissertation research was based on the triangulation of data from both the community and university partner institutions, combined with the expertise of community professionals in the field of dance. Prior research had typically been conducted from a single partner perspective and did not triangulate data gathered from partner institutions and the community. The following section highlights the multiple sources of evidence that were a part of the research design for this dissertation study. Triangulation of these varied data sources provided this dissertation research with a high level of validity based on a rigorous research design.

Personal Interviews

Personal interviews are extensively used in the field of qualitative research. The views of the participants within the case being studied are determined through a purposeful conversation. The investigator guides the research agenda through pre-determined questions, but allows the subjects to respond and guide the development of the data based on their personal experiences within the research site (Rubin & Rubin, 2005). The actions, behaviors, and attitudes of the individuals are not only determined, but also understood through the interview process. This

level of qualitative enquiry provides data that can be used to explain the research purpose, and helps with the development of a theoretical understanding of human behavior.

This dissertation relied heavily on data gathered from personal interviews to help understand the experiences of the individual participants within the partner institutions and professional dance community. In-depth interviews allowed the researcher to probe into personal experiences and gain a thorough understanding of the advantages and challenges interview subjects face within these community dance partnerships. Individual interviews also allowed the participants in this study to interact and express their views in a private forum directly to the researcher without any fear of the impact their comments could have on the attitudes of other individuals within the organization. The identity of each interview subject was protected in accordance with IRB regulations, and the data was collected at an interview site that posed no danger to revealing the identity of the individual respondents. Adequate measures were taken to ensure that each respondent felt comfortable responding to the interview protocol in an unbiased manner.

Focus Groups

Focus group research is propounded on the assumption that “individual’s attitudes and beliefs do not form in a vacuum: People often need to listen to others’ opinions and understandings to form their own” (Marshall & Rossman, 2006, p.114). This technique is effectively used to gain the collaborative perspective of a small group of individuals who are connected by an experience that is being evaluated by a research study.

...in a focus group participants get to hear each others responses and make additional comments beyond their own original responses as they hear what other people have to say... the object is to get high-quality data in a social context where people can consider

their own views in the context of the views of others. (Patton as cited in Merriam, 2009, p. 94)

Focus group interviewing was ideally suited for this dissertation study to evaluate the perspectives of students within the university partner institution. These participants at KSU had common experiences as undergraduate students who were exposed to interactions within the community partnerships in the Program in Dance. Data gathered from sample groups within the student dance population was reflective of the experiences of the larger population of which they were representative. The dialogue within the focus groups allowed the participants to reflect on the experiences of their peers and articulate their individual experiences with relative consideration and deliberation. This dissertation study gathered data from sample populations of KSU students, selected into each focus group based on their common experiences within specific community partnerships in dance. This approach provided rich, thick data related to the experiences of students within the community dance partnerships at KSU.

Document/Audiovisual Analysis

An analysis of written documentation and audiovisual materials provides evidentiary information that is often useful in corroborating evidence gathered from primary sources such as interviews and observation studies. Data gathered from documentation and audiovisual materials can also provide the researcher with an impetus to further investigate a phenomenon or characteristic that may not have been evident or revealed from other sources (Yin, 2009). While documentary and audiovisual data is often not used as a primary research source in case studies, it can serve as an effective method of understanding the formal relationships of individuals within an organization, revealing the institutional culture.

This dissertation case study analyzed documentary evidence that was specific to the development and successful implementation of the community engagement partnerships in dance at KSU. Letters, press releases, memoranda, agendas, announcements, meeting minutes, and other administrative documents were analyzed to reveal the formal structures that govern these partnerships at KSU and within community partner institutions. Coded data from this documentary evidence was triangulated with primary data gathered from other sources to look for thematic findings that guide the research process. This dissertation research lent itself to an analysis of audiovisual data that documented the collaborations between the Program in Dance at KSU and community partner institutions. An analysis of creative scholarship produced within these partnerships, provided an understanding of the pedagogical and artistic impact these collaborations have on the Program in Dance at KSU.

The data gathered from personal interviews was triangulated with data gathered from observation studies, focus groups, and document/audiovisual materials at partner institutions. These documents gathered from both the university and community partner institutions were analyzed for general themes that informed the findings from other primary data sources. An estimated 10 hours of data collection was focused on an analysis of these documentary and audiovisual materials. Creative scholarship developed within each partnership was analyzed through audiovisual materials to gain an understanding of the pedagogical impact the collaborative artistry had on the participants.

Direct Observations

Observations can be distinguished from interviews in two ways. First, observations take place in the setting where the phenomenon of interest naturally occurs instead of a location designated for the purpose of interviewing; second, observational data represent

a firsthand encounter with the phenomenon of interest rather than a secondhand account of the world obtained in an interview. (Merriam, 2009, p. 117)

An observation study is an effective method of gathering data about the habitual patterns that often become routine to the participants themselves. When used in conjunction with data gathered from other sources such as interviews and document analysis, observations can be effectively used to triangulate findings and qualify the trustworthiness of results from a study. Specific attitudes, situational cultures, and events observed by the researcher first-hand provide context to the emerging data. The researcher is able to develop personal accounts of behaviors and observe trends that inform their perception of the individuals being studied. While interviews provide data from the perspective of the research subjects, observations generate data through the perceptions of the researcher, and can help guide the analysis of the data gathered from other sources.

This dissertation study used direct observations to gather observable data about the interactions of the participants within the community partnerships at KSU. Observing the pedagogical and artistic collaborations in practice provided an understanding of the long-term viability of these partnerships. Observation studies were used to document the interactions of participants from community partner institutions at KSU as well as observe the interactions and behaviors of KSU undergraduate students within community partner projects. The data generated was coded and triangulated with other sources of evidence to develop thematic findings.

Population

This dissertation study evaluated the experience of participants within the community partnerships in the Program in Dance at KSU. The boundaries of this single-site case study were

limited to the community educational partnerships in dance at KSU. Data gathered from the following three partner institutions was triangulated with data gathered from KSU:

1. Atlanta Ballet: Educational Partnership with the Program in Dance at KSU. Partnership activities included sharing production resources, technical training for KSU students, collegiate educational opportunities for professional dancers, performance opportunities for KSU students, choreographic opportunities for professional dancers, and advertising opportunities for partner institutions;
2. gloATL: Artistic Partnership with the Program in Dance at KSU. Partnership activities included shared production resources, collaborative performances, choreographic opportunities for professional dancers, technical training for KSU students, and program promotional opportunities; and
3. Cobb Energy Performing Arts Center: Outreach Partnership with the Program in Dance at KSU. Partnership activities included performance opportunities for KSU students, collaborative outreach activities, and sharing facility resources.

Additionally, interviews with sample groups of dance professionals in the community provided an external perspective about the impact these partnerships have in the community and within the profession. The professional evaluation of these community experts was solicited following the coding and triangulation of data collected from KSU and the partner institutions, to verify the accuracy of the findings from these sources.

Research Questions:

1. What are the experiences of stakeholders within the community dance partnerships at Kennesaw State University; and

2. What recommendations can support the long-term viability of the community dance partnerships at Kennesaw State University?

Research Design

The following section outlines the research design for this dissertation, consisting of 24 personal interviews, three focus groups, three observation studies and document analysis.

Table 3.1

Research Design Summary

Method	Population	Frequency	Date	Protocol
Personal Interviews	KSU dance faculty	5 interviews	October 2011	A
Personal Interviews	KSU Administrators	6 interviews	October 2011	B
Personal Interviews	Community partner administrators	9 interviews	November 2011	C
Personal Interviews	Professional dancers who are undergraduate students at KSU	2 interviews	November 2011	D
Personal Interviews	Professional dancers from partner institutions	2 interviews	November 2011	E
Focus Group Interviews	*KSU undergraduate dance majors	3 focus groups	October/Nov 2011	G
Observation Study	**KSU Dance majors/Professional community dancers	3 observations	November 2011	None
Document/ Audiovisual Analysis	Analysis of documents and audiovisual materials	10-hours	November 2011	None

The focus groups served as an effective means of gathering data from the dance students who were involved with the community dance partnerships at KSU. A focus group setting enabled these students to process and articulate their experiences relative to the experiences of their peers. The communal setting fostered a dialogue between the student participants, aimed at a generation of knowledge and understanding of their experiences within these educational partnerships.

**Focus group 1:* Conducted with 5 KSU undergraduate dance majors who have performed with Atlanta Ballet as part of the educational collaboration

Focus group 2: Conducted with 5 KSU undergraduate dance majors who have performed with gloATL as part of the artistic partnership

Focus group 3: Conducted with 5 KSU undergraduate dance majors who have collaborated with Cobb Energy Performing Arts Center as part of the outreach partnership

The observation studies focused on evaluating the experiences of the participants by observing their interactions within practical performance and/or pedagogical settings. In doing so, the researcher was able to evaluate the social, pedagogical, artistic, and cultural phenomena at play within the community partnerships being evaluated. The field notes were triangulated with the data gathered from the interviews and focus groups, to see if the transcribed participant experiences were indeed confirmed in practice within the community dance partnerships being evaluated at KSU.

***Observation study 1:* Conducted at gloATL during their experimental movement laboratory where KSU undergraduate dance students collaborate with gloATL company dancers

Observation study 2: Conducted at KSU during a dance company rehearsal where Atlanta Ballet professionals rehearse with KSU undergraduate dance majors

Observation study 3: Conducted at KSU during a lecture class where Atlanta Ballet professionals study with KSU undergraduate dance majors

Data Management and Analysis

The collection, management, and analysis of data gathered in this study followed a rigorous protocol to ensure a high level of trustworthiness, accuracy, and confidentiality. Individual invitations to participants ensured that the subjects in this study were selected based on a first-hand experience of the community partnerships being evaluated at KSU. In accordance with IRB regulations, all participants were made fully aware of the scope of this study and required to sign written consent forms indicating their informed choice to participate in this research. All individual and focus group interviews were recorded using an audio voice recorder. The data was then transcribed into a written format, and the identity of the respondents in the study was kept confidential. Following the end of this study, all audio data was destroyed to ensure further protection of the identity of all the interview subjects in accordance with IRB regulations. Field notes from observation studies were treated with the same level of confidentiality to protect the identity of all the participants in this study.

Data Inventory

The collection of data in this study was systematically maintained to ensure easy retrieval and accurate referencing within the research report. All data gathered from interviews and observation studies were carefully inventoried, to record their collection dates, times, venues, participants, and any other special circumstances. Documentary and audiovisual evidence used in this study was carefully recorded to ensure its accurate inclusion in the research report.

Coding

The data gathering and *inductive* coding process proceeded simultaneously to ensure an ongoing system of analysis and adjustment to the data collection process when necessary. The effectiveness of the semi-structured interview protocols was continually evaluated based on an early process of coding and data analysis to ensure that the study was responsive to the emerging direction of the investigation. The transcribed data was coded based on an *inductive coding process*. This data analysis method allowed the themes to emerge based on the experiences articulated by the participants within the community dance partnerships at KSU. Using a method of *constant comparison*, the thematic ideas generated from the data in this study were continually compared to the point of saturation, to determine the broad themes reported from this study. The coding process evolved and responded to the emerging trends in the data being gathered, eventually developing categories and themes that were reflective of the recurring trends in the data. These common themes were triangulated across the data gathered to ensure an accurate understanding of the research being conducted based on the chain of evidence. Social exchange theory served as the guiding framework for the organization and analysis of the findings in this study. Adequate triangulation of multiple sources of data ensured a high level of validity to the findings and interpretations.

Member Checks

All interview transcriptions were made available to the interview subjects to check for accuracy of content. These member checks not only ensured the accurate recording of transcribed data, but also gave the respondents the opportunity to reflect on their views. Adjustments were made to the transcripts when requested by respondents.

Peer Review

A process of peer review of findings helped develop the inter-rater reliability for this study, by soliciting the expert opinion of community professionals. The themes developed from the coding process were circulated for review to an external peer researcher as well as to a community partner respondent, to verify the accuracy of the data analysis process. Additionally, a draft of Chapter IV and V was also circulated to these individuals to solicit feedback on the presentation and analysis of data.

Conclusion

The research design in this dissertation study used multiple sources of data to provide a comprehensive evaluation of the long-term viability of the community dance partnerships at KSU. The perspective of participants at both the community and university partner institutions was triangulated with data gathered from field experts to develop an empirical understanding of the community dance partnerships at KSU. The rich thick data gathered from interviews, focus groups, observation studies, and document/audiovisual analysis was organized using the framework of Homans' social exchange theory to evaluate the experiences of stakeholders and develop recommendations to support the long-term viability of the community dance partnerships at KSU.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

The use of Homans' social exchange theory as a theoretical lens for this dissertation, preempted the development of research questions that evaluated the community dance partnerships at KSU based on an understanding of the reciprocal experiences of key stakeholders. Developed out of a six-step inductive coding process, the thematic summaries in this chapter are a synthesized representation of the views and experiences of the participants within the community dance partnerships at KSU. A process of constant comparison of thematic findings helped triangulate the views of these participants, to determine the commonalities in their experiences, represented below within three sub-headings and 12 themes. The data gathered for this dissertation empirically evaluated the dance partnerships at KSU from multiple university and community partner perspectives. Table 4.1 represents the findings that are discussed within this chapter.

Research Questions:

1. What are the experiences of stakeholders within the community dance partnerships at Kennesaw State University; and
2. What recommendations can support the long-term viability of the community dance partnerships at Kennesaw State University?

Table 4.1

Research Findings

(A) PARTNERSHIP DEVELOPMENT AND SUSTAINMENT			
Interaction with Community Partner Institution	Challenges of Developing and Sustaining Reciprocity	Philosophical Challenges	Unrealized and Unexplored Partnership Opportunities
Overlapping Mission	Developing Reciprocity	Degree Pursuit in Conflict with Professional Practice	Lack of Partnership Awareness
Credibility to Partner Institution	Resource Limitations	Negative Perception of Collegiate Dance	Development of Master Classes, Workshops, and Summer Programs
Sharing Resources			Expansion of Teaching Opportunities
			Unexplored Funding Potential

(B) STAKEHOLDER EXPERIENCES				
Student Development	Student Challenges	Faculty Perspectives	Implications for Professional Dancers	Challenges Faced by Student Professionals
Role Models for Students	Intimidation, Frustration, Demoralization	Faculty Role as Partnership Instigators	Expanding Employment Potential	Duality of Balancing Professional and Academic Careers
Career Preparation	Need to Develop Deeper Experiences	Faculty Scholarship Opportunities	Teaching and Choreographic Opportunities	Lack of Financial Support for Professionals
	Schedule/Time Conflicts	Lack of Reward and Recognition	Opportunity to Pursue an Academic Degree	Age Conflict and Social Barriers
	Fear of Derailing Student Focus	Personal Time Cost		

(C) PARTNERSHIP IMPACT		
Institutional Impact	Community Impact	Impact on the Profession of Dance
Recruitment	Developing Community Connections	Changing Professional Standards
Cross-Disciplinary Collaborations	Community Enrichment	Audience Development
	Economic Development	

Partnership Development and Sustainment

The experiences of participants within this study were broad and diverse, representing a wide spectrum of reciprocal benefits that served partnering institutions, their membership, and the surrounding community. At the core of the experiences articulated by study participants was the element of reciprocity, which seemed foundational to the development and sustainment of partner relations. An administrator at KSU stated that “what makes engagement important is reciprocity of communication, reciprocity of understanding, reciprocity quite frankly of rewards. What we give to the community, the community gives to us.” The following section synthesizes the findings related to the development and sustainment of the community dance partnerships at KSU into four broad areas, focusing on the interactions of community partners, the challenges of developing and sustaining partnerships, the broad philosophical challenges, and the unrealized and unexplored partnership potentials.

Interaction with Community Partner Institutions

A central theme that emerged from the study focused on the reciprocal interactions between community partners. The data showed that partnering individuals and institutions were able to effectively develop reciprocal relations that were mutually beneficial. A KSU administrator in the arts stated that “part of what you’re trying to do is leverage the other’s [partnering institutions] capabilities.” Another high-ranking administrator at KSU reflected on the educational outreach potential of community engagement activities, stating that he thought, “Most organizations [were] now realizing the importance of connections, not only ... valuable to them in sharing some resources but [also in] bringing in a new energy to ... their educational outreach in a significant way.” This high-ranking KSU administrator provided a broader institutional perspective on the importance and need for community engagement, stating,

“Organizations now have an arm that’s called educational outreach, [that is] critical to their grant writing- it is critical to building that community piece that they now are expected to build.” In trying to gain an understanding of the reciprocal relationships within the dance program at KSU, participants in this study went on to articulate the following three broad sub-themes that focused on the benefits and reasons why community partners interact with the Program in Dance at KSU.

Overlapping mission. Several community partner administrators cited their overlapping institutional missions as a primary reason for the development of community dance partnerships at KSU. An administrator from one of KSU’s oldest partnering community institutions stated, “common mission” was perhaps the “biggest” reason for partnering, as the “institutional goals are the same.” An artist from gloATL, KSU’s most active community partner institution, also cited similarities in mission by saying, “I’m telling you that KSU gives Glo a reason to build from the ground up, you’re building and so are we ... we’re both I think giving incentive to one another to build this knowing that there is a common lifeline.” An administrator from the Cobb Energy Center passionately articulated a commitment to partnering with the dance program at KSU, saying, “I think our mission is the same. We’re after awareness and exposure for these kids [K-12 students.]” This administrator went on to talk about the meaningful relationship that had developed between the Program in Dance at KSU and the Cobb Energy Center.

We know for a fact that for some of these kids, it’s their first time ever in a performing art center. It’s their first time to see anything live on stage. So that is a huge responsibility and a huge excitement for us ... you’re our most interactive partner. So we have a better relationship with you. You’re involved in more than just one of our programs ... our missions are so much alike ... It’s so unique compared to our other collaborative

partnerships because I think we truly are working together on the educational side of bringing the arts to these students.

The overlapping educational and artistic mission of the KSU Program in Dance and its community partners therefore seemed to create a central connection between institutions, giving them a reason to collaborate.

Credibility to partner institutions. Several interviewees reflected on the impact community engagement partnerships in dance at KSU had on the partnering organizations, and noted a reciprocal credibility that was leveraged to partnering institutions. An administrator interviewed at KSU stated, “Partnerships give an automatic credibility to a young program that you don’t necessarily have ... our program naturally becomes more legitimate in some ways.” This administrator also went on to reflect on the credibility gained by community institutions that partner with KSU by saying, “There’s a legitimacy to an academic institution that professional organizations don’t have because we’re a university.” By partnering with an educational institution, a community organization is “able to say that they’re more than just a for-profit organization, they’re actually doing something that’s of benefit to the community that they exist in.” A community dance administrator articulated the same benefit from a community partner perspective, stating, “You know us being connected with the university... That’s a huge thing. That we have a caliber program that can collaborate with KSU.” These reflections were further confirmed during the document analysis conducted within this study, as the websites and publications from KSU and partnering dance organizations revealed the use of logos by partnering institutions to build their credibility through reciprocal institutional affiliation. For example, the KSU dance website and print materials included the Atlanta Ballet logo, intended to give legitimacy to the KSU ballet program by associating it with one of the leading professional

ballet companies in the southeastern U.S. Additionally, the observation study conducted at the rehearsal for the ballet *Paquita* that was being performed at KSU noted the use of two principal dancers from Atlanta Ballet for the ballets *pas de deux*. The inclusion of the two Atlanta Ballet dancers helped give legitimacy to the ballet program at KSU and raised the caliber of the performance. Another KSU administrator noted that the legitimacy builds over time stating, “When you’re able to say Atlanta Ballet and Kennesaw State then eventually, every time someone thinks Atlanta Ballet, they think Kennesaw State and vice versa.” The findings confirmed the importance of institutional credibility that was reciprocally exchanged between KSU and its community dance partners, which was intended to share the cache of a large higher educational institution in exchange for the cache of a professional dance organization.

Sharing resources. The community partnerships provided the opportunity for partnering organizations to leverage and share resources. Study participants were keenly aware of the importance of community engagement during tough economic times. A KSU dance faculty member remarked that “arts organizations have to work together and help each other out, especially when we’re in a slow economy.” Another KSU administrator stated, “There are many things, many resources that community engagement can bring to the institution either both in actual money or in kind.” Reflecting on the current economic challenges facing the arts and higher education across the country, this administrator went on to say, “At times when the economy is looking quite bleak, community engagement makes resources available to us that otherwise wouldn’t be there.” A synthesis of the data gathered pertaining to sharing resources, revealed two common themes related to the reciprocal sharing of human resources and physical space. The following two sub-sections contain selected data summaries that highlight these findings.

Sharing human resources. Several study participants articulated the critical value of human resources shared between partnering institutions to serve a common artistic and pedagogical mission. Reflecting on several collaborative performances that combined the use of KSU student dancers with professional performers, a KSU student noted that the university program provided a resource of additional dancers for choreographers from partnering institutions. “In case she [referring to a choreographer from a partner institution] ever needs extra bodies ... I think that she almost needs KSU ... So I think that we are as invaluable to her and her mission for Atlanta as she is invaluable to us.” Another faculty member at KSU noted similar human resource benefits for community partners, stating, “for [the] Atlanta Ballet to have a bigger pool of dancers to work with will have a positive impact on their organization.” It was evident that the value of human resources at partnering institutions provided reciprocal benefits within the dance partnerships at KSU.

