THE IMPORTANCE AND AVAILABILITY OF FACTORS INFLUENCING SOCIALLY
RESPONSIBLE DESIGN CURRICULUM IN U.S. HIGHER EDUCATION
UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

A Dissertation

by

AMANDA ROSE GARCIA

BED, Texas A&M University, 2002
MFA, Savannah College of Art and Design, 2004

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

DOCTOR of PHILOSOPHY

in

CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi
Corpus Christi, Texas

May 2016

THE IMPORTANCE AND AVAILABILITY OF FACTORS INFLUENCING SOCIALLY
RESPONSIBLE DESIGN CURRICULUM IN U.S. HIGHER EDUCATION
UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

A Dissertation

by

AMANDA ROSE GARCIA

This dissertation meets the standards for scope and quality of
Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi and is hereby approved.

Bryant Griffith, PhD   Kamiar Kouzekanani, PhD
Chair   Committee Member

Corinne Valadez, PhD   Kevin Concannon, PhD
Committee Member   Graduate Faculty Representative

May 2016

ABSTRACT

Graphic design is a powerful tool capable of publicizing, informing, and propagandizing environmental, social, and political messages (McCoy, 2003). However, according to Heller (1994), "design is often seen but not understood, consumed but not appreciated as part of a larger social, commercial, and cultural context" (p. xiii). Within the over 2,000 undergraduate design programs in the U.S., overall, design schooling has not helped students become broader-thinking people who can help shape a democratic society (Swanson, 2005). Socially responsible design curriculum allows for critical dialogue, personal identification and expression, and consideration of cultural significance in a students' body of work. Educators must find ways to expose students to a range of culturally significant curricula so that graduates will no longer perpetuate the culture industry of design education (Bierut, 1988; Kellner, 1989).

A descriptive survey study was conducted to gain insight into the importance and availability of factors that may influence socially responsible design curriculum in higher education throughout the United States. The study used a 40-item online survey instrument that collected demographic and institutional data from 44 graphic design faculty at 42 unique institutions across the United States. Importance and availability of socially responsible curricula participant responses to the survey were compared, using the Wilcoxon Signed-Ranks Test.

The importance scores were significantly higher than the availability scores for three items: the faculty member teaching the role of graphic design in society as a shaper of change/culture, the faculty member allowing students to work with local nonprofits,

and including socially responsible projects in graduating portfolios. However, there were no statistically significant differences between the overall importance and availability scores.

The results of the study have implications for the American Institute of Graphic Arts Design Educators Community, National Association of Schools of Art and Design, and graphic design faculty and departmental administration. Recommendations for future research include expansion of the population of participants, comparison of departmental and faculty responses to the survey, exploration of service-learning as a means for broader context for socially responsible design practices in higher education, and a qualitative research study with agreeable participants.

DEDICATION

This research is dedicated to those who make a difference in both students' lives and the lives of others by using design as a meaningful and powerful tool for positive change in the world.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to begin by thanking my family for their unwavering support over the past four years during my doctoral journey. My husband, Rob, for always putting me first and being there even when I couldn't be. To my son, Aiden, for his unconditional love and never questioning why I couldn't be there for Saturday morning soccer games or late night dinners because I had class to attend. To my daughter, Paloma, for giving me the extra push and confidence I needed to complete my dissertation before you arrive. To my in-laws, Robert and Becky, Valerie, Amanda, Richard, and Ric, for their support both emotionally and physically during this process. To my parents who gave me the drive to be a better version of myself. To my grandparents who showed me what it meant to be successful in life and love.

I would also like to thank my dissertation committee without whom this would not be possible. Thank you Dr. Griffith for being a great mentor over the past four years and always challenging me in ways I didn't expect. Thank you Dr. Kouzekanani for your patience, kindness, and statistical genius. Thank you Dr. Valadez for your enduring positivity and love for education—it is contagious. And lastly, thank you Dr. Scoon and Dr. Concannon for your support and guidance.

Additionally, I would like to thank the rest of faculty who taught me the value of research and perseverance through this process and armed me with the confidence to move forward; Dr. Kakali Bhattacharya, Dr. Nancy Smith, Dr. Dan Pearce, and Dr. Nicholas Curiel.

I would like to thank the designers who are doing this kind of work and making a difference both in the profession and in students' lives everyday. To James Victore,

thank you being a friend, staying true to yourself, and inspiring me in all you do. To

Milton Galser, although we only spent a short time together, your words of wisdom and

attitude toward design as a change agent will forever influence me. Lastly, to Steven

Heller, Katherine McCoy, and Meredith Davis for being my mentors through your

insightful and critical writings on design education—your work continues to inspire and

change me.