The observation studies confirmed these reflections, as evidenced in the use of community dance professionals as instructors and choreographers at KSU and the combination of professional dancers from Atlanta Ballet with student performers at KSU. An analysis of show programs from recent years also revealed the use of dozens of KSU student performers in community partner projects, which required large volumes of supporting dancers. For example, Atlanta Ballet used KSU student dancers in supernumerary roles in the production of *Don Quixote*. During a personal interview with an administrator from Atlanta Ballet, it was noted that the ballet hoped to continue to find innovative ways to leverage the use of the human resources available at KSU. “I was thinking about hiring an academic person to run the conservatory program, but why can’t we use resources that are already here? Why can’t we use

your academic person?” The reflections evidenced the sharing of human resources within the community dance partnerships at KSU and their value in developing reciprocal relations.

Sharing space. The observation study conducted during a rehearsal that synergistically combined dancers from gloATL and KSU revealed an effective physical integration of the two partner institutions into each other’s studio space. It was evident that the dancers from partner institutions were very comfortable working in each other’s space, almost like a second studio home. A faculty member at KSU remarked, “There are certain things the university has that most community organizations seek. One is space!” Conversely, reflecting on the space resources available at partnering institutions like the Cobb Energy Center, a KSU administrator stated, “The Cobb Energy partnership is important ... because it gives us a venue where we have enough space to put a large music ensemble together with a large dance ensemble.” When asked about the use of their space resources, a Cobb Energy Center administrator responded, “Just as we come here [Cobb Energy Center] because the theater is beautiful...if you want to do something with music, then we should do a partnership and use that [KSU] space if this [Cobb Energy Center] is not available, since this is not a concert hall.” The comments showed a developing synergy and sharing of physical space between the partnering institutions, which contributed to their reciprocal relationship.

Challenges of Developing and Sustaining Partnerships

Numerous study participants articulated the challenges faced by partnering institutions as they develop and sustain partner relationships. The centrality of social exchange theory was repeatedly evident in the views of the respondents. A KSU faculty member remarked, “It has to be a two-way street. They have to have something to offer us. We have to have something to offer them. If they don’t have anything to offer us, then it’s worth nothing.” Triangulated

findings from responses that focused on the challenges of partnership development and sustainment were synthesized into two broad sub-themes related to the challenges of developing reciprocity and resource limitations.

Challenges of developing reciprocity. Study respondents articulated concerns about the development of reciprocal relationships between KSU and its community partners. Concerns were raised about imbalances in costs and benefits, which could negatively impact the future development and sustainment of the existing dance partnerships at KSU. A KSU administrator articulated the need to “make sure that it’s [referring to the partnership] fulfilling needs on both sides ... if you’re not partnering with an organization that’s equally invested ... and if it’s not equal on both sides it can be a real drain on our resources.” Reflecting on one of the existing community partnerships at KSU with a professional dance company, a KSU dance faculty member felt the partnership was “going through its growing pains.” She was concerned that the reciprocal benefits from the partnering company, was limited to a few performances, discounted tickets, and classes. “They [referring to KSU students] are not included in performances anymore, not that they’ve [referring to the professional company] done anything grand where they needed other people, but I feel like it’s getting a little one-sided.”

Reflecting on some of the opportunities leveraged to KSU by partner institutions, a KSU administrator raised concerns about the programs ability to successfully respond to the demands of professional partner organizations. “The negative would be having opportunities that you can’t take full advantage of ... whether that’s for limited resources, [or] in terms of the dance program, [or, because] the talent pool is not quite where you want it yet.” The failure of KSU to produce the resources or talent to serve the opportunities leveraged through the partnerships could have a negative impact on the reciprocal relationship and future of the partnership.

Another KSU faculty member from another art discipline highlighted the need to partner with organizations that were artistically superior to the university program. The benefits of interacting with professionals would therefore propel the university program to a higher level of artistic and technical prowess. “The community partnering organization has to be at an artistic level beyond what the university can offer.” As a community expert summarized, “One of the main challenges would be just getting clear on what the expectations of both partners are ... there are a lot of negotiations to make.” The data related to the challenges of developing and sustaining reciprocity are categorized into three broad areas related to partnership development, relationship maintenance, and clarifying expectations.

Partnership development. The development of any relationship requires a commitment of time and energy on the part of partnering entities. The study found that the partnerships required a commitment of personal time and motivation from the participants who were involved with the development of the community dance partnerships at KSU. An administrator at KSU stated, “These partnerships take time. First of all to establish a relationship and then second of all, to maintain it.” Another administrator, who was actively involved with the development of community partnerships, including the dance partnerships, added that the development of the partnerships required, “[someone who] likes to build relationships, likes to broaden relationships, deepen relationships, and is not afraid to go out there and cultivate those relationships.” He reiterated, “It takes a lot of time. It requires a real commitment.” Data gathered from other respondents at KSU, similarly highlighted the challenge of time and personal commitment, confirming the importance of this finding in the study. A KSU dance faculty member stated, “I noticed how much time needs to be invested ... even to meet with them [referring to the partner institution,] to talk to them, to let them believe in why this is important to both parties; that takes

time.” Another KSU administrator added, “As it [referring to a partnership] continues to grow, it just takes more and more.” The findings emphasized the personal costs associated with starting a partnership, therefore requiring either institutional incentives or some form of personal motivation.

Relationship maintenance. In addition to the data focusing on the challenges of developing a partnership, the findings also emphasized the challenges of maintaining partner relationships once started. Referencing the community dance partnerships at KSU, a KSU administrator remarked, “It’s easy to get one started. It’s not as easy to sustain it because you need people and you need money and you need all kinds of things.” The findings showed that similar to the challenges and costs associated with the development of the dance partnerships, the maintenance of the partner relationships required a great deal of time and personal motivation. As one respondent stated:

As any relationship does, relationship maintenance work is needed. Relationships go through their own cycle of relationship formation and relationship maintenance and relationship disintegration. And to avoid disintegration, you need to constantly be willing to do the work of relationship maintenance. And sometimes the individuals have to then negotiate institutional pressure and limitation.

A community dance administrator highlighted a similar challenge from the perspective of the community partner organization, by saying, “I think the biggest challenge for me is finding time and I’m sure that’s the biggest challenge for KSU too.” The focus therefore seemed to be on sustaining an ongoing relationship. This was confirmed by a KSU faculty member who vehemently emphasized the importance of developing a long-term partner relationship, saying, “A drive-by event is not really a partnership ... to me, it is when you know there is sustained

relationship.” The maintenance of the dance partnerships at KSU therefore required a great deal of sustained effort on the part of the university administration and faculty.

Clarifying expectations. The document analysis revealed that the community dance partnerships at KSU were not based on formal written agreements between the partnering institutions, but rather brought into existence through mostly verbal negotiations. While these organically evolved partnerships seemed to work in most instances, the respondents articulated the need to clarify expectations and avoid future misunderstandings through the development of formal written agreements. A KSU administrator remarked, “I think you have to have a formal agreement because it has to be clear what everyone’s roles are. It needs to be clear what the expectations are ... so that you can measure it.” Other respondents similarly emphasized the importance of clarifying expectations, ensuring that the partnering institutions were served in a way that aligned with their institutional missions. A KSU faculty member remarked, “If a community organization impedes the progress of the university or impedes the educational mission of the university, there is an immediate problem.” Another KSU administrator similarly articulated the importance of clarifying partner expectations by saying, “I think to me it’s about the clarity of mission. So knowing specifically going into it, what does your institution want to get out of it? What does the partner institution want to get out of it?” The findings showed the challenges of developing reciprocity, and the importance of developing reciprocal relationships based on clearly articulated expectations.

Resource limitations. It was not surprising to find that several respondents identified challenges associated with the development of resources to sustain the community dance partnerships at KSU. Resource limitations were cited in the literature reviewed for this study on community partnerships in other fields. The respondents in this study discussed the resource

challenges within the community dance partnerships at KSU under the auspices of limited institutional support, financial limitations, and human resource scarcity.

Lack of institutional support. The development of the community dance partnerships at KSU was instigated by the initiatives of individuals from partnering institutions. The study found that while these connections on an individual level were critical to the development of the partnerships, it was also important to foster institutional support to leverage the resources and administrative support necessary to develop and sustain the partnerships. One departmental-level KSU administrator remarked, “They’re [referring to the university administration] supportive of it and I’m sure if it ever enters a conversation they’re glad it exists, but on a practical level, the resources are limited.” The comment alluded to the fact that the upper administration at KSU seemed to be supportive of the community engagement activities at the departmental levels, but not actively engaged within the partnerships enough to provide the resources they needed to thrive.

Another departmental administrator added, “The university has to commit to it ... we’re talking people and funds.” Recognizing this need, another administrator who was actively involved with the institutionalization of community engagement at KSU remarked, “It’s going to be a challenge to redirect people’s energies, redirect our resources to actually making this work happen.” Yet another KSU administrator added, “As an administrator at a university I think I have a responsibility...supporting this because it does give us a way to connect with the communities that we exist in more intimately.” The data showed that the university administration recognized the need for institutional support for community engagement, but that this support was still forthcoming. Responding from the perspective of a community partner organization, a community dance administrator articulated a similar need for institutional and

governmental support for community engagement, saying, “I think that boards need to take more time and government officials need to take more time in learning about ... what sort of funding and support we need.” There seemed to be consensus about the need to support and foster community engagement activities with institutional resources.

Limited financial support. A strong consensus existed about the lack of financial support at partnering institutions to develop and sustain the community dance partnerships evaluated in this study. Administrators and faculty repeatedly articulated the need to develop financial support for the partnerships, needed to fully realize the partnership potential. A community dance administrator who articulated a concern about the lack of financial resources at her institution to support the partnership remarked, “We feel as though the collaboration at some point or another is going to help us financially.” She looked at the collaboration with KSU as an investment and felt that the partnership would eventually prove to be financially beneficial. Another dance administrator from another partnering institution, articulated similar financial concerns saying, “Every arts organization out there needs money right now. Everybody is struggling ... and this puts pressure on sustaining partner relations.” A KSU administrator discussed the conundrum faced when partnership initiatives and departmental priorities start to compete for the limited financial resources available at the institution saying, “There’s limited resources to go around, to sustain and keep afloat all the different partnerships alongside the departmental educational mission.” He went on to reiterate the importance of developing financial support through grants and institutional funding awards.

Human resource limitations. Given the importance of individuals engaged in fostering and developing the community dance partnerships at KSU, it was not surprising to find that human resource limitations were cited as a challenge by respondents in the study. Interview

subjects from both the university and community partner institutions discussed the negative impact human resource limitations had on the partnerships being evaluated. A KSU faculty member stated, “It takes staff of the university to run the partnerships ... there are just certain human resource costs that the university has to absorb that hopefully come back in other ways.” The comment highlighted the importance of budgeting for human resources that are necessary to support the community dance partnerships. A KSU student articulated the concern from a more practical standpoint, reflecting on her experience within one of the partnerships, where human resource limitations negatively impacted the experience for her and her peers. “They [referring to the professional choreographers working on a project] really didn’t get the time to know the Kennesaw people as much as the company members did. So I guess, one thing that I would like to see a little more is the interaction between the choreographers and students.” A community dance administrator referenced the issue more directly, saying:

I think any non-profit is faced with the challenge of manpower. You know, it’s just me and we have a part-time person but when it comes to sustaining relationships and keeping relationships vibrant and taking care of our partnerships, we want to make sure that we do the best that we can.

The partnerships therefore seemed to lack the human resources needed to administer and develop the community engagement collaborations at KSU. The respondents seemed to clearly articulate areas for growth and development within the community dance partnerships at KSU, but felt that the human resource limitations left some of the partnership potential unrealized.

Philosophical Challenges

As articulated in the introductory sections of this dissertation, the professional practice of dance has traditionally remained separate from dance in academia. The study found that several

key philosophical differences existed between the KSU Program in Dance and its community partners, that proved challenging to their partnerships. A synthesis of these philosophical challenges articulated by the study participants was triangulated into two broad themes related to the conflicts between academia and professional practice and the negative perceptions of collegiate dance.

Degree pursuit in direct conflict with professional practice. The data highlighted a perception that professional practice was in direct conflict with collegiate dance education. Several respondents articulated their experience of the professional world being exclusionary of an academic focus. A professional dancer from one of the partnering institutions who had returned to KSU to get a degree in dance following his professional performance career, remarked, “I was a terrible student because I was interested in dancing and somebody had told me, if you really want to be a dancer, you just need to focus on dancing. Just don’t focus on academics.” Another contemporary confirmed the generational trend, by saying, “So at that time [referring to the 1970s and 1980s] if you went to college, it meant you couldn’t get a job [in dance.]” Another dance administrator who had broken these traditions, shared, “I can tell you historically just from my own personal experience when I was in [a professional ballet company, the artistic director] would not let us go to college. And finally ... I broke that.”

Those individuals employed in higher education seemed to articulate a similar dichotomy between professional practice and a collegiate career. One KSU dance professor shared her philosophy saying, “If you want to perform, you want to perform now. And so, many professional dancers started out at a much younger age and chose not to engage in academia.” Data gathered from another interview with a community dance professional, helped explain the philosophy as this individual stated, “Ballet is such a specialized discipline ... the majority of

dancers that were in professional companies did not go to college ... as the discipline called for intense training.” Another community professional added, “And back then, boy oh boy, the emphasis was on youth ... if you wanted to be a dancer, you got into a professional school and got associated with a professional company.” The traditional training philosophy therefore seemed to be in conflict with professional practice. The community dance partnerships at KSU were negatively impacted by this perception that kept the populations of degree-seekers and professional practitioners apart.

Negative perception of collegiate dance. The traditional conflicts between dance in academia and its professional practice seemed to be perpetuated within a philosophy of negativity towards collegiate dance. A dance professional explained, “There’s an animosity that may have developed in the beginning that has just been perpetuated for lack of a better oral tradition.” Another professional also talked about this historic negativity that seemed to be slowly changing. He said, “There’s also a certain level of residual snobbery that ballet kind of can have, kind of an elitism that is actually spreading up from the very roots.” Other professionals interviewed seemed to have experiences of collegiate dance that contributed to their negative perceptions. One remarked, “I’ve seen some college dance programs and I know it’s true. And that’s why I was like, I’m not going to college for dance.” Another said, “Often the colleges are not good enough. The dancers aren’t technical enough. They’re too mediocre.” The comments showed a negative perception of collegiate dance and its traditional separation from the profession.

Unrealized and Unexplored Partnership Opportunities

Lack of partnership awareness. While the data from the study alluded to several positive aspects of the community dance partnerships at KSU, respondents also shared concerns

about a lack of awareness about the partnerships themselves among the general populations on campus and within the community. Some populations were unaware of the existence of the partnerships, while others seemed unclear about their scope and function. This limited the growth of the partnerships and narrowed the participation to those directly associated with the dance program at KSU. A community dance administrator stated, “I think maybe make it a little more clear as to what are the benefits ... They [referring to the community] don’t know how it works.” Another professional dancer from the same community institution added, “I don’t think they really fully grasp the impact that it has had in the dance scene regionally and nationally. And I think if we can kind of stress that, I think that would be a great thing.” While the collaborations allowed the partnering institutions to advertise for each other, the potential seemed to be underachieved. A KSU dance faculty member expressed concern about the reciprocal benefits received by the university saying, “They’ll use you when they can. They’re not going to go out there and advertise you. They’re out to advertise themselves and if they can fit you in, they will.” The study helped evaluate this level of reciprocity and shed light on the need to expand the awareness and knowledge about the partnerships into the broader university and off-campus community.

Development of master classes, workshops, and summer programs. A large volume of data from the study focused on the need to expand the educational potential of the community dance partnerships at KSU. Student respondents across the three focus groups discussed the need for more pedagogical interaction between the partnering institutions, calling for more master classes, workshop opportunities, and the potential to develop summer programming and camps. Selected data from the students is presented below to represent this finding:

1. Maybe more with Atlanta Ballet ... open classes ... they come here and teach ... I think that would be really exciting to work with them a bit more.
2. We could have the opportunity for master classes ... or seminars or I don't know, camps ... maybe giving the students here who are about to graduate the chance to teach a class or meet with people or I guess just come together so that we're very familiar with all of our partnerships and that it's not just on paper.
3. It would be really awesome to have Atlanta Ballet instructors come teach master classes or have more interaction with their company and their faculty. We get to take discounted classes and discounts to performances, but I'd like to have more interaction with them behind the scenes.
4. Atlanta Ballet could come in and teach a master class or teach a workshop or host a camp here at Kennesaw.
5. I don't think Glo has actually ever done a master class and I think a master class open to anyone and have it either at Kennesaw or the Goat Farm. I think that would really open people's eyes to this partnership as well if there could be an open class for anyone.

The comments reflected the need and opportunity to expand the pedagogical programming within the partnerships. It was clear that the existing educational collaborations were well received, however the respondents felt that the partnership potentials remained underexplored, and could be enhanced by the addition of master classes, workshops, and dance intensives.

Expansion of teaching opportunities. In addition to the partnerships providing educational opportunities for KSU students in the community, there also seemed to be the potential for the development of internship and teaching opportunities at the community partner

organizations. Two KSU dance faculty discussed missed opportunities for the pedagogy students at KSU, who they felt could benefit from the experience of teaching or observing classes at community partner institutions. One said, “Even for our pedagogy classes to go out there and be able to work in some of their schools or internships for our dancers ... would be beneficial.” The other added, “I would like to see a partnership specifically for the pedagogy students ... I feel that most of them have a desire for performance but in reality, they may wind up teaching if given the opportunity.” A community dance professional seemed to explore this possibility from the perspective of teaching opportunities for professional dancers saying, “I think it would be nice to see more of the Glo artists moving into KSU for education, through dance education or any kind of education ... feeding more people and getting a little bit of that professional teaching experience.” The data alluded to the opportunities the partnerships provided for the development of the pedagogical skills of students and dancers from the partnering organizations. The development of internships and teaching opportunities could enhance the skills of the students and dancers who aspired to teach dance, giving them valuable practical training at partner institutions.

Unexplored funding potential. The respondents also discussed unexplored funding opportunities that could be collaboratively leveraged by the partnering institutions. Grant opportunities available to foster community engagement and community development could potentially be pursued through collaborative funding applications. A community dance administrator referenced this potential by saying, “Partnerships allow us to collaborate on projects that may be eligible for special grant funding ... opportunities that we cannot pursue individually.” Another administrator added that this potential remained unexplored between the partnering institutions saying, “I do think it gives us the opportunity to look at additional

funding. We have not yet, but I think there's an opportunity there because it is somewhat of an outreach or a collaboration that we could tap into." It was evident that the partners had not explored the possibilities of tapping into funding sources that rewarded community collaborations in the arts. The study highlighted this opportunity, which could potentially address some of the resource limitations discussed earlier.

Stakeholder Experiences

Data gathered from KSU administrators, students, and faculty along with data from community dance administrators and professional dancers highlighted the benefits and challenges experienced by stakeholders within the community dance partnerships at KSU. Triangulated findings were synthesized into six broad themes that are discussed below. The findings referenced issues that were relative to individual populations, as well as the overall administration of the community partnerships in dance at KSU.

Student Development

The community dance partnerships at KSU had a significant impact on student development. A number of participants highlighted areas of student development related to performance opportunities, choreographic opportunities, and training opportunities that were positively impacted by experiences within these partnerships. A dance faculty member at KSU observed that student interactions within the community dance partnerships, "[made students] more aware of the demands and expectations of a professional career ... [giving] them exposure and experiences for their resume." She went on to state that "no other university program's offer their students the same type of experiences" and that the KSU partnerships provided students with "discounted or free tickets to shows ... which [she felt] helped better educate them on what is going on in the world- They are offered more performance opportunities, definitely more

contacts in the field and more opportunity to further training.” The reflections were confirmed by the students themselves, who articulated the impact the partnerships had on their curricular and artistic experiences within the program. A freshman dance major stated, “Travelling to Atlanta and working with people who are in the real world right now [was] more of a preparation than ... a tiny class could ever provide.” Other students interviewed as part of the student focus groups, stated that the partnerships allowed them to “go outside of [their] comfort zone and explore something that [they typically] wouldn’t usually explore” and that the experiences “expanded [their] range of knowledge and ability to express and experience what [they were] doing in a much deeper sense.” When asked about student impact, an administrator at KSU stated that he was “excited” that the opportunities developed gave students “a chance to expand their education beyond just the classroom” as it provided them with “a professional context” combined with an “immediacy and a vibrancy to the work that they do, that they don’t necessarily get as naturally in a classroom environment.” Two sub-themes related to student development were recurrent within the data gathered in this study. The sections below highlight these sub-themes related to student role models and career preparation that emerged from the triangulated data in this study.

Role models for students. The integration of professional dancers from community partner organizations into the collegiate environment at KSU provided the traditional students with role models who seemed to motivate and inspire them to succeed as professional dancers. Students noted that working with professionals “made [them] want to improve and match [the] professionalism and performance quality” they saw as “inspirational.” A student noted that the professionals “served as mentors” and that a lot of them were similar in age stating, “It was really interesting relating with people who are our age and are already at a high level ... very

inspiring, just to see how hard dancers work ... shows you where you would need to be.” The professional dancers seemed to be aware of this dynamic and seemed proud to serve as role models and mentors to the KSU dance students. A professional dancer from Atlanta Ballet stated, “I feel that the kids [referring to the KSU dance students] are looking up to me you know, whenever I’m in the room or we’re just speaking ... they’d ask me questions about what its like in the professional world.” Another dancer from gloATL said that the experience made her “realize how much they actually look up to [her.]” Reflecting on these observations, a KSU dance faculty member stated that she felt that the experience of having professional role models within the program was very beneficial “because they [referring to the KSU dance students] are listening to someone who is actively involved in the field. It makes [the educational experience] more relevant.” Another community dance administrator seemed very proud of the professional dancer from her organization that served as a professional role models to the KSU dance students. She stated, “He [referring to the professional dancer from her organization] is not only a fantastic versatile dancer, but [also] a role model for anybody that works with him. He’s got an amazing work ethic that goes far and beyond most professionals.” The triangulated data in the study evidenced the fact that multiple constituents were aware of the positive dynamic created by professional role models from community partner institutions within the KSU Program in Dance.