Lastly, I would like to thank my dear friends Stephanie Medina and Nilsa

Sullivan. Our late night and early morning writing groups, stats study sessions, and just

general you-can-do-this coffee breaks made it all worthwhile. Without you, this would

not have been possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background and Setting

In the United States alone, there are over 2,000 undergraduate design programs whose curriculum varies widely (AIGA & NASAD, 2007; Davis, 2005a). Within these programs, overall, design schooling has not helped students become broader-thinking people who can help shape a democratic society (Swanson, 2005). Michael Beirut put it best (1998), "modern design education is essentially value-free: every problem has a purely visual solution that exists outside any cultural context" (p. 217). Higher education design programs must see design as a conduit for and a shaper of culture (Davis, 2005a; McCoy, 2003; Swanson, 2005).

This can be difficult as many claims are made that higher education barely imparts enough practical instruction to keep up with the ever widening professional practice (Heller, 2005). Whereas students could once master a specific media within the field of graphic design—typography, interactive design or publication design— professional practice now expects students to be a jack-of-all-trades. According to Swanson (2005), with the expanding definition of what students need to know when graduating with a graphic design degree, the best thing we can do for design students is to make them adaptable and able to tackle any media or design task thrown their way in the industry. This adaptability is achieved at many institutions by offering a broad graphic design curriculum made up of portfolio-ready commercially successful projects rather than exploratory, personally connected, or concept-driven design works (Davis, 2005a; McCoy, 2005).

1

At a time when millennial students are less interested in the exploration and development of ideas, and more interested in immediacy and replication of marketable design solutions, it is increasingly important to create pathways for meaningful connections between the student and their work (Davis, 2005; Heller, 2005; McCoy, 2005). The unifying experience of creating work rooted in personal connection will provide a vehicle of shared social enterprise where voices of all participants may be heard (Dewey, 1978; McLaren, 1999). One way to encourage meaning in students' work is by allowing them to choose topics for projects of which they have a social, cultural, or personal connection (McCoy, 2005).

To recapture the personal connection, Dewey describes pragmatist aesthetics as the understanding of one's everyday experiences and emotions to inform visual expression (Buchanan, 2013; Dewey, 1989; Stroud, 2014). Similarly, Freire explains ontology as being grounded in the learners' self and the way he/she experiences the world (Kincheloe, 2008). Understanding ones ontology and translating these discoveries into pragmatist aesthetics allows the student to see graphic design as more than a commercial application but rather a multi-modal vehicle for visual expression and personal or culturally-relevant meaning making.

Freirian dialogue supports the identification of self, or identity, as a process by which the teacher and student should work together in order to make a difference in the world that enhances community and enables justice and human flourishing (McLaren, 1989). Educators should first attempt to better articulate whose interests higher education serves and look critically at the curriculum to see if it actually offers students the necessary skills to expand their capacity to question disempowering social practices

2

which encumber the identification of self (McLaren & Kincheloe, 2007). Until educators find ways to expose students to a range of culturally significant curricula, of which may include socially responsible design curriculum, graduates will continue perpetuate the culture industry of design education (Bierut, 1988; Kellner, 1989).

Does design for social change and socially responsible curriculum exist in undergraduate programs? This study seeks to gain insight into the importance and availability of factors that may influence socially responsible design curriculum in higher education throughout the United States. Faculty are the curators of the students' classroom experiences and decision makers for creative projects which put into practice the learning outcomes for the course. However autonomous a college professor may be, departmental support is necessary to achieve a greater emphasis on a program of study. This descriptive study aims to link the availability and importance of socially responsible curriculum with faculty and departmental attitudes towards design for social change. In order to make these connections, a descriptive analysis of the importance and availability of factors is needed.

There are no studies found specifically on the integration of socially responsible design curriculum in higher education. Through an extensive search of literature, the only quantifiable data that was presented on the amount of socially responsible coursework taught in U.S. graphic design higher education institutions lies within the American Institute of Graphic Artists (AIGA) 2006 Survey of Design Education programs. In this study, 352 institutions were surveyed to provide the AIGA with information about U.S. design education programs, with the ultimate goal of developing a comprehensive directory of such programs (AIGA, 2006). The instrument measured the

types of undergraduate and graduate degrees as well as majors offered by institutions providing design education and the nature of those degree programs. Items measured were; areas of focus, requirements, enrollment, distance learning options, internship requirements, and the composition of design education faculty at those institutions among others. Of the 352 institutions in the study, only 4% indicated a specialized practice orientation of a Social Model of Design, *see Figure 4 in Appendix A*. However, no additional statistical analysis was provided to give further insight into the findings. Findings are represented in Appendix A.

Although a generous number of journal papers, critical books on graphic design, and other publications support the integration of socially responsible projects and coursework in higher education, little is known about the actual amount of socially responsible design integration in U.S. undergraduate programs. This could be attributed to the lack of strict curricular conventions or blanket requirements for graphic design undergraduate programs (Heller, 2005).

Additionally, no data was found on the direct or indirect benefits to the student of incorporating socially responsible projects or practices within a higher education curriculum. Assumptions are made that the incorporation of such pedagogy would allow students to become engaged and aware citizens who understand the ramifications of their work (Bush, 2003). However, no studies were found that explicitly employed such results.

Studies surrounding graphic design curriculum are those that address the inconsistencies in national standards for design education as well as the competencies expected by the public sector versus those in academia.

A study by Wang (2006) revealed consensus and validation from a panel of industry professionals and educators for a set of competencies in the area of graphic design in Kansas and Missouri using the Delphi Technique. In this study, the 20 most needed competencies for employment within the graphic design industry were identified; 1) to apply the principles of graphic design, 2) apply the basics of graphic design for print production, 3) apply the techniques of page layout and publishing software, 4) be able to learn and comprehend, and 5) apply the basics of graphic design for webpage development (Wang, 2006).

Bridges (2013) expanded Wang's study to include 21st century skills, content knowledge and other tools needed in an effective university-level graphic design program looking specifically in North and South Carolina. The top five most needed competencies were similar to Wang's but included; 1) apply the concepts of typography, 2) exhibit interpersonal skills, and 3) write clearly, concisely, and correctly (Bridges, 2013).

Neither Wang's nor Bridges's results speak specifically to socially responsible design in the higher education classroom but rather support what professional practice expects of graphic design graduates.

Statement of Problem

There are factors that may influence socially responsible design curriculum in higher education. The review of literature identified no specific research on identifying and documenting factors contributing to socially responsible design curriculum in higher education. Additionally, the review of literature did not identify a status quo of socially responsible design curriculum in U.S. higher education. There is a need for research that

explores factors influencing the importance and availability of socially responsible design curriculum in graphic design higher education programs throughout the United States.

Theoretical Framework

Critical Theory provided the framework for this study. Critical Theory is a product of the Marxist-oriented Institute of Social Research, which challenges and exploits repression, alienation, political agenda, and hidden assumptions within Western civilization (Bronner, 2011; Held, 1980; Kellner, 1989). Frankfurt School philosophers Horkheimer and Adorno's seminal work, *Dialect of Enlightenment,* espoused their theory of the *culture industry* and provided a neo-Marxism account of mass media and mass culture (Kellner, 1989). The critical theorists of the Frankfurt School exceled as critics of both high culture and mass culture exploiting what was once culturally individual was now administered thus producing the end of the individual (Held, 1980; Kellner, 1989).

With the loss of the individual, critical theorists investigated the ways in which thinking was reduced to standardized opinions of what was profitable; this included aesthetic enjoyment and the making of art (Kellner, 1989; Meggs, 2006). The culture industry strived to appeal to the lowest common denominator in order to maximize sales and impact by threatening the authentic experience via consumerism of advanced capitalism (Bronner, 2011). The critical theorists, including Marcuse, thus came to see the culture industry as an integral part of capitalist modernity using advertising and mass communications for mass social control (Kellner, 1989; Meggs, 2006).

Horkheimer and Adorno retained their preoccupation with the individual experience arguing that artistic culture represents the perennial protest of the particular against the universal whereas autonomous art has the capacity to transcend class origins

and transform a particular individual experience into a universal statement giving the experience of art multiple layers of meaning and the ability to embody and promote truth (Adorno & Horkheimer, 1972; Kellner, 1989).

Purpose of Study

The purpose of the study was to explore the importance and availability of factors that may influence socially responsible design curriculum in higher education throughout the United States. The following research questions guided the study:

1. What is the importance of factors influencing socially responsible curriculum as perceived by design educators?

2. What is the availability of factors influencing socially responsible curriculum as perceived by design educators?

Operational Definitions

For the purpose of this study, graphic design is defined as the profession that plans and executes the design of visual communication according to the needs of audiences and the context for which communication is intended (AIGA & NASAD, 2007).

For the purpose of the study, socially responsible design is defined as the practice of graphic design for the purposes of bringing awareness to or eliciting change for human rights, social justice, and environmental consciousness for the betterment of society.

For the purposes of this study, undergraduate design programs are defined as Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Fine Arts, Bachelor of Science, and Bachelor of Environmental Design, among others, granting programs who's emphasis is aligned with graphic design professional practices but may be labeled as the following majors

according to the American Institute of Graphic Arts and the National Association of Schools of Art and Design; art, graphic design, communication design, communications design, visual communications, visual communication design, or advertising design (AIGA & NASAD, 2007).

Delimitations, Limitations and Assumptions

The study was delimited to members of the American Institute of Graphic Arts (AIGA) with designated AIGA student group advisory status ($n = 200$). Due to the non-probability nature of sampling, external validity was limited to study participants. Due to the non-experimental nature of the study, no causal inferences were drawn. Additionally, the researcher chose to conduct the survey during the summer semester of 2015 at which time many faculty may have been on vacation and not accessing email to receive the invitation to participate. Limitations of the study included 22% participation in the online questionnaire ($n = 44$) representing 42 institutions of higher learning within six regions of the United States. It was assumed that the study participants provided the researcher with accurate data. It was also assumed the instrument used in the survey accurately measured the importance and availability of factors contributing to socially responsible design curriculum.