Career preparation. The experience of working and interacting with professional dancers and professional dance organizations within the community dance partnerships at KSU, provided students with opportunities for career preparation that they would not necessarily have within a traditional collegiate environment. The community dance partnerships placed the KSU dance students in close proximity to the professional dance world, allowing them to evaluate their potential for success. A KSU student noted, “I wanted to experience as much as I could

before I went out into the field ... and with the partnerships at Atlanta Ballet and with gloATL, I figured that [the experiences] would be a good start towards my career.” Another KSU student felt that the community partnerships were “a great opportunity to be in college and be able to perform in the professional world before you actually graduate.” The practical experiences also seemed to help students determine their future career path, allowing them to experience multiple facets of the professional dance world before they had to make difficult choices about where their skills would be most successful. A student reflected on this by stating, “I believe that our experiences with our community partnerships help us discern whether or not we want to pursue dancing professionally when we graduate or pursue a scholarly route, such as research, education or teaching.” The partnership experiences therefore served as a litmus test for students at KSU, helping them evaluate their individual potential against the demands of the profession, that they could experience first-hand through their interactions within the KSU community dance partnerships.

A community dancer, who had graduated from the KSU Program in Dance and successfully entered the professional dance world, reflected on the impact the community dance partnerships at KSU had on her success. She stated that the experiences she had at KSU interacting with community professionals “made it quite easy to work professionally ... I feel like I didn’t have to go through the usual normal auditioning [process] ... It just sort of happened as I was still a student.” Administrators at KSU seemed to be keenly aware of the role these partnerships could play in the success and development of dance students at KSU. An upper-level administrator stated, “It is also important for them [referring to KSU students] to see ... what the professional world is all about ... It’s about expectations and we don’t want their worlds to be so small that they don’t know what the real world expects of them.” A KSU faculty

member affirmed the administrator's reflections by stating, "I want my students to be collaborators, to be people who seek partnerships, to be people who try to work with other mediums to bring their medium to life. So I think modeling now is really important." The faculty member went on to state that in the arts, "We teach in sort of a weird way, kind of like a trade school. So we're teaching an incredibly specific skill to a group of students... and for them to actually see that skill being utilized at the highest level is crucial." Similar reflections were made by a variety of participants in the study as they highlighted the impact the community dance partnerships at KSU had on the career preparation of students. Additionally, the analysis of video records that archived some of the performance activities within the community dance partnerships at KSU, evidenced the opportunities KSU students received to experience the professional dance world during collaborative performances at Atlanta Ballet and gloATL where KSU student performers were used in supernumerary roles. The six sub-sections that follow represent the findings related to student career preparation within six distinct areas of focus and provide data summaries to help articulate the views of the participants.

Training opportunities. A closer look at the individual experiences within the community dance partnerships at KSU revealed that the training opportunities were one of the key components that contributed to the career preparation of students. A KSU student noted, "She [referring to a teacher from a community partner institution] taught me how I could breathe with my movement. So I pretty much learned different ways to make my dancing look effortless and how to use my body to make it into an art form." Another KSU student who had also worked with the same community teacher added, "She pushed me, she motivated me and I feel like I understood ... I understood!" The students collectively agreed that the training opportunities leveraged through the community partnerships were instrumental in their career

preparation. One of them remarked, “One of the definite benefits would be having your eyes open to the professional world ... you know where the bar is, you know where you need to be and it’s a great learning experience.” Another student added that the training opportunities were, “Inspiring and [made] you ready to push yourself and be out there.” The observations seemed to also exist within the comprehension of the community partner administrators, as one remarked that the training opportunities would “give some definite career tracks for students coming out of the college dance department” helping them to “focus ... on long-term goals and making them identify kind of where they see their career going after they get their degree from KSU.” The community dance partnerships at KSU therefore seemed to leverage additional training opportunities for students allowing them to supplement and enhance the training opportunities available within the KSU dance program.

Resume development. A recurrent theme within the interview and focus group transcripts highlighted the impact the experiences within the community dance partnerships at KSU had on the development of student resumes. The interactive performance and educational experiences with community professionals, allowed students to strengthen and develop their professional resumes while enrolled as undergraduate students at KSU. A KSU student excitedly exclaimed, “To have [a community professionals] name on your resume is pretty intense, especially because I know she’s [referring to a community professional] known basically all throughout New York ... and globally.” Another student also highlighted the opportunity to strengthen her resume by saying that she was “excited about being able to put [her] performances and experience with gloATL on [her] resume.” An analysis of the bios of the student performers in the KSU Program in Dance confirmed this finding, as several students had leveraged

professional credibility by highlighting their experiences of working with professionals within the community dance partnerships at KSU.

Performance opportunities. The collaborations between the KSU Program in Dance and its community partner organizations provided performance opportunities to students that were not available within the traditional workings of the program. A student observed, “I think especially for a college dance program it’s really huge to get to work with... a professional dance company and I think that right there is education ... you see how it’s done ... and it really helps you grow as a dancer.” Reflecting on a recent collaborative performance experience that combined dancers from Atlanta Ballet with a core of student dancers from KSU, another student noted, “With *Paquita* rehearsals this year, the expectations artistically and technically [were] through the roof for the dancers ... having Atlanta Ballet be on the very same stage with our dancers [helped raise the] standard ... [to a level] higher [than usual.]” Adding to this reflection, another KSU student who was also a part of this performance said, “I felt that we had to really work hard just to be on stage with them [referring to the professionals from Atlanta Ballet], like we didn’t want to stick out ... so I felt like the bar was raised ... especially for that performance.”

It was clear that the collaborative performance opportunities propelled the KSU students towards a higher standard of performance expectation. Another KSU student stated, “I think it’s so beneficial to really get out there and perform in so many different venues or with so many different artists or just with ... so many different programs.” In addition to the observations of the KSU students represented above, a community instructor noted, “In the past few years, it seems like their [referring to KSU dance students] movement has softened, they’re a lot more agile and less rigid. They’re able to grab movement more quickly because they’re working with

less tension.” All these technical and artistic developments were direct results of the performance opportunities created within the community dance partnerships at KSU.

Internship opportunities. The community engagement partnerships in dance at KSU provided opportunities for student internships and training on the job. The document analysis of the bachelor of art in dance curriculum, noted the requirement for all dance majors to complete a one-semester internship with a professional dance or art organization. Several respondents pointed out the value of the internship opportunities that were available as a result of the community dance partnerships at KSU. Reflecting on the internship experience, a KSU administrator noted,

They get to work with artists at a completely different organization, so they’re going to be exposed to different people, different talents, and different levels of expertise. They’re going to see what other institutional standards are about. They’re going to have a sense of the work that is done within the art form beyond the boundaries of the campus.

Students interviewed within the focus groups, highlighted similar positive experiences. One student noted, “The use of being able to get to connect with professionals in the field instead of living in [a] sheltered community all the time.” The same student went on to state, “This is an opportunity for those who are wanting to get a sense of what it is really like to be a part of a professional field of dance, whether it is performance-based or administrative-based.” A student who was pursuing an internship opportunity at a community partner institution remarked that the value of her experience lay in “being able to work there [referring to the community partner institution] and really seeing the extent of their outreach and community education...so it’s very neat to see it from both sides.” A community administrator at an organization that had used KSU student interns in the past, added to the discourse about the value of student internships, by

sharing her personal experience with a KSU intern who they ended up hiring, “I know we hired [the student intern] after her internship with us and now she’s one of our instructors for one of the outreach programs we’re doing with the City of Atlanta. So we love KSU students and we see how strong they come out of the program.” Even though most internships did not end up in a job opportunity, the experience played a significant part in the career preparation of dance students at KSU.

Choreographic influence. Working with community dance professionals seemed to have a profound impact on the creative work of the students at KSU. A thematic observation that emerged from an analysis of the data, focused on the choreographic influences that were a by-product of collaborative projects and performances. A KSU student interviewed in one of the focus groups remarked, “I feel like choreographically things are much more developed and there’s a stronger choreographic mindset.” The student went on to attribute the choreographic impact to one of the community partnerships saying, “I think that using the collaboration with Glo is definitely a way to stay present in a current company and learn a technique that has only been around for I feel like 20 years or so.” Responding to this observation, another student within the same focus group remarked, “They [referring to gloATL] show you such a broad expanse of movement and a philosophy of dance and choreography ... the development of choreography and production...I can’t put in words how much you learn from one experience with a choreographer.” The students were clearly aware of the impact the dance partnerships at KSU had on their growth as creative artists and choreographers.

Transcripts from interviews with community professionals also indicated awareness and focus on the creative impact the partnerships had on the students at KSU. One respondent stated:

I think a lot of the students get engaged with material they may not typically be exposed to all their lives. You know when an artist comes in just for a semester or to do a project, it might be something that's too specific to teach as a part of the core curriculum, but it's a great piece of their education.

Another community administrator also noted the impact on the students at KSU, saying, "So for them, this piece really stretched them. And I know that they all were very complimentary and very excited to do it." The administrator was referencing a particular choreographic experience, and went on to say, "So I know for the artist it was wonderful. For our audiences to see something that was different extended them ... for the students on the other hand ... I think there were huge benefits." Another community professional found that the choreographic influences had reciprocal benefits for the partnering organizations:

We're reaching emerging choreographers especially ones that want to go on and make this a profession. ... And I think even having the partnership ... allows our choreographers to be seen by KSU and an opportunity for KSU to see new choreographers and give them platforms to choreograph as well.

The data clearly revealed a strong choreographic influence on the students and partnering organizations, helping enhance their creative capacities.

Networking opportunities. The community dance partnerships at KSU seemed to provide valuable networking opportunities for students and professionals, serving as a platform for the community to congregate and engage with one another. A student interviewed stated, "With the partnership you're building a relationship with the professional world ... It can help you build your career as well as your resume." Another student responded by saying, "It's very important to kind of get your feet wet and established, and kind of introduce yourself to other

people out there in the dance community that could possibly hire you in the future.” A top-ranking KSU administrator confirmed the finding by saying, “Students need to know how to build relationships ... so for our students to early on know what it takes to build those relationships and to participate with other organizations and to share ... is critical.” A community professional who had benefited from this networking opportunity and used a KSU student in one of her professional projects remarked, “In fact because I [had] been exposed to him [referring to the KSU student she hired as a dancer] as a mover, I knew what he could do ... and therefore hired him.” She went on to comment on the broader context of the networking opportunities developed by the community dance partnerships at KSU by saying, “The networking potential of the students working with professionals is a very key element ... it engages them in a professional network [so] they can job hunt when they graduate.” The finding could perhaps best be summed up in the words of another KSU administrator who stated, “I think that it’s a powerful message to send to our students about the importance of being engaged whether it’s civic engagement or some kind of service to the community ... as they can network their way to career success.”

Student Challenges

The following section highlights the data pertaining to the challenges KSU students faced within the community dance partnerships. Triangulated views of respondents from the university and community partner institutions provided a holistic understanding of the negative aspects of the community dance partnerships and helped evaluate the impact on student populations at the university.

Intimidation, frustration, demoralization. A synthesis of the negative student experiences within the community dance partnerships at KSU highlighted the frustrations faced

by students within the partnerships, which often led to their demoralization and intimidation. Several students articulated their fears of working in a professional environment, which sometimes left them feeling frustrated with their own technical and artistic limitations. One student stated, “It’s only slightly disheartening because sometimes you realize you have a long way to go compared to these professional dancers.” While another said, “I was at first a little bit nervous because it was something so different. I’ve never seen movement like that in my entire life.” While the experience of working with professional dance practitioners seemed inspirational to most, students who were underprepared or insecure, felt intimidated, frustrated, and demoralized.

Unprepared for technical challenges. Further analysis of the data related to the negative experiences of students showed that a major cause was related to their technical limitations. While the advanced dance students at KSU seemed prepared to handle the technical demands within the community dance partnerships, others found the experiences challenging and frustrating. One student exclaimed, “I don’t want to do this. I can’t do this,” while another said, “I felt really frustrated, and I felt like I couldn’t get them.” Discussing the experience of working collaboratively with a professional choreographer and professional dancers on a recent project, another student remarked, “I think there was a misunderstanding, because they didn’t really realize the fact that we are students and we’re just starting out.” The professionals therefore seemed to demand a level of technical proficiency that some of the KSU students were unable to deliver. In addition to articulating their frustrations, some students also discussed possible solutions that could help orient them better to the experience of working with professionals. One student said, “If at the top of the schedule we had a workshop that they [meaning the KSU students] could have attended before they decided to take that schedule and

have the experience, that might have helped them immerse themselves [more successfully.]”

Another student in the same focus group added, “It probably could have been approached differently ... a workshop would be a wonderful way ... even just with one class, you can really get a better sense of the quality of the movement, and I think it would have helped.” A student who had recently had a negative experience within one of these professional performance opportunities went on to say, “The expectations [were] really hard for me because they were expecting so much of us and yet I felt like I couldn’t give it to them, because it was my first time working with them and the bar had already been set so high.” Reflecting on the experiences of frustration and intimidation shared by the students, a KSU administrator stated:

Their expectations for the dancers are beyond what a student can deliver and therefore the student is somehow psychologically or physically damaged by trying to meet these expectations or there may be code of ethics difference in behavior for instance between a professional performing arts company and what’s expected at a university.

The experiences intended to enhance and motivate the student performers by placing them on stage with professionals, but could have had the opposite impact on the students if they are unprepared for the experience and its technical challenges.

Pressure on students to participate. In addition to the technical pressures of the professional performance experience, students also articulated negative feelings about the pressure they felt to participate and perform at a high standard. The opportunities available to students at KSU seemed overwhelming to some, who felt that their failure to participate and perform with excellence would be viewed negatively by the faculty and their peers. One student remarked, “When you’re in a professional setting ...there’s just kind of a higher stress to be as correct as possible.” Another student said, “It did a bit frustrate me because there were times

when I felt like I could not do it and I [did not] know how I was going to get through it, and [the] performance was coming.” Some of the students interviewed felt that the negative experiences were directly related to the first-time experiences for some of their peers. One student remarked, “It wasn’t as frustrating to me as it was the first time around, and like this past one- it was not frustrating for me at all.” Another student added, “It’s only frustrating at first because we’re not as familiar with the movement, and coming in not knowing that their expectations are so high, you have no clue what you’re supposed to be doing.” The student went on to however say, “But then as you give it time and the frustration, for me at least, pushes me to get through it to the end and once I push myself ... [it] takes away the challenge.” There were several other similar comments made about the pressure students felt as participants within the community partnerships that are not included for the sake of brevity. One student however articulated the pressure she felt not only as a performer within the partnerships, but also as a student who was somehow expected to volunteer to participate: “There was almost an expectation that I would always be jumping at the opportunity that was presented to me ... I didn’t want the impression to be that I wasn’t interested or I didn’t want to be involved.” The triangulated findings therefore highlighted the pressures students felt to be a part of the partner experiences and then the pressures they faced to perform at an appropriately high standard of technical and artistic excellence.

Competitive environment created. The findings of the study highlighted a competitive dynamic within the partnerships not apparent to the outside viewer or administrator. Some KSU students felt challenged to receive critique from the professional dancers who were their peers in age. One student remarked, “I think some of the other Kennesaw State dancers didn’t appreciate having peers that were our age try and coach us and help us with the material we were given to

learn.” Another student expressed concern about the competition created for roles between the KSU students and visiting artists from professional community organizations saying, “I was concerned about how much dancing I was actually going to get to do ... am I just going to be a back up [dancer] ... Or am I actually going to be equal and have the same experience?” A competitive environment also seemed to be created between the KSU students, as some of them viewed the technical limitations of their peers as disconcerting and potentially embarrassing to the program. One student remarked, “I think that there should have been some experience requirement ... I do want KSU to present itself in the best way possible ... we don’t want to look silly next to them [meaning the professionals.]” The competitive dynamic created within the community dance partnerships could therefore prove negative to the experience if not harnessed and controlled. The issue seemed related to the reciprocity the KSU students perceived from the partnerships, wherein they felt threatened by the visiting professionals or concerned about the abilities of their peers to deliver the required performance product.

Need to develop deeper experiences. Several respondents in the study articulated their concern with the depth of experiences offered to KSU within the community dance partnerships. The concern was related to the ways in which KSU student performers were used by partner institutions to serve in supporting supernumerary roles that did not always provide artistic fulfillment and benefit. One student said, “I found it kind of disheartening ... I stood there on stage as a guard for the entire prologue ... I mean, the experience itself was great ... but I didn’t really get to show what I had on stage.” Another student who was part of the same partner experience added, “It was a little different and I felt a little closed off, from the company.” A student in a different focus group also discussed a similar concern, stating, “The portion that KSU was seen was a very small one ... but if I could change something it would be the amount

of performance that is given to those KSU performers through the partnership.” This finding was confirmed through the observation study conducted at a rehearsal at KSU, wherein two professional dancers served the leading roles in a ballet supported by the *corps de ballet*, made up of KSU students. While the experience of working with professional dancers from a community partner institution seemed enriching, the limited stage time given to the KSU student performers seemed problematic.

Schedule/time conflicts. Several study participants at KSU articulated the challenges they faced in balancing their individual school schedules with the schedules of the community dance partner organizations. The challenge of balancing class schedules with rehearsal schedules prevented some KSU students from fully experiencing the benefits of the community partnerships. Reflecting on the impact a recent partnership project had on the regular rehearsal schedule at KSU, one student remarked, “It did kind of conflict with rehearsals here for the company ... we had to actually cancel an entire rehearsal because 4 out of 5 of us, were away.” Another student added, “As a student you have a lot going on being involved here and with our company alone. ...I think time. It’s always going to be an issue. There’s never enough time for everything.” Others added that the schedule conflicts and time limitations were perhaps the single biggest reason why more students could not be a part of the community partner experiences. A KSU dance faculty member articulated her observations of this challenge by saying, “There are many opportunities in Atlanta for students to become involved in shows outside of even our professional partnerships but sometimes they don’t have the time to invest because of their class work.” The finding showed that schedule conflicts and time limitations had a significant impact on student participation within the community dance partnerships at KSU.

Fear of derailing student focus. Several respondents in the study raised a concern about the negative impact the community dance partnerships could potentially have on student retention, progression, and graduation. The concern stemmed from the fact that exposing students to professional experiences could derail their academic focus causing them to leave college prematurely in pursuit of professional careers. A KSU faculty member articulated a past experience in this regard with a student at a former institution: “He got a job offer ... and so he said, ‘I don’t need to graduate.’ ... he should have graduated and then taken the bait.” Another KSU faculty member also raised a similar concern about students engaged with professionals at KSU saying, “I would bet that the students would so gravitate to the professional work, that they might sometimes be tempted to go ... go be down there when they’re supposed to be up here in class.” A KSU administrator reflected on the impact the community partnerships could have on internal performance projects saying that when you develop a partnership, “You have to give time to it and you have to try to recruit students for it and to build energy around the idea to do it. And so that takes students away from other projects on campus.” The data clearly showed concern about the negative impact the community dance partnerships at KSU could have on student academic focus. While no negative experience was actually reported at KSU, the potential seemed to be constantly looming in the minds of the faculty and administrators.

Faculty Perspectives

The findings from this evaluative study of KSU’s community dance partnerships were in many ways aligned with the existing empirical literature on community engagement in other fields of study. The perspective of the faculty was cited as a key component within the existing literature and within this study. This study also found a close connection between community engagement in dance, and faculty scholarship and professional development. The sections that

follow provide empirical evidence in support of the above findings, and discuss the challenges faculty face within the community dance partnerships at KSU.

Faculty role as partnership instigators. A number of community and university administrators highlighted the role of faculty in developing and sustaining the community dance partnerships at KSU. The individual motivation and personal connections of faculty played a pivotal role in the development of community relationships. An administrator at KSU remarked, “Things don’t happen on their own, they don’t magically occur.” The comment alluded to the role of faculty as partnership instigators. This administrator went on to say that finding faculty with the motivation and skills to develop partner relationships was critical to the implementation and success of community engagement. Another KSU administrator, who had successfully launched a community partnership in another field, emphasized the interpersonal connections that were pivotal to the development of partner relationships. Reflecting on his own experience, he stated, “There was a very quick connection between me and the director [of the partner institution.] ... that personal relationship is a major consideration for the partnerships ongoing success. We both enjoy each other as people.” A faculty member who had a record of developing community partnerships in another art form, reflected on his personal motivation for success in this area by saying, “It’s impossible to burn out if you’ve never been on fire, and I think collaborating ... lights you on fire ... by working with other people, you become inspired more and you dig deeper into your own art.” The study participants were highly reflective of the role faculty played in the development of community engagement relationships. The KSU dance partnerships were originally developed by the faculty in the program, therefore the observations of the faculty respondents were reflective of the development and sustainment of the KSU community engagement partnerships.