Significance of the Study

It is theorized that schooling must permit new relationships, new spaces and identities to be formed (Giroux, 2005). Socially responsible design curriculum can do just that by creating pathways for personal connection between the student and their work, creating a broader social consciousness, and allowing new identities by breaking through the perpetuated culture industry of design education. However, the implications

of socially responsible design education remain unclear. Existing research does not provide an understanding of how curriculum within the United States supports socially responsible design principles and practices in undergraduate education.

Gaining an understanding of the importance and availability of factors that may influence socially responsible design curriculum is the first step in establishing pathways to greater integration of such. The study is important to graphic design higher education administration and faculty as the data provided may assist administration in quantitative results to support a need for socially responsible curriculum development. The results are also useful to the American Institute of Graphic Arts (AIGA) for faculty development purposes, reporting national education statistics, and assistance garnering support for additional socially responsible curriculum in higher education based on importance to their stakeholder's (faculty) wants and needs. Additionally, the study provides quantitative data for the National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD) on the availability of socially responsible curriculum within undergraduate graphic design programs.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of the study was to explore the importance and availability of factors that may influence socially responsible design curriculum in higher education throughout the United States. The combination of the growing number of undergraduate design programs compounded with the increasing demand of the all-in-one graphic design graduate, provides a natural tendency in higher education toward emersion of professional training versus helping students appreciate the power of design to persuade, inform, and delight (Keys, 2008; Swanson, 1994). Can design for social change and the incorporation of socially responsible curriculum alleviate the culture industry perpetuated within U.S. undergraduate design programs?

Critical theorists have examined the dangers of mass culture and commercialization on a society and personal identity. The review of literature surrounding socially responsible design curriculum finds evidence that the focus of commercially successful projects and graduating portfolios leaves little for culturally significant coursework. Thus, the dangers of the culture industry still exist today within undergraduate design programs nation-wide threatening the future of graphic design be reduced to selling products to people who don't need them at prices they can't afford (Adorno & Horkheimer, 1972; Heller, 1994).

The review of literature provided a justification for the need to conduct the study. The chapter is divided into four sections. The first section explores the history (from 1700s to present) of graphic design in higher education. The second section explores the history of socially responsible design both in professional practice and in higher

education. The third section explores the relationship between graphic design curriculum

and socially responsible design education. The fourth section presents Critical Theory

and its relationship to the research purpose. A summary section ends the chapter.

Graphic Design in Higher Education

The field of contemporary graphic design emerged as a result of the needs of

manufacturers during the industrial revolution to advertise and market factory output

(Meggs, 2006). The late 1700s to early 1800s saw a boom in typographers, printers, and

lithographers producing broadsides, posters, handbills, and books in large quantities.

These image-makers were mostly self-taught or apprenticed to learn their craft, whereas

the European type founder and print shop apprenticeship were the only precedents to a

formal graphic design education (McCoy, 2005). The Rhode Island School of Design

(RISD), founded in 1877, was used to transform the training of artists to meet the needs

of the Industrial Revolution and machine manufacturing (Austin, 2009).

The Bauhaus

In 1919, Walter Gropius renamed the former Weimar Art Academy, Das

Staatliche Bauhaus, where he sought a new unity of art and technology to solve problems

within visual design created by industrialism (Meggs, 2006). According to McCoy

(2005), "the Bauhaus Basic Course was the first in design education to declare that basic

design principles underlie all design disciplines" (p. 5). By dissolving the boundaries

between fine and applied arts, the Bauhaus created a close relationship between art and

life—in turn, visual communication was used as a vehicle for social change and cultural

revitalization (Meggs, 2005). The artists, architects, and craftsman of the Bauhaus laid

the foundation for design education in America.

Ludwig Mies van der Rohe, Laszlo Moholy-Nagy, Josef Albers, and Herbert Bayer of the Bauhaus settled in United States after the Bauhaus was forced to close its doors in 1933 because of a refusal to meet the demands of the Third Reich (Kelly, 2001). Josef Albers was asked to teach at Black Mountain College in North Carolina, also in 1933, where Albers said he wanted to 'open the eyes' of his students and did so by developing his own progressive pedagogy concerning experimentation and social change (Diaz, 2008). Laszlo Moholy-Nagy formed the new Bauhaus in Chicago in 1937 which later became the Institute of Design in Chicago that was based on the abstract Bauhaus design principles (Findeli, 1990). The curriculum at the Institute of Design consisted of the Bauhaus Basic Course followed by three years of specialized workshops focusing either on product design, graphic design, photography, film, and architecture (Findeli, 1990). The first American school to launch a Bachelor of Fine Arts degree specifically in graphic design was Yale University in 1950 (Kelly, 2001). The Yale program was unique at the time, and its graduates were instrumental in establishing the profession of graphic design in the United States during the 1960s (Kelly, 2001). The resounding influence of the Bauhaus, Institute of Design, Black Mountain College, Yale University, and RISD can still be seen today in most undergraduate design programs.

Curriculum Today

Within the top five graphic design programs within the United States today—Rhode Island School of Design, Yale University, Maryland Institute College of Art, Carnegie Mellon University, and Virginia Commonwealth University—three different degrees can be achieved (US News, 2012). A Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Fine Arts, and Bachelor of Design degree are all variations with a similar course matriculation

requiring a mixture of fine arts courses ranging from drawing, art history, printmaking, and painting—similar to the Bauhaus model. This is true nation-wide, as basic undergraduate design programs offer mostly the same courses, but the levels of teaching excellence vary between institutions (Heller, 2005).

The area in which the program or major is housed plays a role in the curriculum required of undergraduate students. The graphic design programs located within a Department of Art require many more fine arts courses to satisfy degree requirements. Art schools and university art departments have yet to fully embrace the idea that design is not a commercial application of fine arts ideas and processes (McCoy, 2005). In these scenarios, graphic design courses make up only two to three courses within the art department. McCoy (2005) also points out, "compounding the problem has been the growing eagerness among university art departments to compensate for shrinking fine arts enrollments with graphic design programs, whether prepared or not" (p. 4).

Conversely, Graphic Design Departments focus less on fine arts requirements and more on specific graphic design intentions, design history, theory, methods, and processes (McCoy, 2005). However, many claims are made that graphic design higher education barely imparts enough practical instruction to keep up with the ever-widening professional practice (Heller, 2005). Davis (2005) agrees, "the survival of the profession may depend less on its traditional education in art-based concepts and more on responding strategically to changes in the business, social, and communications environments" (p. 15). This is challenging for design educators as the definition of the profession expands and shifts to meet the needs of professional practice in the technological age (Davis, 2005). The tendency toward a professional rather than liberal

arts education has continued to grow over the past twenty years. Design programs

nation-wide produce more graduates than standard corporate design departments and

agencies can employ, thus schools feel compelled to provide more entry-level job skills

for their graduates to have a chance in this competitive market (Swanson, 1994).

Although design educators have the best intentions in adjusting curricula to meet these

ever shifting needs, the democratic and bureaucratic nature of higher education often

delays curricular changes well after their need for them is apparent in professional

practice (Davis, 2005b).

Due to more practical curriculum employed in higher education design

classrooms, socially responsible design or design for social change courses are sparse if

at all available to the undergraduate student (Heller, 2005). Instead, courses most

frequently offered are those that can adequately prepare the student for the job market

while maintaining theory and historical perspectives in the design field. Examples of

required course titles in the top design programs mentioned above are; History of Graphic

Design, Design Studios 1–3, Interactive Design, and Typography Studios 1 and 2.

Although it is possible that these required courses integrate socially responsible design

topics or projects, there was no evidence in the literature of specific required courses in

design for social change that were found. However, it is possible that socially

responsible design elective courses exist at these institutions but are not listed within their

standard requirements.

German critic Walter Benjamin describes the relation of authorship to technology;

predicting new methods would replace the historically tactile and authentic systems of

production (Lupton, 2005). Embracing these new systems, design schooling prepares

students to become authors via technological advances but not to forget the audience, or reader, but rather as Benjamin had hoped, to turn the audience into collaborators (Bignell, 2000). Design authorship is a reoccurring theme in some present day higher education programs at notable institutions such as the School of Visual Arts, New York and the Maryland College Institute of Art (MICA), and the Savannah College of Art and Design (SCAD). At these and similar programs, a productivist view can be seen as students create products and offer them for sale in pop up shops or university owned stores. In these cases, Lutpon (2005) describes the relationship of the student to the product as a designer/author instead of client/designer relationship in which the student is concerned with the experience of the user/reader as an interactive, collaborative, and social experience. In this way, Benjamin's "sphere of authenticity is outside the technical" exists in the initiated creative projects by the students own conception and individual creation (Benjamin, 2009). Designer as author programs, although not directly socially responsible, do provide an alternative path for hermeneutics of society's relationship to graphic design.

Design for Social Change

Graphic design is a powerful tool capable of publicizing, informing, and propagandizing environmental, social, and political messages (McCoy, 2003). However, according to Heller (1994), "design is often seen but not understood, consumed but not appreciated as part of a larger social, commercial, and cultural context" (p. xiii). The designer, as the creator of a persuasive image or message, has an ethical responsibility to understand the impact their message will have (Holland, 2001). From twentieth century propaganda war posters expressing the concerns of society to contemporary sustainable

15

design and ethical consumerism, design for social change has touched every individual at some point in their life.

Propaganda

In the first half of the twentieth-century, graphic design underwent massive changes in tone, character, and meaning in response to the global shifting technological and social landscape. Amidst this turbulence, it is not surprising that visual art and design experienced a series of creative revolutions that questioned the role of design in society at which point graphic design saw a shift from advertising to socially provocative messaging (Meggs, 2005).

This revolution prompted the Futurist and Dada design movements that were meant to visually represent the emotions of public during WWI. The work during these movements conveyed the individual decision making of the artist and expressed what was felt during the time of war as random change and willful choice. Dadaist art spread quickly across Europe and mocked a society that 'went insane.' The poster was often the medium of choice of artists to express anti-Nazi sentiments, until of course the artists became the public enemy and were forced to flee Germany.