Faculty scholarship opportunities. The impact the community dance partnerships at KSU have on faculty scholarship and professional development was evidenced in the data gathered from multiple constituents in this study. Reflecting on the personal benefits, a KSU faculty member stated, “It [referring to the community dance partnerships at KSU] helps the faculty stay in tune with developments and trends in the dance field.” The community partnerships provided a venue for KSU faculty to engage with the professional practice of their art form, and stay current about developing trends in the field of dance. Another KSU faculty member discussed the opportunities that were leveraged through the community dance partnerships at KSU by saying, “For me as a choreographer, it was interesting to present my work at different locations and different venues and also to different audience members.” These reflections were triangulated with the views of other non-faculty participants in the study to confirm a similar point of view. A KSU administrator supported the finding by saying, “Faculty get to have their work viewed by other audience members that would not perhaps come to the campus.” The community engagement partnerships therefore, provided external venues for faculty scholarship. An analysis of show programs from past performance collaborations with community partners, reflected opportunities KSU dance faculty had to produce their work at venues such as Atlanta Ballet, Georgia Ballet, gloATL, Cobb Energy Center and the Rialto Center for the Arts, among many others.

Lack of reward and recognition. A recurring theme in the data referred to the lack of adequate reward and recognition at KSU to incentivize the faculty to become more active participants within the community dance partnerships. Faculty believed that the development of community relationships was expected to be a part of their professional interests and agenda, but not recognized through course release time, financial reward, or institutional recognition. A

KSU dance faculty member stated, “I think there needs to be greater recognition for this kind of work ... reassignment time ... pay ... promotion ... annual reviews.” A KSU administrator shared his frustration with not having the resources to reward faculty for their community engagement work saying, “I should be able to go to [a faculty member] and say, ‘Given all the work you’re doing, here, I’m going to give you three hours of release time so you can focus your energies’ [on developing the community relationship].” Another administrator echoed the sentiments saying, “I wish we had more resources. I wish we had more resources to find release time for the staff who are going to be doing this work.” The findings clearly articulated the need for community engagement to be institutionalized at KSU and recognized through university funding and resources. When asked to discuss this need, a high-ranking KSU administrator passionately articulated the importance of signaling an institutional commitment to engagement, saying:

The messaging from all the levels of the institution is important ... the President and the Provost signaling to the Deans, the Deans signaling to the Chairs. The President and the Provost also signaling to the Chairs but it’s like this multi-level approach of what is valued, and how that value is actually recognized at the institution ... also an assessment of our promotion and tenure guidelines to see to what degree engagement is recognized and valued, rewarded in our promotion and tenure guidelines.

It was clear from the data that the success of the community dance partnerships at KSU was the initiative of a few faculty and administrators, who fostered relationships for the benefit of the program and institution. There was clearly a lack of institutional reward structures to recognize community engagement efforts and inspire them in others.

Personal time costs. The data also highlighted the challenges of time associated with faculty involvement in community engagement activities. The development of partner relationships, along with the involvement of faculty on partner projects, required a time commitment beyond the regular hours of the program. A dance faculty member stated, “Maybe giving the faculty enough time or the person developing these [community relationships] enough resources and time to continue working with these partnerships” would help address some of the challenges. A KSU administrator added, “At the core you need someone who is willing to put the time in to make it work ... I watched what you did to make some of these things happen and how much time it took.” He went on to discuss the need for institutional support for community engagement saying, “There has to be support from upper levels of administration ... so you might free up time for a faculty member or dedicate a staff member to this and probably reasonable money.” Another dance faculty member who had not actively been a part of the community dance partnerships remarked, “I cannot imagine if I were the person who was developing the partnerships, how much time [it would take]. But just even being another faculty member who participates in some of these activities ... it takes away time.” The finding highlighted the commitment of time that was required from faculty engaged in the development of community partnerships, articulating the need for institutional support to compensate faculty for the time spent on community engagement activities.

Implications for Professional Dancers

In addition to the positive impact the community dance partnerships had on KSU students and faculty, the partnerships also seemed to have significant implications for the professional dancers who were affiliated with the university through these educational and artistic collaborations. Several professional dancers from partnering organizations were able to pursue

undergraduate degrees in dance at KSU as a result of the affiliation of their professional dance organization with the KSU Program in Dance. A professional dancer from one of the partnering organizations who was pursuing his bachelor of art degree in dance at KSU remarked, “I like to push myself in new ways and kind of take risks ... my experiences here at KSU, renew my interest in different subjects outside of dance, enriching what I bring to dance.” Responding to this finding, a KSU faculty member shared her experience of having one of the professional dancers from a community partner organization in her class by saying:

I see [the professional] learning things that he wouldn't learn no matter where he goes in the classical ballet world ... He's learning new ways of looking at things. And so that is only going to make him a better teacher, and help bring up even more well-rounded, perceptive, sensitive artists.

The three sub-sections that follow highlight the triangulated findings that focus on the impact the community dance partnerships at KSU have on professional dancers from community partner organizations.

Expanding career potentials. A number of professional dancers interviewed in this study articulated the potential impact their affiliation and opportunities at KSU could have on their future career transition following their professional performance careers. The introductory sections of this dissertation study highlighted the inability of most professional dancers in the field to pursue an academic degree in tandem with their performance careers. The community dance partnerships at KSU helped overcome the traditional boundaries between the profession and academia. The partnerships provided opportunities for professional dancers to pursue an undergraduate dance degree at KSU through the mutually beneficial agreements between their

organization and the university. One such professional interviewed in this study articulated his experience by saying:

Professionally, I'm looking to enhance what I know and get the tools on how to go about doing whatever I need to do. There is a dangerous climate, this economy ... budget cuts and people getting fired ... I want to be prepared for the next thing ... I think it's going to prepare the people who are professional dancers that come here to be better leaders in the arts. ... When I finish doing this, I'm going to be better equipped.

Another professional dancer from the same community partner organization, who was also enrolled at KSU as an undergraduate dance major shared his experience of the non-dance curriculum he was taking by saying, "I find that some of these general education courses are opening new avenues of interest for me again, foreign language is one, literature is another." The reflections evidenced the positive impact the collegiate educational experience was having on the professional dancers enrolled in the dance program at KSU. Their academic experiences were enhancing their professional credentials and developing their abilities to further their success in the field of dance.

Teaching and choreographic opportunities. The study highlighted the teaching and choreographic opportunities that were available to professional dancers through the community dance partnerships at KSU. Through collaborative projects and curricular planning, several professional dancers were given opportunities to teach and choreograph. These opportunities were not typically available to these professionals within their own organizations, and the data showed that the experiences were enriching to their personal and professional development. One such professional dancer who had opportunities to substitute teach at KSU thanks to a partnership with her community organization said, "It was a push for me to teach college level

students ... their minds are in a very different place than younger students ... the experience was enriching.” Another professional dancer expressed her gratitude for the opportunity to teach at KSU saying, “Personally it’s giving me an opportunity to instruct and teach, which we haven’t done before. We don’t teach anywhere else besides Kennesaw.” Yet another professional dancer seemed personally enriched by the experience saying, “It was difficult to say who is learning more, me or them.” While most of the data pertaining to this finding came from the professional dancers themselves, one community administrator made a remarkable reflection on the value of having professionals choreograph on college students at KSU by saying, “A lot of choreographers do better work on the students because they don’t have phenomenal performers who can make anything look good [therefore propelling them to use their choreographic skills in a strategic manner.]” The findings therefore suggested that the partnerships provided opportunities for professionals to practice and expand their pedagogical and choreographic skills at KSU.

Opportunity to Pursue an Academic Degree. Several participants interviewed in this study articulated the benefits the community dance partnerships at KSU provided for dancers to pursue a professional career alongside an academic degree. The partnerships also gave traditional dance students at KSU the opportunity to experience the duality of the professional world alongside their academic experiences. A number of KSU students interviewed in the focus groups discussed the impact this duality had on their decision to attend KSU and on their collegiate experience. “I previously danced at Atlanta Ballet ... So in order to get a degree and still be able to dance and kind of keep my title at Atlanta Ballet, I chose to go to Kennesaw State.” Another student discussed the opportunities the partnerships provided students to pursue professional performance opportunities while at school saying, “The partnership with Glo will

benefit those students who want to pursue their connection with gloATL, but also want and need to get a degree.” The data also provided evidence of the attraction this duality provided for professional dancers interested in higher education. A KSU student remarked, “I know that several Glo dancers have mentioned to me the excitement that they had in looking to get a degree, because some of them didn’t have the opportunity.” An administrator at a community partner institution also expressed the opportunity the partnership provided students at her organization, who were interested in getting a collegiate degree alongside their professional training, “We want our kids to dance but we also want them to go to college. I think that’s something we need to explore more and make it easier to say, okay, here, go apply to KSU.” Another community professional reflected on the opportunity in a personal way saying, “I personally am a huge advocate for professional partnerships with colleges. I think that if there was a program that I could have found while I was in college ... I think that it would have made me choose that program.”

The duality of pursuing an academic degree alongside a professional career in dance seemed very appealing to the respondents in this study. The partnerships between KSU and professional dance organizations seemed to overcome the traditional boundaries between dance in academia and the profession, which traditionally discouraged dancers from pursuing both avenues simultaneously. A community administrator seemed to think that the profession of dance was changing its attitude towards the academic world saying, “More than 50% or about 50% of the dancers, professional dancers at Atlanta Ballet are going to school. They’re going to college and graduating and that’s unbelievable to me.” The dyadic opportunity for the simultaneous pursuit of an academic and professional career in dance seemed to be a major strength of the community dance partnerships at KSU.

Challenges Faced by Student Professionals

A hallmark of the community dance partnerships at KSU was the opportunity provided to professionals to enroll as undergraduate students at the university and pursue a bachelor of art degree in dance. The data highlighted some of the challenges faced by these student professionals as they balanced their professional careers alongside their academic pursuits. Challenges associated with this duality, along with financial struggles and social barriers, were some of the themes that emerged from the data that are discussed below.

Duality of balancing professional and academic careers. Several respondents articulated the challenges associated with the integration of professional dancers into the dance program at KSU. The duality of balancing a professional career alongside the demands of academia seemed to prove challenging for the student professionals. As a KSU dance faculty member remarked, “It’s very difficult for a dancer who dances full-time 6 days a week, 6 hours a day to go to school.” Limitations of time and energy seemed to be important considerations for those interested in pursuing this dualistic path. Another KSU dance faculty member added, “I’m sure ... it’s hard for them [referring to the student professionals] to get away from the demands of their jobs and to get up here and get to class.” The finding was confirmed by responses received from the student professionals themselves. One stated, “Juggling time and then just me learning to be better at organization. That’s my thing that I’m hopefully improving on.” Another student professional shared his frustration with balancing his professional life with the academic curriculum saying, “It’s the general education, that’s the pain in the neck trying to make that work and fit with my schedule.” He went on to articulate the challenge he faced trying to schedule his classes around his weekly rehearsal schedule and family obligations. The challenge

of balancing this duality seemed to be a barrier that prevented other professionals from pursuing dance degrees at KSU.

Lack of financial support for professionals. The professionals also articulated concerns about the lack of financial resources available to support and encourage their degree pursuits at KSU. Being part-time students, they were not eligible for a majority of the financial aid available at the university. When asked about the challenges faced at KSU, one student professional responded, “It has to be, well, the finances ... and if I do it [referring to his degree] then everybody takes a hit in my family.” The cost of his education seemed to create significant financial challenges for him and his family, requiring a strong commitment and personal sacrifice. Another student professional responded in a similar way saying, “The two biggest challenges are time and money ... I earned the Hope Scholarship and I got it this summer, and then they changed the rules making me ineligible!” The cost of attending KSU, combined with limited funding opportunities, made attendance challenging for the student professionals. Those that persisted either did so at great financial difficulty, or because they had an alternate source of financial support.

Age conflict and social barriers. While the study noted positive interactions between the traditional students in the dance program and the student professional during classes and rehearsals, there seemed to be a social disconnect between the two populations. The observation study conducted during rehearsals that integrated the professional dancers with traditional students recorded a social disconnect between the two groups. During rehearsal breaks, the traditional students congregated together away from the student professionals. The differences in age and levels of maturity seemed to factor into this social disconnect. When asked about the socialization experience, one professional responded by saying, “I can’t really get an opportunity

to be social with them and share, even though they're very sweet. They've invited me out a few times and I can't go because of my [professional] duties and my family." Some of the traditional students articulated their socialization experience with the professionals in the program by saying that they were "respected and revered," however not personally approachable, due to differences in age and maturity. A KSU faculty member who had observed the interactions, or lack thereof, said, "I didn't notice that much interaction between our dancers and the dancers from [the community partner institution.]" There was clearly a social barrier created by the difference in age, maturity, life experience, and focus, that prevented the two groups from enjoying socialization experiences that could perhaps enhance their experience of the community dance partnerships at KSU.

Partnership Impact

The community dance partnerships at KSU seemed to have implications beyond the immediate stakeholders impacting the profession, the community, and the larger institution. The data revealed that the impact of these partnerships in areas such as professional standards and economic development and recruitment provided long-term benefits that in turn impacted the key stakeholders within the partnerships. The following section highlights the data within this area of focus looking at the impact these partnerships have within the institution, in the community, and on the broader profession of dance.

Institutional Impact

A recurrent theme that emerged from the data in this study focused on the impact the community dance partnerships at KSU had on the institution. The growth and success of the dance program in a short six-year period was in part attributed to the success of its community engagement activities. A KSU administrator remarked, "[The administrative] vision which

includes that community engagement piece and the building of partnerships ... has been the key to our success ... [moving] the dance program ahead much faster than it would have moved had we not had those partnerships.” This same respondent went on to articulate that the credibility gained by the program due to its community affiliations and successful partnerships helped leverage internal credibility and support from within the institution. The respondent stated, “External approval of what you’re doing, makes the internal approval move forward.” The following two sub-sections focus on the impact the community dance partnerships have had on recruitment and cross-disciplinary collaborations at KSU.

Recruitment. The community dance partnerships at KSU had a dramatic impact on the recruitment of students into the program. Reciprocal advertising at partner institutions, websites, and publications leveraged credibility and allowed access to populations that were not within the reach of each institution independently. The KSU students interviewed in the three focus groups were asked why they chose to attend KSU as dance majors. Their answers, some of which are excerpted below, indicated that their recruitment to KSU was directly impacted by the community engagement activities within the program:

1. When I heard about the partnerships, especially the one that the program had with the Atlanta Ballet. I was very interested;
2. I chose Kennesaw State because ... I saw their partnerships with Atlanta Ballet and gloATL. I was thinking maybe I should change and try something different. So coming here was a great experience because I learned so much ... the partnerships are great;
3. That’s another reason why I picked Kennesaw because at my previous college we didn’t have these kinds of opportunities;

4. I found out about the partnership and loved Atlanta Ballet, so in my mind if Kennesaw had partnered with Atlanta Ballet then it had to be a good dance program; and
5. And so when I found out about Kennesaw and about the partnership with Atlanta Ballet and how it was ballet-based, I was really excited and came and auditioned and got in.

An analysis of publication materials from partnering institutions showed that the KSU logo was used to highlight the partner affiliation explaining some of the comments articulated by students above. As a publicist interviewed in the study noted, “Putting your logo on their [referring to Atlanta Ballet] website ... even if no one clicks that link, every time you go to that website, you see KSU ... quality that Atlanta Ballet feels comfortable [representing].” A KSU faculty member made a similar observation when he stated, “Every time Atlanta Ballet gets mentioned in the same sentence with KSU, it strengthens KSU's position in the community.” The empirical evidence therefore suggested that the community dance partnerships at KSU leveraged institutional credibility that had a direct impact on student recruitment and retention. A KSU administrator actively involved with student recruitment, stated that when prospective students were made aware of the community partnerships with leading professional dance organizations, “they suddenly start[ed] to take you a little bit more seriously ... especially when you start[ed] to talk to them about the benefits ... discounted classes at Atlanta Ballet ... [opportunities] to dance with gloATL ... Those kinds of things [meant] something.” Further analysis of the enrollment trends within the dance major at KSU since its inception three years prior to the time this study was conducted revealing unprecedented growth to more than 100 students in the program. The

community dance partnerships seemed to play a pivotal role in the recruitment of this exponentially growing student population.

Cross-disciplinary collaborations. The partnership developed between the KSU Program in Dance and the Cobb Energy Center provided a large enough venue for the dance program to partner with the music program. This performance collaboration was not possible at the university due to the lack of a facility large enough to hold a 60-piece orchestra and 30-member dance company. Reflecting on the community dance partnerships in relation to cross-disciplinary collaborations, an administrator at KSU remarked, “I think it inspires partnerships from within and I think we have seen that here with crossing the lines into music and the orchestra.” The partnership at the Cobb Energy Center provided the KSU Program in Dance an opportunity to develop a show that featured collaboration among several art disciplines. An administrator at the Cobb Energy Center stated, “KSU brings the only piece that incorporates all of the art forms in one hour ... for schools that don’t have the arts taught at all, those students are getting to see all of the art forms in one experience.” Reflecting on the pedagogical value of these cross-disciplinary collaborations, a KSU faculty member noted, “From a musicians perspective, it’s very important ... that we have the opportunity to work with dancers ... that’s becoming a rare opportunity and it’s really important.” The community dance partnerships at KSU therefore provided opportunities for cross-disciplinary performance collaborations and in doing so promoted cross-unit interactions at the university.

Community Impact

An investigation of the multiple facets of reciprocity within the community engagement dance partnerships at KSU revealed that the collaborations had a significant impact on the surrounding local community. The partnerships had instigated economic development,

community enrichment, and the development of community connections that cumulatively had a positive effect on the surrounding local community. A professional dancer interviewed in the study remarked, “I feel like the art community in Atlanta has been so kind of under the radar and now a university being involved with a professional dance company will ... make art in Atlanta more accessible to everyone.” Another community dance professional shared a similar view of the positive impact the KSU dance partnerships had on the dance community by saying, “I felt like dance was a little on a hippy-dippy side in Atlanta ... and you guys have brought fierceness and technique and inventiveness, the best of our worlds here. I just think that everybody is benefiting.” The partnerships seemed to have the most immediate impact on the local dance community; however, the data revealed that this impact extended into the broader community, making the university an integral part of the surrounding metro-Atlanta community. A KSU administrator articulated this dynamic by saying:

The actual phrase that came to my mind is “communiversity” community and university together where it isn’t necessarily a negative connotation. It’s a university that has grown up essentially to the point where it is completely connected to its surrounding community and completely synergistic with that community.

The section that follows highlights three key facets of the community impact revealed within the data and provides excerpts from the transcripts to help articulate the community impact of the dance partnerships at KSU.

Developing community connections. The development of community dance partnerships at KSU leveraged a variety of strong community connections that were evidenced in the support the program had received from community leaders. An analysis of web resources revealed a robust community advisory board in dance that comprised of arts leaders from across

the metro-Atlanta area. A KSU administrator reflected on the impact community engagement initiatives can have for an institution by saying, “I think that one of the really powerful benefits of community engagement is ... mutual understanding, so that the stereotype of the Ivory Tower is broken down.” A KSU dance faculty member reflected a similar view by saying, “It will kind of help not only just the dance community but help the local community to understand that the academic is not out of reach or it’s not just isolated from the entire community.” Other similar observations made by participants focused on the broader impact for the arts in society. A top-ranking KSU administrator stated, “Anything that we can do to enhance the fabric of the arts as being a key component of our society and our culture and our community as you know, there tends to be this perception that the arts are extra.” The view was reiterated by another administrator at KSU who said, “Arts organizations are ... getting to be perceived as being less vital parts of the communities that we live in ... anytime that you can start building these kinds of connections it has got to be a good thing for everyone involved.” The development of community connections therefore seemed to be a vital component of the engagement activities in dance at KSU that greatly impacted the arts within the surrounding community. The community dance partnerships, therefore, served more than just the two partnering institutions and leveraged connections that had a far-reaching impact into the community.

Community enrichment. In addition to building community connections, the dance partnerships at KSU were catalysts for the enrichment, education, and enhancement of the local community. Performances, programming, and outreach activities were cited as central to the mission of many of these community dance partnerships. Reflecting on an outreach performance titled “Synergy” that was developed through the dance partnership at the Cobb Energy Center, a KSU administrator noted that the performance “was probably the only arts event that those [K-

12] kids would ever see in a given year. And so ... it has a direct impact on the community.”

The comment highlighted the lack of art education within the K-12 school system and indicated that the dance partnerships at KSU served an important outreach and educational mission within the community. A community administrator highlighted the important role played by the KSU dance partnerships in enriching and developing the local community by saying, “I’m aware that KSU has played a very important role bringing well-trained artists into the community ... we can all exchange and interact and I just think it’s wonderfully positive, personally and artistically and professionally.” The findings showed ways in which the community dance partnerships at KSU had positioned the university to serve an educational and enrichment mission beyond its institutional boundaries. A community dancer professional indicated the growing “perception that dance is going to be part of more mainstream culture.” He went on to state, “Dance can broaden the horizons between institutions and ideals in different working cultures ... [enhancing] certain connection that people have to their communities and to other people, or to their own lives.” The KSU dance partnerships served a growing community enrichment mission providing programming and outreach education to K-12 and the local community.

Economic development. A number of study participants reflected on the economic impact the dance partnerships at KSU had on the surrounding community. While the impacts were not noted as significant or necessarily direct, they indicated potentials that could be developed in the future. A KSU administrator believed that

The immediate surrounding area might benefit in a commercial sense [from a development of collaborative partner projects] because of increased volumes of people coming to a certain venue that’s then going to build up the restaurants, and the other area

commercial establishments because people are travelling there, they are going there for an event and so they are going to be spending money in that area.

The art administrators at partnering institutions shared this view and saw the potential the partnerships could have as economic generators for the local community. However, the potential seemed to be left unrealized. A community dance administrator stated, “Even though the arts are an economic engine for many cities, we’re still struggling.” Another community administrator added to the discourse by highlighting the “umpteen studies that show that the communities that are thriving, that are attracting businesses, that are attracting families, are the ones that make an emphasis on supporting the arts.” She went on to say that ancient societies and civilizations made art a vital part of their existence and that art served as “the measurement of civilization ... one of the ways to measure how advanced a society was how developed was their culture and how developed was their art.” The development of the community dance partnerships at KSU could therefore positively impact the surrounding community.

Another economically focused finding within the study pertained to the development of employment opportunities for professional dancers in Atlanta. The community dance partnerships at KSU enhanced the opportunities for performance within the community and addressed the historic trends of dancers leaving the metro-Atlanta area for employment within other communities. A community administrator stated, “I love the idea of professional dancers staying in Atlanta ... I think the KSU partnership is just going to help foster professional dance in Atlanta ... attracting people from outside of Atlanta to come back.” The partnerships within the KSU Program in Dance seemed to have the potential of serving as a catalyst for economic growth within the local community, enhancing performance and employment opportunities for dancers, and generating patrons for local business.

Impact on the Profession of Dance

The evaluation of the community dance partnerships at KSU was conducted from a multi-dimensional perspective, focusing on gathering and analyzing data from a varied group of university and community participants. The synthesized findings represented the impact these partnerships have on a variety of internal and external constituents. Two central themes in the data focused on the impact the community dance partnerships at KSU had on the profession of dance. While these themes were representative of the data in this particular study, they alluded to the impact community dance partnerships at collegiate institutions could have on the profession of dance.

Changing professional standards. Several study participants reflected on the impact the community dance partnerships at KSU had on altering the professional standards required of dance practitioners. A community dance administrator expressed concern that often college educated dancers lack an experience of the professional world limiting their chances of developing successful careers in the professional arena. She believed that the community dance partnerships at KSU with professional dance companies, allowed students and practitioners to “bridge the best of both worlds” and raise the standard of future professionals in the field. Another community dance professional remarked, “Hopefully dancers are going to be getting smarter and more diverse and more versatile, because they’ll be going through colleges and be able to really enter into [professional] companies [knowing] more about who they are and what they have to offer.” Reflecting on the practical knowledge gained by students within the KSU Program in Dance, a KSU dance faculty member stated that the partnerships allowed future dance practitioners to develop the knowledge they need to prevent injuries and develop a holistic understanding of their art form: “I hope that [the education] will make the professional world

healthier, [and] make the professional world dance longer.” The comments evidenced a direct impact the cross-pollination of the professional and academic worlds could have on the future professional standards in dance. The exponential development of community dance partnerships in academia could ultimately raise the bar on the skills and knowledge required for success in the field of dance.

Audience development. One of the more frequently noted themes in the study focused on the impact the community dance partnerships at KSU had on the development of audiences for dance. A KSU student stated, “I think it [referring to a partnership project] also reaches a different crowd ... working with gloATL, they have a big group of followers but then we also have a totally different group of followers;” therefore, the partnerships provide the potential to share audiences between partnering institutions. Another student interviewed within the same focus group also mentioned the impact community partnerships have on the growth of audiences at partnering institutions stating, “The outreach in the community working together is helping dance as a whole grow.” This finding was further confirmed by the views articulated by one of the professional dancers, who felt that the partnerships help “educate the audience to the language that we speak. The more they see it, the more they understand it and the less intimidated they are by it.”

An observation study conducted within a collaborative project between KSU and gloATL, noted the mix of patrons in the audience from both institutions. The inclusion of student dancers from KSU in performances at community partner institutions, attracted a new demographic of patrons comprising of parents, family, and friends of the student dancers. A KSU dance faculty member confirmed this finding by stating:

I feel that KSU has access to many groups of people who are not already keyed into a dance company or even to the arts ... they will be exposed to at least one if not more of the dance partnerships at any given concert. And I believe that this cross-pollination of concert attendance has occurred more than we realized. I don't know if there is really a way that the companies are tracking this, but I feel that this will increase attendance in their professional shows.

In a climate of dwindling funding and support for the arts, it seemed logical that the collaborative partner projects generated reciprocal audience support and serving as a way of enhancing audience development and attendance at both partnering institutions.

Conclusion

The evaluation of the community dance partnerships at KSU provided a comprehensive understanding of the benefits and challenges faced by stakeholders and partnering organizations. The views of university and community participants were triangulated to generate findings that represented their reciprocal experiences within these partnerships. The data highlighted topical issues common to the partnerships, as well as themes related to specific stakeholders. While some of the findings mirrored the literature on community engagement in other disciplines, others were specific to the field of dance and unique to the community dance partnerships at KSU.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The findings from this case study provided valuable insight into the experiences of key stakeholders within the community dance partnerships at KSU. The synthesized results offered an understanding of the benefits and challenges of these partnerships by evaluating their ongoing effectiveness and long-term viability. Most of the dance partnerships evaluated at KSU evolved out of professional relationships between institutional administrators, university faculty, and community professionals, and this study served as the first formal measure of evaluating their effectiveness at a programmatic and institutional level.

While some of the findings, such as those related to resource limitations were somewhat predictable and reflective of the existing literature on community engagement, other empirical discoveries related to the experiences of individual stakeholders were highly informative and surprising. For instance, the conversations with students provided an opportunity for them to be introspective about the impact the community partnerships had on their educational and artistic experiences within the program. It seemed logical to assume a pedagogical benefit, however issues related to the frustrations and insecurities created by the partnerships were not understood prior to this study. This study gave a voice to individual stakeholders to articulate their independent views about the effectiveness of the partnerships, and to evaluate their overall impact.

While conducting this study, it became evident that the use of Homans' social exchange theory was an ideal framework to situate this research agenda. The element of reciprocity

foundational to Homans' theory was referenced multiple times by study participants, who viewed their experiences within the cost-benefit frame. An understanding of the reciprocal exchanges within each partnership helped provide an understanding of the long-term viability and potential for future growth. It was also valuable to analyze the data across varied populations of respondents to understand the findings in relation to the overall effectiveness of the partnerships. The data triangulation not only validated the findings from the study, but also provided an understanding of the issues through comparative viewpoints. Reflections from one population of stakeholders were referenced against findings from other groups to determine the evaluative outcomes and the relativity of experiences.

Research Question 1: What are the Experiences of Stakeholders Within the Community Dance Partnerships at Kennesaw State University?

The following section outlines the experiences of individual stakeholders within the community dance partnerships at KSU based on the empirical findings of this study.

Stakeholders within the community dance partnerships at KSU are defined as

1. dance students at KSU;
2. professional dancers from community partner institutions;
3. faculty and administrators at KSU;
4. faculty and administrators at community partner institutions; and/or
5. the local dance community in the metro-Atlanta area.

Student Experiences

It was extremely valuable to ask students to reflect upon their experiences within the community dance partnerships at KSU. While the reflections were somewhat varied between individual students, the synthesized findings alluded to broad commonalities in experience. The

findings helped develop an understanding of the benefits and challenges faced by students within these partnerships.

The findings showed that the partnerships played a significant role in preparing students for professional careers in dance. Through the partnerships, students had opportunities to enter the professional world of dance, perform at professional venues, train with professional practitioners, and network with potential future employers. Internships and partnership projects gave students practical experiences in the field that were not available within the collegiate curriculum. Additionally, the interactions with professionals had a profound impact on the overall motivation and success of the KSU dance students. They saw the professionals as role models who helped them gain a first-hand experience of their discipline and its practice. The partnership experiences also helped students develop their dance resumes, preparing them competitively for success in the field. Through choreographic and teaching opportunities, students gained valuable experience at partner institutions and were successfully integrated into the professional world prior to their graduation from college.

Despite the numerous benefits synthesized above, students also experienced significant challenges engaging with professional practitioners and participating in the community dance partnerships at KSU. Students were often unprepared to meet the technical demands of the community partners. Despite their enthusiasm and willingness to work hard, their skill level often limited their success within partnership projects leading to frustration and demoralization. Additionally, students faced schedule conflicts and time limitations that hindered their participation and success in the community dance projects. The findings showed that the partner projects required a commitment of time far beyond the regular academic schedule. The students

were challenged to balance their academic lives with the additional demands on their time created by the community partnerships.

Professional Dancer Experiences

The experiences of professional dancers who engaged with the KSU Program in Dance through the community partnerships were overall very positive. These community practitioners were either enrolled at KSU as undergraduate students or served as liaisons from their community partner institutions as teachers and choreographers. The findings highlighted the benefits derived by dance practitioners who were able to pursue their academic credentials at KSU in tandem with their professional careers. These practitioners highlighted the positive impact the partnership opportunities had on the development of their credentials for future employment in the field following their performance careers. Additionally, the professional dancers expressed gratitude for the teaching and choreographic opportunities that enhanced their artistic abilities. Their engagement with a collegiate program provided them with opportunities that they viewed very positively and granted them experiences which they believed would enhance their professional abilities, expand their cognitive skills, and prepare them for future success in the field of dance.

While the opportunity to pursue an academic and professional career seemed to be greatly valued, the professional dancers highlighted the challenges they faced balancing this duality. The addition of a part-time academic schedule on top of a full-time dance career was physically and mentally exhausting. Professionals, particularly those supporting immediate families, discussed the financial implications of balancing the fiscal duality of their academic pursuits with an adult life. The findings showed that there were almost no financial support structures in place at KSU to support these professional dance students. Additionally, their age

differences created social barriers between them and the traditional-age students, limiting the peer support they received in the program. The pursuit of a collegiate experience came at a personal and financial cost to the professional dancers, limiting their populations within the Program in Dance at KSU.

KSU Faculty and Administrator Experiences

An evaluation of the experiences of the dance faculty and administrators at KSU provided both an individual and programmatic perspective on the community dance partnerships. These stakeholders experienced the recruitment benefits from the community partnerships, as well as, reported enhanced studio and classroom experiences created by an influx of professional dancers at KSU. They stated that the credibility of the KSU Program in Dance was enhanced through its association with regionally and nationally acclaimed community partner institutions. The partnerships provided opportunities for KSU faculty to present their work in professional off-campus venues while enhancing their creative scholarship and visibility within the local community. The partnerships also provided opportunities for faculty to collaborate with other colleagues on campus in ways that would not be possible without the community partnerships. The KSU orchestra, for instance, was able to partner and play live for the KSU Dance Company at a community partner theatre that had an orchestra pit large enough to allow for this collaboration. In this way, the community partnerships provided production resources, space, and human resources that enhanced the experience and work of KSU dance faculty and administrators.

The findings, however, revealed that there were personal costs for KSU faculty and administrators who engaged with the community dance partnerships. The partnerships infringed on personal time and required sustained personal engagement from the faculty and administrators

to ensure their success. There seemed to be almost no institutional incentives and rewards for faculty and administrators who developed these partnerships. The community engagement work of these stakeholders was therefore reliant on each individual's personal commitment in spite of low institutional support.

Community Partner Experiences

Experiences of the community partners were rooted in a reciprocal sharing of resources. The findings showed that the dance partnerships provided a vehicle for collaboration between the university and community dance organizations, resulting in shared production and pedagogical resources. University spaces were available to community partner organizations for rehearsals, and production resources like costumes and scenery were available for their use when necessary. The community partners experienced enhanced credibility from their association with an academic institution. Additionally, the partnerships opened community access to artists, scholars, and patrons at the university, which helped them expand their audiences and stimulate attendance at their events.

While the community partners viewed the use of KSU dance students for community projects positively, there seemed to be challenges inherent in these collaborations with student artists. The community partners experienced unanticipated problems working with student artists who were physically and intellectually unprepared for the challenges of a professional project. The student artists required close supervision and mentoring, which often resulted in a human resource cost for the community partners. Working with students required a significant shift in approach for the community partners as they were typically used to working with artists at a professional skill level. The community partners also experienced challenges of time that placed the academic world of dance in conflict with the professional practice. The professional

companies typically rehearsed during a normal 10a.m. - 6 p.m. workday from Tuesday through Saturday. This conflicted with the peak academic class schedule at the university, which limited collaborations to Saturdays or, in some cases, after normal working hours. Additionally, the pursuit of a professional dance career required rigorous daily training that was challenging to schedule when pursued in tandem with a collegiate education.

Experiences of the Community

The community patrons and supporters interviewed held an overall positive outlook on the community dance partnerships at KSU. While their firsthand experiences of these partnerships—typically as collaborative performances and outreach events—were somewhat limited, they described auxiliary benefits that seemed to enrich the community. The partnerships seemed to foster an educational mission that extended to the surrounding community and to local dance organizations. Through outreach performances, thousands of local school students had been exposed to the art of dance, enriching the community experience with the art form. These performances also helped economically stimulate the local community by developing additional patronage and support for the arts and local businesses.

Synthesis of Stakeholder Experience

Prior to this study, the experiences of individual stakeholders within the dance partnerships at KSU and the effects of stakeholder groups on each other were not fully understood; however, this research provided an overall understanding of reciprocal costs and benefits to individual constituents. It was clear that despite the costs and challenges experienced by stakeholders, the net value of the partnerships were overall positive. While recommendations could be made to improve future engagement practice based on the findings of this study, the benefits experienced outweighed the partnership costs for each stakeholder group.

Research Question 2: What Recommendations Can Support the Long-Term Viability of the Community Dance Partnerships at Kennesaw State University?

An analysis of the findings from this study supports the development of recommendations intended to enhance the long-term viability of the existing community dance partnerships at KSU, as well as, fosters the development of future engagement activities. The recommendations also provide a focus on areas of improvement that can be strategically assessed in future evaluative studies. Table 5.1 highlights the recommendations that are discussed below.

Table 5.1

Recommendations to Support the Long-Term Viability of the Community Dance Partnerships at KSU

Partnership Orientation	Workshops and Master Classes	Partner Site Visits	Peer mentoring
Development of Richer Experiences	Performance Opportunities	Choreographic Opportunities	Pedagogical Opportunities
Communication and Advertising			
Formalizing Partnerships			
Partnership Screening			
Developing Institutional Support	Funding	Human Resources	Professional Expertise
Academic Credit Opportunities			
Partnership Evaluation and Assessment			

Partnership Orientation for Students

The synthesized views of students at KSU showed that their overall experience within the community dance partnerships was positive. Students seemed to understand the pedagogical and

artistic value of the partnerships, which were instrumental in recruiting many of them to the program. While students articulated their appreciation of the professional experiences leveraged through the partnerships, the findings revealed a level of insecurity and fear surrounding the initial partner experience. Students often felt unprepared to enter the professional world, which resulted in a great deal of frustration and emotional stress. It was suggested during the study that the KSU Program in Dance consider the addition of some kind of orientation process for students at the start of a community partner experience. The following section outlines recommendations that were generated from the study participants and an analysis of the findings.

Workshops and master classes. An effective way to orient students to the physical and technical demands of a community partnership project could be through a workshop or master class. This class would give students the opportunity of experiencing the pedagogical and choreographic style of the community partner, which helped them gain an understanding of their movement philosophy. The concerns raised in the findings in this area were focused around the technical challenges that students felt unprepared to successfully achieve. Orientation through a workshop or master class would give students the opportunity to develop a preliminary understanding of the technical challenges, which would give them a better chance of being successful within a project. Through this form of physical orientation, the community professionals could have the opportunity to foster an environment of learning, gain an understanding of the physical and intellectual abilities of the student artists, and mentor the students towards their success within the partnership project.

Partner site visits and meetings. Another helpful way of orienting students to the community partner experience, prior to the start of a project, could be through a site visit to the community partner institution and a meeting with the dance professionals. This visit would

allow the students to familiarize themselves to the physical environment where they are going to work and perform, while giving them an opportunity to meet the professionals with whom they are going to engage. Feelings of intimidation could be significantly lowered through this kind of an orientation and informal interaction and the levels of uncertainty could be greatly reduced.

Peer mentoring. The findings in this area were predominantly linked to the initial partnership experience. It was noted, that once oriented, the students experienced reduced feelings of insecurity and intimidation. An effective orientation strategy could therefore be developed around a system of peer mentoring wherein students who had experienced the partnerships could be asked to counsel new students recruited to the partnership. This strategy would allow for dialogue between KSU students, helping the new partnership recruits gain an understanding of expectations through the prior experiences of their peers.

Development of Richer Experiences

A concern raised by several study participants pertained to the superficiality of many of the community partner experiences. Respondents believed that while some of the partner experiences contributed to the intellectual and physical growth of students, others were limited in their depth of experience for KSU dance students. One fear expressed was that some of the collaborative experiences were intended to serve the immediate needs of the community partner organization, without adequate consideration of their impact on student learning. The following three areas of focus were articulated in the data for consideration and potential improvement.

Performance opportunities. Careful assessment of the pedagogical and artistic impact of performance opportunities generated through the community partnerships needs to be a focus of future partnership planning. While the number of performance opportunities afforded to KSU students through the partnerships seemed to be noteworthy, some of the opportunities seemed to

lack both physical and intellectual value. It is recommended that future performance opportunities be carefully assessed prior to their implementation to ensure that they serve the developmental needs of the students. Performance opportunities that do not meet a basic pedagogical rubric for student development should either be abandoned or pursued with a clear communication of their scope to the student participants.

Choreographic opportunities. The findings revealed that there was a great deal of unexplored potential for the development of reciprocal choreographic opportunities for students and community professionals within partnering institutions. The development of choreographic opportunities at partner institutions would elevate the visibility of the partnerships and provide a career launch for potential choreographers from partnering institutions. It is therefore recommended that the future development of community partnerships at KSU include an exploration of the potential to develop a reciprocal exchange of choreographic opportunities, wherein each organization commit to producing the work of a choreographer from the partner institution within their season every year.

Pedagogical opportunities. Engagement with partner institutions provided a valuable opportunity for the development of pedagogical skills among study participants, which remained underexplored within the partnerships evaluated in this study. The respondents who had experienced the opportunity to teach at partner institutions expressed a strong sense of gratification. It is therefore recommended that, similar to the development of reciprocal choreographic opportunities, partnering institutions explore the potential for reciprocal teaching opportunities for their technically skilled and advanced populations. This form of reciprocity would help engage the partner organizations as well as serve the experiential development of student teachers.

Research opportunities. The existence of community engagement activities at KSU provided the opportunity for scholarly research to be conducted by faculty and students. This evaluative case study serves as an example of scholarly research conducted in the area of community engagement based on community engagement practice at KSU. The potential for creative and written scholarship based on the existing partnerships within the KSU Program in Dance remains underexplored and must be encouraged in the future interest of both informing and developing these partnerships.

Communication and Advertising

The long-term success of the community dance partnerships at KSU requires a clear communication of the scope, function, and objectives of each partnership initiative to the key stakeholders. The study showed that some of the constituents were unclear about partnership opportunities, and therefore reluctant to engage in initiatives due to a lack of adequate knowledge about their potential benefits and costs. It is therefore recommended that the future development of partnership projects include a deliberate campaign to educate the internal and external constituents about the initiatives and their scope. An exploration of advertising resources at partner institutions and a concerted effort to promote partnership initiatives would also help raise the internal and external profile of the partnerships.

It is also recommended that an information campaign be launched to target populations of professional dancers at community partner institutions who could benefit from the pursuit of an undergraduate degree at KSU. The study showed that only a small number of professional dancers were currently taking advantage of the partnership agreements, which provided advanced academic credit to professional dancers interested in pursuing an undergraduate dance degree at KSU. The data showed that while there seemed to be a growing curiosity and interest

among professional dancers about the possibilities of an academic career, there were no initiatives in place to encourage and inform their future academic pursuits and post-collegiate career options. One possibility could be to incentivize the professional dancers currently enrolled in the dance program at KSU to serve as ambassadors at their respective professional dance organizations, advising and mentoring their peers who may be interested in following in their footsteps. Since the professionals currently enrolled in the KSU dance program have a first-hand experience of the program and the challenges faced with the duality of balancing an academic and professional career, they are key players who have not yet been effectively used in the recruitment of other student professionals.

Formalizing Partnerships

The development of the existing community dance partnerships at KSU was based on verbal agreements and professional relationships between individual institutional representatives. While the partnerships seemed to be working effectively without any major misunderstandings, several study participants indicated concern about the lack of formal agreements. The future growth and development of the community dance partnerships at KSU will require a more formalized approach to ensure that the growing complexities do not lead to misunderstandings between partnering entities. It is therefore recommended that written formal agreements be developed between KSU and its community dance partners detailing the scope and expectations of each partnership. Furthermore, the development of individual projects and initiatives within each partnership should also be formalized in writing to ensure clarity and common understanding. These preemptive measures would support the existing collaborations and encourage the development of future partnerships.