During WWII, the United States government established the Office of War Information to spread positive propaganda to improve morale and encourage women to become more involved (Ryan, 2012). Designers and artists alike were commissioned to create posters for a wide array of socially relevant topics such as increased production of goods, air corps recruitment, polio research, and for the means of educating the public on Nazi brutality among others.

The Push Pin artists of the late fifties and early sixties, such as Chwast and Glaser—most famous for his I Heart NY Logo—used graphic design as a tool to provoke and critique and influenced design and art direction with the marriage of design and illustration (Heller, 1985). War posters serve as early examples of socially responsible design and the power graphic design can have on a generation (Meggs, 2006).

Professional Practice

In 1964, in response to the rise of excess and consumer culture, British graphic designer Ken Garland wrote the First Things First manifesto, calling upon designers to take responsibility for their collective contribution to society (Heller, 2002). During this time, creative revolutions were taking place in the advertising industries of New York and London, however, designers began to question the role design was playing. The original First Things First manifesto had twenty-two signatories and was reproduced into multiple languages (McCarron, 2001). McCarron (2001) remembers Tibor Kalman remarking, "…we designers, who are very skillful and have powerful tools at our disposal, what role are we playing—making the filthy oil company look clean, making the car brochure higher quality than the car" (p. 114)? Poyner (1999) pointed out we live and breathe design and we have absorbed design so deeply into ourselves that we no longer recognize the myriad of ways it affects us. In 2000, Kalman made a ploy to re launch the Manifesto with Rick Poyner and bring the language up to date while trying to maintain its original spirit (McCarron, 2001). These manifestos were a call to industry professionals to take a greater social responsibility for the actions of their work and professed the importance of design that attends to the social needs of society rather than pandering to the prescriptions of capitalist consumption (Bush, 2003). However admirable these may have been, we

have once again begun to train a profession that feels political or social concerns are extraneous to practice (McCoy, 2005).

In 1970, Dieter Rams, an industrial designer by trade, introduced the idea of 'good design' as that which is sustainable, free from obsolescence that was later developed into ten principles that are embraced by graphic designers, architects, and industrial designers alike. Good design, as defined by Rams, is 1) innovative, 2) makes a product useful, 3) is aesthetic, 4) makes a product understandable, 5) is unobtrusive, 6) in honest, 7) is long-lasting, 8) is through down the last detail 9) in environmentally friendly and 10) is as little design as possible. Similar to the Manifesto's mentioned above, these principles are not to contribute to the visually pleasing aspect of design, but rather the affect design has on its consumers and the culture in which it exists. Rams principles provide a socially responsible context for the intention of design. Similarly, Milton Glaser has always believed that there is a psychological and ethical difference between those who make things and those who control things (Glaser, 2004).

Conversely to Rams principles, Glaser released his Road to Hell in 1987 in which he outlined a series of questions for designers to determine how far they would go in using the power of design to persuade and inform audiences on topics not ethically in line with their own beliefs. Question one begins by asking a designer if he/she would design a package to look larger on the shelf? While the last question asks if the designer would design an ad for a product whose continued use might case the user's death. The purpose of these questions, according to Glaser, is to force the designer to reflect on his/her own socially responsible convictions and ethical responsibility of telling the truth in design (Glaser, 1987).

Corporate Culture

The recent rise in cause-related marketing and ethical consumerism has seen a number of corporate brands project a socially responsible and ethical image (Singh, Iglesias, & Batista-Foguet, 2012). A study conducted by the Center for Social Research (2001), showed that 70% of consumers surveyed mention social responsibility was important to them when choosing a product or service and has only continued rise in the last ten years. However, critics of cause related marketing argue that all too often cause-related marketing is simply a creative strategy to save a weak public image by tying a product to a worthwhile charity (Schwartz, 2003). Some critics feel that cause related marketing is opportunistic and simply a chance for brands to gain cheap publicity (Schwartz, 2003). Although these may be viable tactics for some corporations, brands that make socially impactful connections in all levels of their business—from graphic design to stewardship—succeed in making a real difference (Singh, et al., 2012). Certain companies at the highest level of corporate conscience include Ben & Jerry's, The Body Shop, Reebok, Tom's Shoes, and Benetton—all with long-term commitments to social responsibility (Schwartz, 2003). Chaudhuri and Holbrook (2001) agree that brand trust is a cognitive element that develops over time. The brands that are getting it right recognize the value in socially responsible practices and allow their design firms and advertising agencies the freedom to find creative solutions that support their corporate brand message.

Higher Education and Socially Responsible Design

Although the Bauhaus model provides a springboard for abstract and neutral meaning-making detached from context and purpose, critics argue that it is problematic in that divorcing design from its content or context implies to students that graphic form

is unrelated to subjective values or meaning (McCoy, 2003). Many programs will use semiotics and conceptual problem solving as giving meaning to design, but too often than not, these distinctions are applied in a cultural vacuum (Bierut, 1988). Whereas students are taught that objects, patterns, and color hold visual meaning, rarely are these meanings proven or tested in a wider social context other than those relevant to the project at hand. The detachment of graphic design to implicit or explicit value and cultural significance is further reinforced in the commercial and corporate projects assigned in most higher education classrooms (Heller, 2003).

Projects in higher education classrooms vary in design courses depending on learning outcomes set forth. Projects may include creating logos and stationery packages, creating advertising campaigns, long format book or report layouts, packaging projects, poster designs, and typographical compositions among many others. Students are often assigned a client, asked to define an audience, and make appropriate conceptual, imagery, and typographic conclusions. Davis (2005) cautions, "students rarely ask whether the problem is even worth solving, move beyond simple demographics in defining an audience, or explore how the product fits into the audience's culture and everyday lives" (p. 16).   In most U.S. design programs, course projects are planned out during a students' matriculation to culminate in a diverse and well-rounded portfolio in preparation for entry into the job market. Therefore, project's topics and/or clients are those in which the faculty feels would best fill a void within a students' portfolio. Many of these projects do not allow for socially responsible discourse within required classes and therefore students' portfolios do not reflect a cultural significance or self-reflection. Additionally, strict curricular matriculation does not allow students have meaningful exposure to world

literature, science, history, anthropology, politics or other disciplines that unite us in a common culture (Bierut, 1988).

An additional conduit for disconnectedness is the reliance on the computer for creative expression versus the tactile typesetting and paste-ups of the twentieth century. The computer allows instant gratification of a trendy layout—something that looks cool to the student—rather than the process-driven and contextualized meaning found in research and self-reflection. Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery and Taubman (2008) point out that computers can lead us to decontextualize our ways of thinking about the world, which is compounded by cyberspace and new media. Students consider their own autonomous relationship to design on a daily basis in their interaction with the ever-growing customized and personalized nature of social media, gaming, electronics and other interfaces. However, students may not see these design choices as valuable tools within a greater societal lens. Mass customization is just one component of the participatory student who requires engagement with their own identities and experiences (Cope & Kalantzis, 2011). One way to encourage meaning in students work is by allowing them to choose topics for projects of which they have a social, cultural, or personal connection (McCoy, 2003). By exploring the histories of these topics, students can see the contextual interdependencies and subtexts and make analogies to their work in the present (McCoy, 2003). The encouragement of the student to explore his/her own experiences for the basis of creating design works for a broad audience will help to acknowledge a greater connection of socially awareness between the student and society. Integration of such projects into all design courses, not only those specifically earmarked for design for social change, will teach the student that personal connection can be a

21

useful tool in all design media and application. In *Historical Thinking*, Wineburg (2001) states, "before students can see subtexts, they must first believe they exist. In the absence of such beliefs, students simply overlook or do not know how to seek out features designed to shape their perceptions" (p. 76). Until students are told they are allowed to have an opinion in their work—and see the subtexts—they are likely to create the anonymous and forgettable work (Bierut, 2010). We must stop inadvertently training students to ignore their convictions and rather help them clarify their personal values (McCoy, 2003).

Dewey's understanding of the nature of art and the experience of creating art is specifically relevant to higher education at a time when students are becoming increasingly disconnected with the formulation of concepts or ideas (McCoy, 2005). Virtually unlimited access to computer-aided design and image-making technologies has only increased the likelihood that the student will not form an emotional or practical connection to a subject (Bierut, 2010). To recapture the personal connection, Dewey describes pragmatist aesthetics where he asserts the understanding of one's everyday experiences and emotions informs visual expression (Buchanan, 2013; Dewey, 1989; Stroud, 2014).

For Dewey, it is emotion that unifies an experience—it is not something that can be separated—emotion informs the artistic and aesthetic, intellectual, or practical (Buchanan, 2013; Pinar et al., 2008). Hegelian influences are clearly pronounced in Dewey's early work— most specifically found in his belief of dualism between the child and classical nineteenth century curriculum—but are also found in his need for unification of a higher order reality through emotion and a synthesis in experience (Pinar

et al., 2008; Stroud, 2014).

Critics of Dewey's works feel his descriptions and breadth of ideas are so obtuse that they may be misinterpreted (Pinar et al., 2008; Stroud, 2008). His concept of the aesthetic is often criticized as being so wide-ranging that anything can be considered art—however, perhaps this is Dewey's intention. If the experience is individualized and the emotion is true to oneself, then the aesthetic is unique to each person and their epistemology. In this way, the form in which a lived experience and emotion becomes tangible is up to the artist and thus, the aesthetic can be anything within the subjectivities of the individual.

Service Learning

The aims of service-learning, socially responsible design, and critical theory are complimentary as each strives to create spaces for empowerment and change in communities and cultures (Stanton, Giles, & Cruz, 1999). Empowerment in the form of authorship and self-direction is explored in both critical theory and service-learning communities alike. Creating a personal and culturally relevant connection between the student and their work, while at the same time providing real-world client interactions and critique, should be an essential component to any undergraduate design education (Heller, 2005).