Partnership Screening

The future development of community engagement activities within the KSU Program in Dance will require a strategic plan for the addition of new partnerships and community initiatives. Several study participants raised concern about the addition of new partnerships, which they perceived could have a negative impact on the existing community initiatives and overall student experience. The limited resources available at KSU would only be able to effectively support a limited number of community initiatives and therefore require a careful assessment of additional partnerships. It would be unproductive if the addition of new partnerships diminished the value of the existing community engagement initiatives in place within the KSU Program in Dance. It is therefore recommended that the program develop a rubric for the careful evaluation of future partnership additions based on the following broad evaluative criteria:

1. Institutional profile: Limiting partnerships to community organizations with high profile regional and national reputations;
2. Commonality of mission: Ensuring that community partners share the educational and artistic values that are integral to the KSU Program in Dance;
3. Reciprocal benefits and costs: Determining the reciprocal value of the partnership to the program, students, faculty, and institution; and
4. Partnership impact: Evaluating the impact the partnership would have on existing partnerships and the program.

Developing Institutional Support Structures

The data showed that the existing community partnerships in dance at KSU received very limited institutional funding and support. The lack of institutional support was cited in the data

as the reason for the unrealized development of the community dance partnerships. The future development of community engagement activities in dance and the long-term viability of the existing partnerships require the development of institutional support structures as outlined below.

Funding. The future development and sustainment of community engagement activities in the KSU Program in Dance is critically related to institutional funding. The data in this study showed that partnership support was limited to a bartering of resources between institutions without any incremental institutional funding from either side to support these engagement activities. It is therefore recommended that securing increased institutional funding to support engagement activities become a strategic goal for the long-term viability of KSU's community dance initiatives. The study also showed the unrealized potential for external funding that could be explored by the partnering institutions.

Rewards and incentives. The findings from this study confirmed the findings in the literature review pertaining to the role of individual faculty and administrators as the primary instigators of community engagement initiatives on a college campus. The data revealed that no significant rewards or incentives existed at KSU to encourage the development of community engagement initiatives. The development of future institutional support structures for community engagement must therefore include a focus on rewarding and incentivizing the individuals who foster and promote community partnerships.

Human resources. The data also highlighted the human resource challenges that partnering institutions face as they serve students and professionals within the partnership projects. The long-term development and viability of the existing community dance partnerships will require the development of human resources to support these community engagement

activities. Future expansion of engagement initiatives will require release time for faculty and dedicated staff to serve the partnerships. These resources should be strategically developed over time to support KSU's community engagement dance mission.

Professional expertise. The development of institutional support structures should include the hire of community engagement specialists who can effectively promote and strategize the development of community partnerships in dance. For example, several Carnegie community engaged institutions have developed centers for community partnership and engagement to house professional experts who can guide the engagement mission of individual academic and non-academic units on campus (Carnegie, 2008). The future growth and success of KSU's community engagement mission in dance can strategically be enhanced and supported through the development of this expertise at the institution.

Academic Credit Opportunities

A challenge articulated by several respondents in the study identified schedule conflicts as a key reason why students were unable to participate in partnership projects. Conflicts with academic courses and rehearsals seemed to prevent students from prioritizing partnership activities even though the data confirmed their interest. Students felt that the partnerships provided valuable professional development opportunities; however, they were not linked to the academic curriculum in any way. This limitation made the partnership projects extracurricular, requiring a commitment beyond the already demanding curricular schedule. Based on the findings of this study, it is recommended that the future development of partnership initiatives include an investigation of the possibility of academic credit for student participation. Linking the partnership projects to academic credit opportunities would encourage student participation

and leverage an evaluative expectation of student performance within the partnerships and thereby legitimize the engagement activities within the academic curriculum.

Partnership Evaluation and Assessment

This evaluative case study provided the opportunity to understand the experiences of participants within the community dance partnerships at KSU and evaluate the overall success of the engagement initiatives. The findings help inform future practice, and provide a thorough assessment of the engagement initiatives currently in place within the Program in Dance at KSU. The long-term success of the community dance partnerships at KSU will require a periodic assessment of engagement initiatives, aimed at identifying problems and implementing measures of efficiency. It is recommended that the program institute a system of periodic evaluation and assessment of the engagement initiatives in place. Additionally, these periodic evaluations should focus on a study of individual partnerships and individual initiatives, as well as an evaluation of the overall experience of participants. The development of assessment rubric would ensure a standardization of this process, allowing for comparisons of data gathered over a continuum. A formalized system of assessment would ensure continued reciprocity and provide useful information about future potentials for growth, which would allow the implementation of measures to end partnerships when they no longer effectively serve the partner or the KSU Program in Dance.

Study Implications

Development of Base Line Data for Future Research

The community dance partnerships at KSU that were developed over the past six years were based on the program's growing community relationships with professional dance organizations. These partnerships seemed to have organically evolved out of a reciprocal sharing

of educational, performance, and outreach opportunities. This study provided an evaluation of these partner relationships and experiences for the first time within the Program in Dance at KSU. The synthesized findings represented the views of multiple stakeholders involved and impacted by these community dance partnerships, which provided base line data that can now be used to inform future evaluation and practice. This study also helped fill a void in the existing empirical literature on community engagement by adding to this body of knowledge in the discipline of dance. Very few research studies have been conducted within the field of community engagement in dance. This study not only enhanced the existing literature, but also highlighted the value of community partnerships between academia and the profession of dance. The empirical evaluation of the partnerships at KSU provided an understanding of how dance in academia and in the community can collaborate synergistically, informed by an awareness of the inherent challenges, to provide benefits for the partnering institutions and surrounding community.

Triangulation of Multiple Stakeholder Perspectives

The sampling of multiple university and community stakeholders gave this study a unique characteristic, which allowed for the synthesis of findings from a diverse range of participants. Empirical studies evaluated in the literature review of this dissertation were mostly conducted from a single stakeholder perspective, highlighting the need to gain an empirical understanding of the synthesized views of multiple partnering entities. This study, therefore, added significantly to the body of knowledge on community engagement by providing the synthesized perspective of multiple stakeholders within a partnership. Triangulated findings provided a valuable understanding of the reciprocal relationships that are foundational to the development and survival of these community partnerships in dance at KSU.

Implications for Future Practice

On a practical level, this study helped inform the ongoing development and long-term viability of the community partnerships in the Program in Dance at KSU. An evaluation of the experiences of stakeholders provided a synthesized empirical understanding of the benefits and challenges of these engagement activities. The findings provided a comprehensive understanding of the experiences and concerns of multiple stakeholders involved and impacted by these partnerships. Future practice can now be informed by the findings of this study, and the development of a data driven plan can help ensure the long-term sustainability of the community dance partnerships at KSU. The following is a listing of some of the areas of future research that could be developed based on this study. They include:

1. Independent studies conducted of each partnership could provide an in-depth understanding of each partnership experience, making comparison between partnerships possible;
2. The experiences of individual stakeholders could become the focus of future empirical research, allowing for a comparison to be made between a stakeholder groups across various partnerships;
3. An exploratory study could be conducted to understand the relationship between the partnerships and the growth of the KSU Program in Dance; and
4. A longitudinal study could help inform the impact community partnerships between collegiate dance programs and professional dance organizations have on the profession of dance.

Study Limitations

The scope of this empirical research study was bounded within the community dance partnerships at KSU. The limitations of the research site, combined with the targeted focus of this study, must be acknowledged to gain an accurate understanding of the findings from this study. While none of these limitations undermined the credibility of this study, their understanding is useful to inform future studies within this area of research.

Lack of Comparative Data

The community dance partnerships at KSU were evaluated through this case study for the first time since their development over the last six-year period. While this study revealed rich data pertaining to the experiences of the varied stakeholders involved in these partnerships, the lack of base line data prevented a comparison to evaluate the effectiveness of partnership strategies and programs. The study instead provided an evaluation summary of the benefits and challenges that stakeholders experienced within the partnerships without the ability to evaluate these experiences over a continuum. This limitation was exacerbated by the lack of studies within this field of research. Since very few empirical studies have been conducted in the field of community engagement in dance, the findings from this study could not be effectively analyzed with the findings from other similar studies to gain a comparative perspective.

Lack of Independent Partnership Evaluation

This case study collectively evaluated the experiences of multiple participants within a variety of community dance partnerships at KSU. The synthesized findings were representative of the collective experiences of stakeholders within all the community dance partnerships at KSU, which limited an evaluation of the individual effectiveness of each partnership. This limitation prevented an internal comparison between the KSU dance partnerships, which could

have provided a valuable way of measuring the relative effectiveness of each partnership. A comparison between partnerships would have also allowed an evaluation of the effectiveness of individual initiatives, to determine their impact on the success of the partnership. The findings from this study are therefore limited in representing the experiences within an individual community dance partner initiative at KSU. The generalized findings could be more applicable to one partnership over another, and the study did not allow for this distinction to be effectively understood between partnerships.

Lack of Generalizability

The scope and focus of this single-site case study was limited to an evaluation of the community dance partnerships at KSU. The distinctive characteristics of the partner institutions, along with the unique environment and culture within which the partnerships exist, make their comparison to other institutional partnerships challenging. The findings from this study are therefore not easily generalizable to other institutions and instead can only be used to experientially inform the design and development of future studies.

Impact of Researcher

While the role of the researcher as the founding director of the KSU Program in Dance and the instigator of the partnerships evaluated in this study was acknowledged and carefully considered in developing the study design, it can be safely assumed that the relationship impacted the respondents and data gathered in this study. Adequate measures were taken to ensure careful data collection and a high level of inter-rater reliability; therefore, the findings from this study meet a high standard of ethical credibility. However, it must be acknowledged that the relationship of the researcher to the site was both advantageous to gaining access and

having an expert understanding of the study subjects, as well as a study limitation that warrants consideration.

Conclusion

The study limitations discussed above inform the potential for future research and practice in the field of community engagement in dance. The findings show the impact these engagement practices have on changing professional standards in the field of dance by fostering a synergy between academia and the profession. It is therefore recommended that future research be conducted in the field of community engagement in dance to enhance the body of empirical knowledge that can inform future engagement practice. The long-term impact of engagement activities between collegiate programs and professional dance organizations can only be evaluated through sustained research. The development of additional empirical knowledge will also allow for a comparison of community dance partnerships across collegiate institutions over a period of time. Furthermore, it could also be beneficial to conduct an independent empirical evaluation of each individual community dance partnership at KSU to gain a deeper understanding of the experiences within each partnership. This study, however, successfully evaluated the overall community engagement experiences within the KSU Program in Dance, thereby developing an understanding of how the program strategically partners with professional community organizations to foster a positive change in dance higher education.

REFERENCES

- *Akdere, M., & Egan, T. M. (2005). Higher education-community partnerships: An HRD perspective. *Online Submission*. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- *Astin, A. W., Vogelgesang, L. J., Ikeda, E. K., Yee, J. A. (2000). How service learning affects students. *Executive Summary*. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- *Basinger, N., & Bartholomew, K. (2006). Service-learning in nonprofit organizations: Motivations, expectations, and outcomes. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 12*(2), 15-26.
- *Beck, J., & Appel, M. (2003). Shaping the future of postsecondary dance education through service learning: An introductory examination of the artsbridge model. *Research in Dance Education, 4*(2), 103-125. Doi:10.1080/1464789032000130345
- Beere, C. (2009). Understanding and enhancing the opportunities of community-campus partnerships. *New Directions for Higher Education, (147)*, 55-63. doi:10.1002/he.358
- *Benn, T. (2003). Reflections on a degree initiative: The UK's Birmingham royal ballet dancers enter the university of Birmingham. *Research in Dance Education, 4*(1), 5-16.
- *Bennett, D. (2009). Academy and the real world: Developing realistic notions of career in the performing arts. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education: An International Journal of Theory, Research and Practice, 8*(3), 309-327.
- *Bloomgarden, A. H., & O'Meara, K. (2007). Faculty role integration and community engagement: Harmony or cacophony? *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning, 13*(2), 5-18.
- *Bond, R., & Paterson, L. (2005). Coming down from the ivory tower? Academics' civic and economic engagement with the community. *Oxford Review of Education, 31*(3), 331-351.
- *Bordelon, T. D., & Phillips, I. (2006). Service learning: What students have to say. *Active Learning in Higher Education: The Journal of the Institute for Learning and Teaching, 7*(2), 143-153.
- Boyer, E. L. (1979). Selected speeches. Princeton, NJ: Author.
- *Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (2000). Institutionalization of service learning in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education, 71*(3), 273-90.
- Bringle, R. G., & Hatcher, J. A. (2002). Campus–Community partnerships: The terms of engagement. *Journal of Social Issues, 58*(3), 503-516. doi:10.1111/1540-4560.00273

- *Bringle, R. G., & Plater, W. (2008). The public purposes of higher education: What does the public think? *Metropolitan Universities*, 19(3), 25-40.
- *Bushouse, B. K. (2005). Community nonprofit organizations and service-learning: Resource constraints to building partnerships with universities. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 12(1), 32-40.
- *Buys, N., & Bursnall, S. (2007). Establishing university-community partnerships: processes and benefits. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 29(1), 73-86.
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. 2008. Community engagement elective classifications. Retrieved August 2, 2010, from the World Wide Web:
http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/descriptions/community_engagement.php?key=1213
- Carriere, A. (2008). Community engagement through partnerships--A primer. *Metropolitan Universities*, 19(1), 84-100.
- Carter, C. L. (1984). The state of dance in education: Past and present. *Theory into Practice*, 23(4), 293-99.
- Chadwick-Jones, J. K. (1976). *Social exchange theory: its structure and influence in social psychology*. Academic Press, London.
- *Chadwick, S. A., & Pawlowski, D. R. (2007). Assessing institutional support for service-learning: A case study of organizational sensemaking. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 13(2), 31-39.
- *Cohen, P. G. (2002). Partnership potential between private dance schools and dance programs in higher education: Connections and disconnections. *Journal of Dance Education*, 2(2), 50-62.
- Cook, K. S., & Emerson, R. M. (1978). Power, equity and commitment in exchange networks. *American Sociological Review*, 43(5), 721-739.
- Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Educational research* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Education.
- *Dickie, C., & Dickie, L. (2009). Alliance performance to integrate higher education: Smarter partners with shared values and capacity building. *Online Submission*. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Dreeszen, C., & Arts, E. P. (2001). Teaching partnerships: Report of a national forum on partnerships improving teaching of the arts (New York, New York, November 18-19, 2001). Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Driscoll, A. (2008). Carnegie's community-engagement classification: Intentions and insights. *Change*, 40(1), 38-41.

- Driscoll, A. (2009). Carnegie's new community engagement classification: Affirming higher education's role in community. *New Directions for Higher Education*, (147), 5-12.
- *Ferman, B., & Hill, T. L. (2004). The challenges of agenda conflict in higher-education-community research partnerships: Views from the community side. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 26(2), 241-257. doi:10.1111/j.0735-2166.2004.00199.x
- Hagood, T. K. (2000). *A History of dance in American higher education* (First ed.). Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellen Press.
- *Harwood, A. M., Ochs, L., Currier, D., Duke, S., Hammond, J., Moulds, L., Stout, K., & Werder, C. (2005). Communities for growth: Cultivating and sustaining service-Learning teaching and scholarship in a faculty fellows program. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 12(1), 41-51.
- H'Doubler, M. (1921). *A manual of dancing* (first ed.). Madison, Wisconsin: Tracy & Kilgore, Printsteps.
- H'Doubler, M. (1925). *The dance and its place in education*. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace and Company.
- Homans, G. C. (1958). Social behavior as exchange. *American Journal of Sociology*, 63, 597-606. doi:10.1086/222355
- *Jenkins, D. B. (2001). Characteristics of enduring partnerships. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- Johnson, P. (2008). Community engagement? let's dance! *ERS Spectrum*, 26(4), 1-6.
- *Joseph, M., Stone, G. W., Grantham, K., Harmancioglu, N., & Ibrahim, E. (2007). An exploratory study on the value of service learning projects and their impact on community service involvement and critical thinking. *Quality Assurance in Education: An International Perspective*, 15(3), 318-333.
- *Keen, C., & Hall, K. (2009). Engaging with difference matters: Longitudinal student outcomes of co-curricular service-learning programs. *Journal of Higher Education*, 80(1), 59-79.
- Kennesaw State University. (2011). *Kennesaw State University 2010-2011 Fact Book*. Retrieved December 28, 2010, from the World Wide Web: http://vic33.kennesaw.edu/EIMWebApps/vic/fact_books/
- *Kezar, A. (2005). Moving from I to we: Reorganizing for collaboration in higher education. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 37(6-), 50.
- *Kezar, A. (2006). Redesigning for collaboration in learning initiatives: An examination of four highly collaborative campuses. *Journal of Higher Education*, 77(5), 804-838.
- Letven, E., Ostheimer, J., & Statham, A. (2001). Institutionalizing university-community engagement. *Metropolitan Universities: An International Forum*, 12(3), 63-75.

- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2006). *Designing qualitative research* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Maurrasse, D. J. (2002). Higher education-community partnerships: Assessing progress in the field. *Nonprofit & Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 31(1), 131-139.
- *McKay, V. C., & Rozee, P. D. (2004). Characteristics of faculty who adopt community service learning pedagogy. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 10(2), 21-33.
- McLean, J. E., & Behringer, B. A. (2008). Establishing and evaluating equitable partnerships. *Journal of Community Engagement and Scholarship*, 1 (1), 66-71.
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (Second Edition ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- *Miron, D., & Moely, B. E. (2006). Community agency voice and benefit in service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 12(2), 27-37.
- *O'Meara, K., & Niehaus, E. (2009). Service-learning is... how faculty explain their practice. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 16(1), 17-32.
- Parrish, M. (2009). David Dorfman's "here": A community-building approach in dance education. *Journal of Dance Education*, 9(3), 74-80.
- *Prentice, M. (2007). Service learning and civic engagement. *Academic Questions*, 20(2), 135-145. Doi:10.1007/s12129-007-9005y
- *Pribbenow, D. A. (2005). The impact of service-learning pedagogy on faculty teaching and learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 11(2), 25-38.
- Prioleau, D. (2004). Engagement: Transcending outreach. *Journal of Dance Education*, 4(2), 58-61.
- *Ramaley, J. A. (2001). Why do we engage in engagement? *Metropolitan Universities: An International Forum*, 12(3), 13-19.
- Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (2005). *Qualitative interviewing* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Saltmarsh, J., Giles, D. E., Jr., Ward, E., & Buglione, S. M. (2009). Rewarding community-engaged scholarship. *New Directions for Higher Education*, (147), 25-35.
- *Sandmann, L. R., Williams, J. E., & Abrams, E. D. (2009). Higher education community engagement and accreditation: Activating engagement through innovative accreditations. *Planning for Higher Education*, 37(3), 15-26.

- *Sandy, M., & Holland, B. A. (2006). Different worlds and common ground: Community partner perspectives on campus-community partnerships. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 13(1), 30-43.
- *Siegel, D. J. (2008). Framing involvement: Rationale construction in an interorganisational collaboration. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 32(3), 221-240.
- *Shrader, E., Saunders, M. A., Marullo, S., Benatti, S., & Weigert, K. M. (2008). Institutionalizing community-based learning and research: The case for external networks. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 14(2), 27-40.
- Skidmore, W. L. (1975). *Sociology's models of man*. Gordon and Breach Science Publishers, New York.
- Thibaut, J. & Kelley, H. H. (1959). *The social psychology of groups*. Wiley and Sons, New York.
- *Tryon, E., Stoecker, R., Martin, A., Seblonka, K., Hilgendorf, A., & Nellis, M. (2008). The challenge of short-term service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 14(2), 16-26.
- *Tushnet, N. C., & Southwest, R. L. (1994). Does it really take a whole village to raise a child? Mixing metaphor and meaning in the educational partnerships program. Retrieved from ERIC database.
- *Ward, K., & Wolf-Wendel, L. (2000). Community-centered service learning: Moving from doing for to doing with. *American Behavioral Scientist* 43(5) 767.
- *Worrall, L. (2007). Asking the community: A case study of community partner perspectives. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 14(1), 5-17.
- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Zafirovski, M. (2005). Social exchange theory under scrutiny: A positive critique of its economic-behaviorist formulations. *Journal of Sociology*, 1198-3655.
- * *Indicate sources that are empirical studies*

APPENDIX A

SUMMARY OF RESEARCH ARTICLES *Partnering for Change in Dance Higher Education*

Article	<i>Higher Education- Community Partnerships: An HRD Perspective</i>	<i>How Service Learning Affects Students</i>
Authors/Date	AKDERE (2005)	ASTIN (2000)
Area of Research	Higher education community partnerships	Service-learning
Theoretical Framework	Maurrasse's measurement tools	None
Research Question	This study assesses the impact of student community engagement projects on neighborhood organizations that engage in partnership agreements with the university.	Effect of service-learning and community service on college undergraduates cognitive and affective development.
Data Collection	Questionnaire (213 community organizations)	Longitudinal data collected from 22,236 students attending baccalaureate-granting institutions nationally.
Location	Midwest U.S.	National
Validity	Confirmed	Credible
Findings	1.The challenge of competency is significant in higher education and community partnerships. 2.These partnerships focus on the outcomes as a measurement of success and improvement. 3.Human capital and social capital are important themes in these partnerships. 5.One of the goals of partnership is to provide training to increase individuals' human capital. 6.Partnerships often aim to improve the community organizations through bringing change. 7.the issue of performance improvement in the partnerships is evident.	Service learning participation had a significant positive effect on all 11 outcome measures. Service-learning had its strongest effect on students' decision to pursue service careers.

Article	<i>Service-learning in Nonprofit Organizations: Motivations, Expectations and Outcomes</i>	<i>Shaping the future of postsecondary dance education through service-learning: an introductory examination of the ArtsBridge model</i>	<i>Reflections on a degree Initiative: the UK's Birmingham Royal Ballet dancers enter the University of Birmingham</i>
Authors/Date	BASINGER (2006)	BECK (2003)	BENN (2003)
Area of Research	Service-learning relationships between students and community partners	Dance service-learning	Dance Partnerships
Theoretical Framework	Personal Donorship	ArtsBridge Model	Auto ethnography
Research Question	What are the participation motivations, expectation outcomes and satisfaction levels of community partners involved in service-learning?	How university dance students participating in service-learning are affected cognitively and professionally?	Impact of Birmingham dance partnership
Data Collection	Survey questionnaire to 98 community organizations	Survey questionnaires (23 students), Interviews and focus groups (10 students), field observations, journal analysis (10 students)	Case study of partnership
Location	University of Utah	California universities	Univ. of Birmingham (UK)
Validity	Confirmed	Confirmed	Credible
Findings	Community partner motivation is guided by both altruistic and self-serving factors. The results suggest that service-learning should be viewed as reciprocal in nature, as with other donor-recipient situations.	5 themes: . Students reported a better understanding of the theory and technique of dance. . Enhanced appreciation and understanding of cultural and intellectual diversity . Holistic and well-rounded experience through Artsbridge participation . Pedagogical benefits, networking benefits	. Changes in education that have allowed this degree to be developed- Higher education has grown to embrace dance as a valid and valuable part of human knowledge. . Development of dance in Britain- the development of ballet as an art form and agent of personal development and learning.

Article	<i>Academy and the Real World: developing realistic notions of career in the performing arts</i>	<i>Faculty Role Integration and Community Engagement harmony or Cacophony?</i>	<i>Coming down from the Ivory tower? Academics' civic and economic engagement with the community</i>
Authors/Date	BENNETT (2009)	BLOOMGARDEN (2007)	BOND (2001)
Area of Research	Performing arts partnerships	Faculty engagement in community projects	Higher education community engagement
Theoretical Framework	Social cognitive career theory	Faculty civic engagement theory	Academic universalism
Research Question	Identification of professional skills needed in profession relative to career preparation in higher education	"Do those who pursue civic teaching and/or research find integration and overlap among their roles?"	"Whether academic values and practice tend toward a 'detached' or 'universalist' perspective in which location is largely redundant and any perceived 'community' has a global character?"
Data Collection	239 participants in two surveys and two sets of interviews	29 semi-structured interviews	Semi-structured interviews with 17 community leaders from 14 organizations
Location	Australia	Hidden	Scotland and England
Validity	Confirmed	Confirmed	Confirmed
Findings	Findings revealed disparity between undergraduate curricula and the career expectation in the profession	Three faculty orientations toward integration of teaching, research and community partnerships- an "integrated" view, an "if only..." view and a "non-integrated" view. Faculty development strategies that intentional integration of roles of teaching, research and community engagement may facilitate and improve faculty research and teaching and institutional impact in the community.	Academics exhibit a strong commitment to engagement and interaction with their communities both in principle and practice; that such an interaction takes place at a varied geographical levels; and that it is often accomplished under less than propitious circumstances.

Article	<i>Service-learning: What students have to say</i>	Institutionalization of service Learning in Higher Education	<i>The Public Purpose of Higher Education: What does the public think?</i>
Authors/Date	BORDELON (2006)	BRINGLE (2000)	BRINGLE (2008)
Area of Research	Service-learning	Service-learning	Career Preparation and service learning in Higher Education
Theoretical Framework	None	Comprehensive Action Plan for Service Learning (CAPSL)	Boyer's civic engagement theory
Research Question	Characteristics of students choosing service-learning. An examination of service-learning from their perspective	Investigate the degree to which institutions reported the institutionalization of SL. Study the variables that were associated with differences in the institutionalization of SL.	Perceptions of the general public towards civic engagement activities that involve community service and service learning?
Data Collection	500-student survey	Questionnaire administered to 179 attendees of the Colloquium of National Service	Telephone interviews with 821 residents
Location	Midwestern metropolitan University	National	Indiana
Validity	Confirmed	Confirmed	Confirmed
Findings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> . No statistically significant differences between gender and involvement . No statistically significant differences between age and involvement . Gender differences emerged when comparing the section of service-learning courses over regular courses. . 2 major themes of time constraints and the appropriateness of requiring service learning emerged 	Some institutions are positioned to accomplish institutionalization more easily than others. Institutionalization benefits from deliberate institutional planning and the development of certain infrastructures such as a centralized office for SL	If community leaders and residents do not have good information about civic engagement activities in their communities, then these activities will be undervalued.

Article	<i>Community Nonprofit Organizations and Service-Learning: resources constraints to building partnerships with universities</i>	<i>Establishing university-community partnerships: Processes and benefits</i>	<i>Assessing Institutional Support for Service-learning: A case study of organizational sensemaking</i>
Authors/Date	BUSHOUSE (2005)	BUYS (2007)	CHADWICK (2007)
Area of Research	Non-profit organization participation in service-learning	Community partnerships	Service- learning
Theoretical Framework	Transactional/ Transformative relationship framework	Academic Collaboration	Organizational Information Theory
Research Question	“Did the Community non-profit Organization (CNO) benefit from the experience? Would the CNO’s participate in service-learning experiences again and if so how?”	“An examination of the process by which partnerships are established and implemented. Explores the perceived benefits of partnerships to the academics and the university.”	How can service-learning data be used to drive organizational change
Data Collection	Interviews with 14 CNO’s engaged in service –learning as part of a graduate nonprofit management course taught in 2000, 2001, 2003	In-depth interviews with 7 academics	Case study design (multiple data sources)
Location	Mississippi public universities	Brisbane, Australia	Creighton university
Validity	Confirmed	Confirmed	Confirmed
Findings	<p>. Resources constraints place a high premium on opportunity costs of staff time for CNO</p> <p>Transactional relationships are preferred by CNO’s as they yield high benefits at low costs.</p> <p>. All the community partners indicated that they would like to interact with the university in the future, however half indicated that they only wanted project-specific interaction.</p>	University-community partnerships provide many benefits to university research, teaching and learning, community recognition and status." Findings extend the Sargent and Waters framework.	<p>Phase 1: generate interest in service-learning across campus.</p> <p>Phase 2: generating various acts to sustain service-learning</p> <p>Phase 3: Strategically using assessment data to effect change</p>

Article	<i>Partnership Potential Between Private Dance schools and Dance Programs in Higher Education: Connections and Disconnections</i>	<i>Alliance performance to integrate higher education: Smarter partners with shared values and capacity building</i>	<i>The Challenges of Agenda Conflict in Higher-Education-Community Research Partnerships: Views from the Community Side</i>
Authors/Date	COHEN (2002)	DICKIE (2009)	FERMAN (2004)
Area of Research	Dance Partnerships	Educational Partnerships	Higher education community research partnerships
Theoretical Framework	Beyond Enrichment (Remer and Hagood)	Alliance Performance (Three-round Delphi-technique)	Community engagement theory
Research Question	Factors that facilitate or prevent successful interaction and describe models for mutually beneficial partnerships.	"Examine the pros and cons of partnerships- how partnerships could be made more successful?"	"What are the motivations for and experiences of participating in higher education community research partnerships?"
Data Collection	40 questionnaires	5-questions survey (5 university partners)	Semi-structured interviews with 17 community leaders from 14 organizations
Location	National sample	3 universities in China, 1 in Malaysia, 2 in Singapore	Philadelphia (8), Chicago (2), Tennessee (1), Detroit (1), Trenton (1), upstate New York (1)
Validity	Credible	Credible	Confirmed
Findings	<p>. Longstanding animosity between private dance schools and higher education has prevented more partnerships.</p> <p>. A distinction must be made between partnering relationships and an exchange of services.</p> <p>. Differences in goals must be understood and acknowledged</p>	Partnership success can be addressed in relation to: Shared values, capacity building, alliance management	<p>Four principal incentives for partnering with higher education (community partner perspective):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.obtaining project-related resources 2.leveraging further resources 3.gaining access to networks 4.increasing legitimacy

Article	<i>Communities for Growth: Cultivating and sustaining service learning teaching and scholarship in a faculty fellows program</i>	<i>Characteristics of Enduring Partnerships</i>
Authors/Date	HARWOOD (2005)	JENKINS (2001)
Area of Research	Service-learning in a Faculty fellows program	Educational Partnerships
Theoretical Framework	None	None
Research Question	What barriers to faculty perceive to adopting service-learning pedagogy? What issues present challenges as they implement service-learning courses? How might participation in a structured program designed to help faculty examine their pedagogy and scholarship contribute to faculty development?	“Why do some educational partnerships endure, while others soon meet their demise?”
Data Collection	Questionnaires, meeting transcriptions, faculty reports and reflections with 16 faculty members	26 In-depth telephone interviews and 26 focus groups
Location	Western Washington University	Across US
Validity	Confirmed	Credible
Findings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> . Faculty report time concerns as a big barrier, as are student and community concerns, lack of resources, attitudinal issues, and need for support. . Elements of implementing the pedagogy and working effectively with community partners and students were recurring concerns. . Faculty were able to address barriers and challenges of SL, resulting in scholarly professional development and enhanced personal growth. . Findings indicate the supportive culture created through the program was central to its powerful impact; other positive outcomes were grounded in the sense of community that developed. 	<p>Lessons learned:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . Instill and maintain commitment to a vision. . Build skills in eliciting support . Build skills in handling change

Article	<i>An exploratory study on the value of service learning projects and their impact on community service involvement and critical thinking</i>	<i>Engaging with Difference Matters: Longitudinal Student Outcomes of Co-curricular Service-Learning Programs</i>	<i>Moving from I to We: Reorganization for Collaboration in Higher Education</i>
Authors/Date	JOSEPH (2007)	KEEN (2009)	KEZAR (2005)
Area of Research	Service-learning/ Community service (student perspective)	Service-learning	Higher Education Collaboration
Theoretical Framework		None	Organizational change
Research Question	What are the principal benefits/factors attributable to service learning/ community service projects on: . Sense of community awareness/ social responsibility . Critical thinking skills . Job skills and marketability	“Does co-curricular SL have an impact on desired outcomes of the college experience? Do characteristics of liberal arts colleges increase the effects of participation in co-curricular service-learning on college outcomes?”	How can colleges and universities move from bureaucratic structures and secluded disciplinary units to an organizational context that supports collaboration?
Data Collection	67 males, 83 females questionnaire developed from NSSE	Longitudinal survey of 23 liberal arts colleges (Bonner Scholar Program)	20 interviews at each institution
Location	Unknown	Minneapolis, Minnesota	4 university campuses
Validity	Confirmed	Credible	Confirmed
Findings	Students believe that their college experience is preparing them for the job market, that service learning has enhanced critical thinking, and that their academic experience has emphasized community service upon graduation.	. The potential power of well-designed four-year, co-curricular service-learning programs can be inferred by the findings. . Attending a more diverse liberal arts campus enhanced desired program outcomes while no differences were evident when comparing four other characteristics of college campuses.	8 organizational features identified: . Mission . Networks . Integrating structures . Rewards and Incentives . Sense of priority from people in senior positions . External groups . Values . Learning

Article	<i>Redesigning for Collaboration in Learning Initiatives: An examination of four highly collaborative campuses</i>	<i>Characteristics of Faculty who Adopt Community Service Learning Pedagogy</i>	<i>Community Agency Voice and Benefit in Service-learning</i>
Authors/Date	KEZAR (2006)	MCKAY (2007)	MIRON (2004)
Area of Research	Higher education collaborations	Faculty engagement in service-learning	Service- Learning
Theoretical Framework	Organizational Context theory (Mohrman, Cohen and Mohrman)	Innovation theory	Social Exchange Theory
Research Question	Investigation of the organizational features and conditions that facilitated the collaboration process	Characteristics of faculty who engage in innovative pedagogy, specifically community service-learning.	What are the perceived benefits of SL to the agency? What are their perceptions of the university?
Data Collection	Case study (multiple data sources) at 4 universities	32 structured interviews	Interviews with supervisors from 40 community agencies
Location	Hidden	Large metropolitan southwestern university	Across US
Validity	Confirmed	Confirmed	Confirmed
Findings	Organizational features: . Mission/ philosophy . Campus networks . Integrating structures . Rewards . Sense of priority . External pressure . Values . Learning Organizational conditions: . Philosophy . Campus network . Integrating infrastructures	Common faculty characteristics related to SL: . Faculty view benefits from the perspective of satisfying faculty/teaching, student/learning, community/nonprofit needs. . A learning-driven model enables a self-perpetuating process that increases faculty numbers in SL	. Agency members' indicating more voice in program planning saw more benefits to their agency. . The perception of benefits predicted agency members' positive perceptions of the university as a whole. . Correlation between a longer history of SL and number of SL students employed to positivity about the SL relationship

Article	<i>Service Learning is... How Faculty Explain their Practice</i>	<i>Service Learning and Civic Engagement</i>	<i>The Impact of Service-learning Pedagogy on Faculty teaching and Learning</i>
Authors/Date	O'MEARA (2009)	PRENTICE (2007)	PRIBBENOW (2005)
Area of Research	Service Learning	Service-learning and civic engagement	Service-Learning pedagogy
Theoretical Framework	Discourse analysis and its application to public rhetoric about service-learning	None	Driscoll et al. impact variable framework
Research Question	Understanding the dominant discourse used by faculty to explain service-learning	Impact of service-learning on civic engagement?	The impact of service-learning on faculty
Data Collection	Discourse analysis of 109 files of exemplary faculty nominated for the Thomas Ehrlich Award	2 surveys containing the same 27 questions administered pre and post course to students.	Embedded single case study- semi-structured interviews with 35 faculty
Location	US	Unknown	Edgewood College
Validity	Confirmed	Confirmed	Confirmed
Findings	Faculty use the following 4 dominant discourses: . A model of teaching and learning . An expression of personal identity . An expression of institutional context and mission . Embedded in a specific community partnership	Community college student participation in service-learning may have an influence on increasing students' civic engagement levels when civic engagement is defined as more than just political action.	6 themes emerged: . More meaningful Engagement in and Commitment to teaching . Deeper connections and relationships with students as learners and individuals . Enhanced knowledge of student learning processes and outcomes . Increased use of constructivist teaching and learning approaches . Improved communication of theoretical concepts . Greater involvement in a community of teachers and learners

Article	<i>Higher Education Community Engagement and Accreditation</i>	<i>Different Worlds and Common Ground: Community Partner Perspectives on Campus-Community Partnerships</i>
Authors/Date	SANDMANN (2009)	SANDY (2006)
Area of Research	Accreditation and student engagement	Community partner perspectives
Theoretical Framework	Interpretive accreditation theory	Community Partnership Theory
Research Question	What are the benefits of linking accreditation with an institutional commitment to student engagement?	What are the characteristics of effective community partnerships from the perspective of the community partner?
Data Collection	In-depth comparative case study (2 universities- multiple data sources)	Focus group data analysis and codification (99)
Location	Univ. of New Hampshire/ Univ. of Southern Indiana	8 California communities
Validity	Confirmed	Confirmed
Findings	<p>1. Challenges of advancing engagement as an institutional priority are to be expected.</p> <p>2. Engagement must be strategically linked to top priorities and linked to the institutional mission.</p> <p>3. Development of engagement champions via community practices is an important strategy for long-term viability of engagement priorities.</p> <p>4. Leaders can make opportunistic use of documentation and data gathering process associated with institutional engagement.</p> <p>5. Community-based data gathering can provide grant opportunities and validation for new engagement initiatives.</p> <p>6. Engagement aspects of accreditation should be articulated and connected to other areas and priorities.</p> <p>7. Accreditation process can provide legitimacy towards reshaping the institutional culture to support engagement.</p> <p>8. The accreditation process can be used to connect engagement to strategic plan.</p> <p>9. Institutional leaders should link accreditation to engagement when ever possible, but must plan for adjustments over time.</p>	<p>The analysis affirms the characteristics of effective partnerships, but reveal the following challenges and recommendation from community partners:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Value relationships 2. Hold conversations regularly about partnership process and outcomes 3. Involve faculty more directly 4. Consider ways the academic institution can help build social capital 5. Develop new, more facilitative roles for service learning offices 6. address the hours divide

Article	<i>Framing involvement: rationale construction in an inter-organizational collaboration</i>	<i>Institutionalizing Community-based learning and Research: The Case for External Networks</i>	<i>The Challenge of Short-Term Service-Learning</i>
Authors/Date	SIEGEL (2008)	SHRADER (2008)	TRYON (2008)
Area of Research	Inter-organizational collaborations in HE	HE Community-based learning and research	Service-learning
Theoretical Framework	Organizational change theories	Institutionalization Rubric Rapid Assessment Method (Assessing service-learning and Civic engagement: principles and Techniques)	None
Research Question	Analysis of different rationales articulated and utilized by partners in an inter-organizational collaboration	Analysis of CoRAL Network institutionalization	Challenges of short-term service-learning partnerships
Data Collection	. 77 Semi-structured interviews . Field-based observations . Document analysis	Self-assessment teams gathered data	Interviews with 64 staff of community organizations
Location	Leadership Education and Development (LEAD) program	Washington D.C. (8 universities)	U.C. Berkeley
Validity	Confirmed	Credible	Confirmed
Findings	Major themes: . Range of altruistic to utilitarian benefits. . Rationales are not sedimentary but continue to evolve in conjunction with the environment and organizational changes. . Rationales display varying degrees of directness . Rationales vary in terms of their meaning and importance to actual programmatic outcomes	5 Strategic Initiatives developed for Community Research and Learning (CoRAL): . Conducting research and evaluation . Providing capacity-building and training . Encouraging CoRAL staff participation in campus activities . Convening stakeholders and creating spaces for dialogue . Disseminating information	Despite the obstacles associated with short-term service-learning projects (staff capacity to train and supervise, incompatibility with direct client services, timing and project management, academic calendar issues) community organizations reported their desire to continue the projects.

Article	<i>Does it really take a whole village to raise a child? Mixing metaphor and meaning in the educational partnerships program</i>	<i>Asking the Community: A Case Study of Community Partner Perspectives</i>
Authors/Date	TUSHNET (1994)	WORRALL (2007)
Area of Research	Institutionalization of Partnerships	Community-based service-learning
Theoretical Framework	Innovation and Change	Partnership Evolution theory
Research Question	What are the types of partnerships that achieve greatest success? Determining the fit between metaphor and program activities, structures and goals.	To understand how community-based organizations define their relationships with Steans Center at De-Paul University?
Data Collection	Based on data gathered from the Documentation and Evaluation of the Educational Partnerships Program: year 2 Report	In-depth interviews with 40 representatives from 12 community-based organizations
Location	29 Educational Partnership Programs (EPP)- across the country	De-Paul University, Chicago
Validity	Confirmed	Confirmed
Findings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> . Initiation- projects started to solve local problems . Implementation- successful when participants are clear about roles . Impacts –(a) for students and schools (b) for communities and businesses . Institutionalization- schools tend to institutionalize, community partners tend not to over time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> . Community Based Organizations (CBO's) see themselves engaged and committed to SL at De-Paul's. . The benefits of working with De-Paul's outweigh the challenges . The quality of the relationship is paramount . The Sterns center has positively affected the CBO's perception of the university.

APPENDIX B

ANALYSIS OF RESEARCH FINDINGS *Partnering for Change in Dance Higher Education*

<i>ARTICLE/CREDIBILITY</i>	<i>FINDINGS</i>
AKDERE, Mesut (2005) Confirmed	1.The challenge of competency is significant in higher education and community partnerships. 2.These partnerships focus on the outcomes as a measurement of success and improvement. 3.Human capital and social capital are important themes in these partnerships. 5.One of the goals of partnership is to provide training to increase individuals' human capital. 6.Partnerships often aim to improve the community organizations through bringing change. 7.The issue of performance improvement in the partnerships is evident.
ASTIN, Alexander et al. (2000) Credible	Service-learning participation had a significant positive effect on all 11 outcome measures. Service-learning had its strongest effect on students' decision to pursue service careers.
BASINGER, Nancy BARTHOLOMEW, Keith (2006) Confirmed	Community partner motivation is guided by both altruistic and self-serving factors. The results suggest that service-learning should be viewed as reciprocal in nature, as with other donor-recipient situations.
BECK, Jill APPEL, Morgan (2003) Confirmed	5 themes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . Students reported a better understanding of the theory and technique of dance. . Enhanced appreciation and understanding of cultural and intellectual diversity . Holistic and well-rounded experience through Artsbridge participation . Pedagogical benefits, networking benefits
BENN, Tansin (2003) Credible	Changes in education that have allowed this degree to be developed- Higher education has grown to embrace dance as a valid and valuable part of human knowledge. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . Development of dance in Britain- the development of ballet as an art form and agent of personal development and learning.
BENNETT, Dawn (2009) Confirmed	Findings revealed disparity between undergraduate curricula and the career expectation in the profession
BLOOMGARDEN, Alan O'MEARA, Kerry Ann (2007) Confirmed	Three faculty orientations toward integration of teaching, research and community partnerships- an "integrated" view, an "if only..." view and a "non-integrated" view. Faculty development strategies that intentional integration of roles of teaching, research and community engagement may facilitate and improve faculty research and teaching and institutional impact in the community.

BOND, Ross PATERSON, Lindsay (2001) Confirmed	<p>Academics exhibit a strong commitment to engagement and interaction with their communities both in principle and practice; that such an interaction takes place at a varied geographical levels; and that it is often accomplished under less than propitious circumstances.</p>
BORDELON, Thomas D. PHILLIPS, Iris (2006) Confirmed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> . No statistically significant differences between gender and involvement . No statistically significant differences between age and involvement . Gender differences emerged when comparing the section of service-learning courses over regular courses. . 2 major themes of time constraints and the appropriateness of requiring service learning emerged
BRINGLE, Robert HATCHER, Julie A. (2000) Credible	<p>Some institutions are positioned to accomplish institutionalization more easily than others.</p> <p>Institutionalization benefits from deliberate institutional planning and the development of certain infrastructures such as a centralized office for SL.</p>
BRINGLE, Robert G. PLATER, William (2008) Confirmed	<p>If community leaders and residents do not have good information about civic engagement activities in their communities, then these activities will be undervalued.</p>
BUSHOUSE, Brenda K. (2005) Confirmed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> . Resources constraints place a high premium on opportunity costs of staff time for CNO Transactional relationships are preferred by CNO's as they yield high benefits at low costs. . All the community partners indicated that they would like to interact with the university in the future, however half indicated that they only wanted project-specific interaction.
BUYS, Nicholas BURSNALL, Samantha (2007) Confirmed	<p>University-community partnerships provide many benefits to university research, teaching and learning, community recognition and status." Findings extend the Sargent and Waters framework.</p>
CHADWICK, Scott A. PAWLOWSKI, Donna R. (2007) Confirmed	<p>Phase 1: generate interest in service-learning across campus.</p> <p>Phase 2: generating various acts to sustain service-learning</p> <p>Phase 3: Strategically using assessment data to effect change</p>
COHEN, Patricia (2002) Credible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> . Longstanding animosity between private dance schools and higher education has prevented more partnerships. . A distinction must be made between partnering relationships and an exchange of services. . Differences in goals must be understood and acknowledged

DICKIE, Carolyn DICKIE, Laurie (2009) Credible	Partnership success can be addressed in relation to: Shared values, capacity building, alliance management
FERMAN, Barbara HILL, T.L. (2004) Confirmed	Four principal incentives for partnering with higher education (community partner perspective): 1.obtaining project-related resources 2.leveraging further resources 3.gaining access to networks 4.increasing legitimacy
HARWOOD, Angela et al. (2005) Confirmed	. Faculty report time concerns as a big barrier, as are student and community concerns, lack of resources, attitudinal issues, and need for support. . Elements of implementing the pedagogy and working effectively with community partners and students were recurring concerns. . Faculty were able to address barriers and challenges of SL, resulting in scholarly professional development and enhanced personal growth. . Findings indicate the supportive culture created through the program was central to its powerful impact; other positive outcomes were grounded in the sense of community that developed.
JENKINS, Deborah Bainer Credible	Lessons learned: . Instill and maintain commitment to a vision. . Build skills in eliciting support . Build skills in handling change
JOSEPH, Mathew et al. (2007) Confirmed	Students believe that their college experience is preparing them for the job market. Service learning has enhanced their critical thinking, and that their academic experience has emphasized community service upon graduation.
KEEN, Cheryl HALL, Kelly (2009) Credible	. The potential power of well-designed four-year, co-curricular service-learning programs can be inferred by the findings. . Attending a more diverse liberal arts campus enhanced desired program outcomes while no differences were evident when comparing four other characteristics of college campuses.
KEZAR, Adrianna (2005) Confirmed	8 organizational features identified: . Mission . Networks . Integrating structures . Rewards and Incentives . Sense of priority from people in senior positions . External groups . Values . Learning

KEZAR, Adrianna (2006) Confirmed	Organizational features for collaboration process: . Mission/ philosophy . Campus networks . Integrating structures . Rewards . Sense of priority . External pressure . Values . Learning Organizational conditions: . Philosophy . Campus network . Integrating infrastructures
MCKAY, Valerie C. ROZEE, Patricia D. (2007) Confirmed	Common faculty characteristics related to SL: . Faculty view benefits from the perspective of satisfying faculty/teaching, student/learning, community/nonprofit needs. . A learning-driven model enables a self-perpetuating process that increases faculty numbers in SL
MIRON, Devi MOELY, Barbara E. (2004) Confirmed	. Agency members' indicating more voice in program planning saw more benefits to their agency. . The perception of benefits predicted agency members' positive perceptions of the university as a whole. . Correlation between a longer history of SL and number of SL students employed to positivity about the SL relationship
O'MEARA, Kerry Ann NIEHAUS, Elizabeth (2009) Confirmed	Faculty use the following 4 dominant discourses: . A model of teaching and learning . An expression of personal identity . An expression of institutional context and mission . Embedded in a specific community partnership
PRENTICE, Mary (2007) Confirmed	Community college student participation in service-learning may have an influence on increasing students' civic engagement levels when civic engagement is defined as more than just political action.
PRIBBENOW, Dean A. (2005) Confirmed	. More meaningful Engagement in and Commitment to teaching . Deeper connections and relationships with students as learners and individuals . Enhanced knowledge of student learning processes and outcomes . Increased use of constructivist teaching and learning approaches . Improved communication of theoretical concepts . Greater involvement in a community of teachers and learners
SANDMANN, Lorilee R. WILLIAMS, Julie E. ABRAMS, Eleanor D. (2009) Confirmed	1.Challenges of advancing engagement as an institutional priority are to be expected. 2.Engagement must be strategically linked to top priorities and linked to the institutional mission. 3.Development of engagement champions via community practices is an important strategy for long-term viability of engagement priorities. 4.Leaders

	<p>can make opportunistic use of documentation and data gathering process associated with institutional engagement. 5.Community-based data gathering can provide grant opportunities and validation for new engagement initiatives. 6.Engagement aspects of accreditation should be articulated and connected to other areas and priorities. 7.Accreditation process can provide legitimacy towards reshaping the institutional culture to support engagement. 8.The accreditation process can be used to connect engagement to strategic plan. 9.Institutional leaders should link accreditation to engagement when ever possible, but must plan for adjustments over time.</p>
<p>SANDY, Marie HOLLAND, Barbara A. (2006) Confirmed</p>	<p>The analysis affirms the characteristics of effective partnerships, but reveal the following challenges and recommendation from community partners: 1. Value relationships 2.Hold conversations regularly about partnership process and outcomes 3.Involve faculty more directly 4.Consider ways the academic institution can help build social capital 5.Develop new, more facilitative roles for service learning offices 6.address the hours divide</p>
<p>SIEGEL, David J. (2008) Confirmed</p>	<p>Major themes: . Range of altruistic to utilitarian benefits. . Rationales are not sedimentary but continue to evolve in conjunction with the environment and organizational changes. . Rationales display varying degrees of directness . Rationales vary in terms of their meaning and importance to actual programmatic outcomes</p>
<p>SHRADER, Elizabeth SAUNDERS, Mary Anne MARULLO, Sam (2008) Credible</p>	<p>5 Strategic Initiatives developed for Community Research and Learning (CoRAL): . Conducting research and evaluation . Providing capacity-building and training . Encouraging CoRAL staff participation in campus activities . Convening stakeholders and creating spaces for dialogue . Disseminating information</p>
<p>TRYON, Elizabeth et Al. (2008) Confirmed</p>	<p>Despite the obstacles associated with short-term service-learning projects (staff capacity to train and supervise, incompatibility with direct client services, timing and project management, academic calendar issues) community organizations reported their desire to continue the projects.</p>
<p>TUSHNET, Naidia C. (1994) Confirmed</p>	<p>Partnership Characteristics: . Initiation- projects started to solve local problems . Implementation- successful when participants are clear about roles . Impacts –(a) for students and schools (b) for communities and businesses . Institutionalization- schools tend to institutionalize, community partners tend not to over time.</p>

<p>WORRALL, Laurie (2007) Confirmed</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> . Community Based Organizations (CBO's) see themselves engaged and committed to SL at De-Paul's. . The benefits of working with De-Paul's outweigh the challenges . The quality of the relationship is paramount . The Sterns center has positively affected the CBO's perception of the university.
---	---

APPENDIX C

MATRIX OF RESEARCH FINDINGS *Partnering for Change in Dance Higher Education*

Themes and Sub-Themes

THEME 1.

Reciprocal Benefits

- a) Benefits to the students
- b) Benefits to the faculty
- c) Benefits to the community partner Benefits to the university
- d) Benefits to the community
- e) Benefits to the profession

THEME 2.

Challenges of Achieving Distributive Justice

- a) Resource problems
- b) Communication problems
- c) Philosophical differences
- d) Time constraints
- e) Pedagogical differences

THEME 3.

Reciprocal Culture and Organizational Structure

- a) Developing structures and resources
- b) Philosophic changes
- c) Outcome assessment

AUTHOR	Theme 1	Theme 2	Theme 3
AKDERE (2005)	(e)	(a)	
ASTIN (2000)	(a)		
BASINGER (2006)	(c)		
BECK (2003)	(a)		
BENN (2003)	(f)		(c)
BENNETT (2009)		(e)	

BLOOMGARDEN (2007)	(b)		
BOND (2001)	(e)		(b)
BORDELON (2006)		(d)	
BRINGLE (2000)			(a)
BRINGLE (2008)		(b)	
BUSHOUSE (2005)		(a)	(a)
BUYS (2007)	(d)		
CHADWICK (2007)	(d)		
COHEN (2002)	(c)	(b) (c) (e)	
DICKIE (2009)			(b) (c)
FERMAN (2004)	(c)		
HARWOOD (2005)	(b)	(d) (e)	(b)
JENKINS (2001)			(b)
JOSEPH (2007)	(a)		
KEEN (2009)	(a)		
KEZAR (2005)			(a) (b) (c)
KEZAR (2006)			(a) (b) (c)

MCKAY (2007)	(b)		
MIRON (2004)	(c)		(b) (c)
O'MEARA (2009)	(a) (b) (d)		
PRENTICE (2007)	(a)		
PRIBBENOW (2005)	(b)		
SANDMANN (2009)	(d)		(a) (b) (c)
SANDY (2006)		(b) (c) (d)	
SIEGEL (2008)	(c)		
SHRADER (2008)			(a) (b) (c)
TRYON (2008)		(a) (d) (c)	
TUSHNET (1994)	(a) (d) (e)		(b)
WORRALL (2007)	(c)		
VINSON (2010)			(b) (c)

APPENDIX D

LITERATURE SEARCH CRITERIA

Partnering for Change in Dance Higher Education

Search Criteria

Databases listings used.

- ERIC
- Academic Search Complete
- MLA Directory of Periodicals
- Google Scholar
- JSTOR

Academic journals referenced.

- Dance Research Journal
- Dance Chronicle
- American Alliance of Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance

Database limiters.

- Date limiters used for some categories: 2000-2010
- Peer reviewed articles only
- Educational Level: Higher Education
- Publication Type: Reports- Research
- Also searched for related words (synonyms and plurals)

Key words used.

- Educational Partnerships
- Collaboration- Higher Education

- Community Engagement- Higher Education
- Higher Education Dance
- Research Partnerships- Higher Education
- Service-Learning Partnerships
- Dance Partnerships- Higher Education
- Community Partners- Higher Education

(Several variations of the above key words used with varied data base limiters)

Selection of Sample

	INCLUDE	EXCLUDE
TOPIC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educational partnerships • Service-learning partnerships • Community engagement/ partnerships 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • K-12 partnerships • Discipline-specific service-learning studies
RESEARCH QUESTIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community partnership perspectives/experiences (faculty, students, community partners) • Organizational structures and resources required for community partnerships/ service-learning partnerships • Community engagement in higher education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partnership finances • Political perspectives

PARTICIPANTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty • Students • Community partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government organizations • Business Enterprises
DATA INCLUDED	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative • Quantitative 	Non-empirical studies
DATE RANGE	1980 onwards	<p>Studies earlier than 1980</p> <p><i>(Few exceptions made for studies that are more specific to higher education dance partnerships)</i></p>
PUBLICATION TYPES	Peer-reviewed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dissertations • Thesis • Opinion papers • Meeting/conference presentations • Speeches

APPENDIX E

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Partnering for Change in Dance Higher Education

Protocol A: Interviews conducted with KSU dance faculty

1. Discuss your professional history as a dance artist and scholar.
2. Discuss your involvement and experience of participating in the community dance partnerships at KSU.
3. What impact do you think the KSU community dance partnerships have on the experience of students at KSU?
4. What impact do you think the KSU community dance partnerships have on the experience of faculty at KSU?
5. How do you think the community partnerships in dance developed at KSU impact the partner organizations and their membership?
6. What impact do you think the KSU community dance partnerships have on the local Atlanta community?
7. What challenges do you see associated with developing and sustaining these partnerships?
8. What personal costs and benefits do you derive from the community dance partnerships at KSU?
9. What, if anything, would you like to change about the community dance partnerships at KSU?
10. What are some of the critical components that you see as key to the success of the community engagement initiatives in dance at KSU?

11. Describe the interaction between the traditional students in the program and dancers from professional community organizations.
12. What challenges do you face working with these varied populations?
13. Is there a difference in the way traditional students and professional dancers enrolled at KSU respond to discussions and work in class?
14. Why do you think the professional dance world has traditionally remained separate from academia?
15. What influence do you see these partnerships having on the profession of dance?

Protocol B: Interviews conducted with KSU administrators

1. Discuss your history of working at KSU and describe your role within the KSU Program in Dance.
2. Discuss your involvement and experience of the community dance partnerships at KSU.
3. What impact do you think the community partnerships in dance have on the experience of students at KSU?
4. What impact do you think the community partnerships in dance have on the experience of faculty at KSU?
5. How do you think the community partnerships in dance developed at KSU benefit the partner organizations and their membership?
6. What impact do you think the KSU community dance partnerships have on the local Atlanta community?
7. What challenges do you see associated with developing and sustaining these partnerships?

8. What role do you think the administration, BOR and government should play in developing and sustaining community dance partnerships at the university?
9. What are some of the critical components that you see as key to the success of the community engagement initiatives in dance at KSU?
10. What resources are necessary to foster the development of community dance partnerships at KSU?
11. How do the community dance partnerships contribute to the growth of the program and university?
12. How do you think the dance partnerships developed at KSU can serve other departments and units within the university?
13. What are some of the negative effects you see with developing more community engagement initiatives in dance at KSU?
14. What, if anything, would you like to change about the community dance partnerships at KSU?
15. What impact do you see these partnerships having on the profession of dance?

Protocol C: Interviews conducted with administrators at community partner organizations

1. Discuss your professional history and role within your organization.
2. Discuss your involvement and experience of participating in the community dance partnership with KSU.
3. What impact do you think community dance partnerships have on the experience of students and faculty at KSU?
4. How do you think the community partnerships in dance developed at KSU benefit your organization?

5. How do you think the community partnerships in dance developed at KSU benefit the membership of your institution?
6. What impact do you think the KSU community dance partnerships have on the local Atlanta community?
7. What challenges does your institution face in developing and sustaining these partnerships?
8. What resources, if any, are available within your organization to foster and sustain university partnerships?
9. What personal costs and benefits do you derive from the community partnership with KSU?
10. What role do you think administrators, boards and the government should play in developing and sustaining community dance partnerships within your organization?
11. Discuss your experiences of observing the interactions of university students with professional dancers from your organizations.
12. What are some of the critical components that you see as key to the success of the community engagement initiatives at your institution?
13. What, if anything, would you like to change about the community dance partnership with KSU?
14. Why do you think the professional dance world has traditionally remained separate from academia?
15. What impact do you see these partnerships having on the profession of dance?

Protocol D: Interviews conducted with professional dancers who are undergraduate students at KSU

1. Discuss your past academic and professional history.
2. Discuss your involvement and experience of participating in the community dance partnership at KSU.
3. What are the external and personal factors that influenced your decision to return to college and get an undergraduate degree in dance?
4. How do you think this academic degree in dance will influence your ongoing professional career?
5. What are the challenges you face balancing the duality of a professional performance career with your academic work at the university?
6. What reaction and response have you seen from your professional dance colleagues to your involvement with the educational partnership with KSU?
7. What impact do you think community partnerships have on the experience of students and faculty at KSU?
8. Discuss the challenges and benefits of working with undergraduate dancers who have very different physical and intellectual skills?
9. Having experienced both a professional and collegiate dance environment, could you discuss the fundamental similarities and differences you see in the philosophy?
10. What are the challenges you have faced this past year as you have made the transition into the collegiate environment?
11. What, if anything, would you like to change about the community dance partnerships that you have experienced at KSU?

12. What are some of the critical components that you see as key to the success of the community engagement initiatives between KSU and your professional institution?
13. What are the personal costs you face from your involvement with the community dance partnerships at KSU?
14. Why do you think the professional dance world has traditionally remained separate from academia?
15. What impact do you see these partnerships having on the profession of dance?

Protocol E: Interviews conducted with professional dancers within community partner organizations

1. Discuss your past professional and academic history.
2. Discuss your involvement and experience of participating in the community dance partnership with KSU.
3. What impact do you think the community dance partnerships have on the experience of students and faculty at KSU?
4. How do you think the community partnerships in dance developed at KSU benefit your organization and its membership?
5. What impact do you think the KSU community partnerships have on the local Atlanta community?
6. What are the benefits you have gained from interacting with students and faculty at KSU?
7. What are the challenges you have faced working within the KSU community dance partnership?
8. How have the students in the program at KSU responded to you as an artist and collaborator?

9. What reaction and response have you seen from your professional dance colleagues to their experiences within the KSU partnership?
10. What personal costs and benefits do you derive from the community partnership with KSU?
11. What, if anything, would you like to change about the community dance partnerships that you have experienced at KSU?
12. What are some of the components that you see as key to the success of the community engagement initiatives between KSU and your professional organization?
13. Having experienced both a professional and collegiate dance environment, could you discuss the fundamental similarities and differences you see in the philosophy?
14. Why do you think the professional dance world has traditionally remained separate from academia?
15. What impact do you see these partnerships having on the profession of dance?

Protocol F: Interviews conducted with community dance professionals

1. Discuss your history of working at your institution and describe your administrative role within the organization.
2. Discuss your involvement, experience and /or knowledge of the community dance partnerships at KSU.
3. What impact do you think community partnerships have on the experience of students and faculty at KSU?
4. What impact do you think the KSU community partnerships have on the local Atlanta community?

5. What challenges do you see associated with the successful implementation and development of these partnerships?
6. What resources do you think are necessary to foster and sustain community partnerships at a university?
7. How do the community dance partnerships at KSU impact your professional experience?
8. Discuss your experience of the creative collaborations that have resulted from these partnerships.
9. What, if anything, would you like to change about the community dance partnerships that you have experienced at KSU?
10. What role do you think community dance professionals like you play in developing and sustaining community dance partnerships at KSU?
11. What role do you think external constituents like the government and local community should play in fostering community dance partnerships at KSU?
12. Why do you think other dance communities have not fostered similar collegiate dance partnerships?
13. What are some of the negative effects you see with developing more community engagement initiatives in dance at KSU?
14. Why do you think the professional dance world has traditionally remained separate from academia?
15. What impact do you see these partnerships having on the profession of dance?

Protocol G: Focus group interviews with KSU dance students

1. Discuss the factors that influenced your decision to pursue a dance degree at Kennesaw State University.

2. How have the community partnerships developed at KSU had an impact on your educational experience and artistic growth?
3. How do you think these community partnerships will impact your future as a dance artist or scholar?
4. What are your experiences interacting and connecting with the professional dancers on a collegial and personal level?
5. Discuss the experiences you have had working with choreographers from community partner organizations.
6. Discuss the challenges you have faced while working with community partner organizations.
7. Do you find that the technical and artistic expectations are different when working within community partner organizations?
8. What benefits do you think community partner organizations and their members gain from interactions with KSU?
9. What concerns, if any, do you have about the future development of community partnerships at KSU?
10. What, if anything, would you like to change about the community dance partnerships that you have experienced at KSU?
11. Why do you think the professional dance world has traditionally remained separate from academia?
12. What impact do you see these partnerships having on the profession of dance?

APPENDIX F

IRB Approval *Partnering for Change in Dance Higher Education*

July 29, 2011

Office for Research
Institutional Review Board for the
Protection of Human Subjects

Ivan Pulinkala, MFA
1700 Northside Dr. #1407
Atlanta, GA 30318

THE UNIVERSITY OF
ALABAMA
R E S E A R C H

Re: IRB# 11-OR-239: "Partnering for Change in Dance Higher Education"

Dear Mr. Pulinkala:

The University of Alabama Institutional Review Board has granted approval for your proposed research.

Your application has been given expedited approval according to 45 CFR part 46. Approval has been given under expedited review category 7 as outlined below:

(7) Research on individual or group characteristics or behavior (including, but not limited to, research on perception, cognition, motivation, identity, language, communication, cultural beliefs or practices, and social behavior) or research employing survey, interview, oral history, focus group, program evaluation, human factors evaluation, or quality assurance methodologies.

Your application will expire on July 28, 2012. If the study continues beyond that date, you must complete the IRB Renewal Application. If you modify the application, please complete the Modification of an Approved Protocol form. Changes in this study cannot be initiated without IRB approval, except when necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to participants. When the study closes, please complete the Request for Study Closure form.

Should you need to submit any further correspondence regarding this application, please include the assigned IRB application number.

Good luck with your research.

Sincerely,

358 Rose Administration Building
Box 870127
Tuscaloosa, Alabama 35487-0127
(205) 348-8461
FAX (205) 348-7189
TOLL FREE (877) 820-3066

Carpantato T. Myles, MSM, CIM
Director & Research Compliance Officer
Office for Research Compliance
The University of Alabama