Service learning challenges higher education to reconsider its mission to be that of educating students for a life as responsible citizens, rather than educating students solely for a career (Boyer, 1994). Bringle and Hatcher (1996) consider two types of community service, or service learning, students encounter in higher education; extracurricular and curricular. Although extracurricular or experiential service learning opportunities

provide practical, clinical, co-op, or internship experiences, Bringle et al. (1996) argue

that "the learning objectives of these activities typically focus only on extending a

student's professional skills and do not emphasize to the student, either explicitly or

tacitly, the importance of service within the community and lessons of civic

responsibility" (p. 222). Curricular integration of service learning pedagogy, such as

those that exist within socially responsible design curriculum, can provide pathways for a

greater critical dialogue within the experience itself.

An understanding of the appropriate placement of service learning within graphic

design higher education matriculation will be important to achieve academic success with

such pedagogy. Graphic design curriculum suggests working with local non-profits can

provide a valuable resource for design services as well authentic client/designer

experiences for the student (Heller, 2005). A study conducted by Phillips, Bolduc, and

Gallo (2013) questioned the placement of service learning in higher education curricula.

Their findings indicated that no specific curricular conventions exist as to where to place

service learning but did suggest that service learning should consider disciplinary

outcomes or competencies with the department, student development outcomes, and

measures of effectiveness among others (Phillips, Bolduc, & Gallo, 2013). If service

learning is viewed as socially responsible design pedagogy put into practice, the

integration of such curriculum should be at various levels of a students' educational

journey. It will, however, take the initiative of educators and local organizations alike to

find service learning opportunities that coincide with learning objectives of required

coursework.

Critical Theory

Socially responsible design provides pathways for resolving the challenges posted by Horkheimer, Adorno, and Marcuse as critics of both high culture and mass culture exploiting what was once culturally individual as now administered and part of the culture industry—an integral part of capitalist modernity using advertising and mass communications for mass social control (Held, 1980; Kellner, 1989; Meggs, 2006).

By espousing students personal connection to their work and creating pathways for critical understanding of others cultural significance, students can realize the power of design as a shaper of culture and change in order reduce the impact of threatening the authentic experience via consumerism of advanced capitalism (Bronner, 2011). In direct opposition of the culture industry, socially responsible design aims to use graphic design as a tool with the ability inform, affect change, and shape perception (Nakamura, 2006). Galser (2005) further explains the role of design in a critical context, "informing is different than persuading. When one is informed, one is strengthened" (p. 147). In higher education, critical theory allows students to re-write the relationships between self and society, and look beyond how the culture industry has positioned media and technology in a client serving role—the purpose is to empower the student to create works which serve society rather than a client while maintaining the personal connection (Glaser, 2005; McLaren & Giarelli, 1995).

Cultural Individuality & The Authentic Experience

The critical theorists of the Frankfurt School exceled as critics of both high culture and mass culture exploiting what was once culturally individual was now administered thus producing the end of the individual (Held, 1980; Kellner, 1989). The

culture industry strived to appeal to the lowest common denominator in order to

maximize sales and impact by threatening the authentic experience via consumerism of

advanced capitalism (Bronner, 2011).

In perpetuation of the loss of the individual experience, McCoy (2003) explains,

"design education most often trains students to think of themselves as passive arbitrators

of the message between the client/sender and audience/receiver, rather than as advocates

for the message content or audience" (p.7). Graphic design is an instrumental form of

communication and it cannot divorce itself from the world; yet, students are not being

taught that a culturally significant work is just as important as commercially successful

ones (Blauvelt, 2006).

Creating culturally significant, or culturally individual, work supports the

authentic experience of the designer and user. Empowering the student to make personal

and social connections to his/her work will, in turn, support a critical pedagogy in the

classroom (McLaren, 1989). When such work is enabled and encouraged, what

professional designers and students alike create can be viewed as a gift—it can be seen as

an instrument of possibility of affecting our consciousness through empathy and shared

symbolism and experience (Glaser, 2005; McLaren, 1989; Victore, 2012). Freire's

concept of critical pedagogy transitions deep personal meaning within one's cultural

narrative where truth can be negotiated and transformed into the production of knowledge

(Freire, 1985; McLaren, 1993; McLaren, 1999).

In the production of knowledge, allowing students to discover generative themes

that affect their specific lived experiences—read the word and the world—facilitates the

empowerment of all students (Kincheloe, 2008). Articulating the cultural narrative into

visual form allows the student to create art that reflects their lived experience and ultimately allows for shared meaning among fellow students (Freire, 1985; McCoy, 2005). The unifying experience of creating work rooted in personal connection will also provide a vehicle of shared social enterprise where voices of all participants may be heard (Dewey, 1978; McLaren, 1999).

However, critical design thinkers have argued for years for a more critical consciousness in the design field, but this consciousness has yet to become central to the way education and the profession operates (Margolin, 2006). At the core of the issue is the content of the projects professors assign from the very first introductory exercise— these projects typically deal with abstracted form or removal of imagery from context (McCoy, 2003). In this way, the professor is the dictator of form and maintains the power in directing the outcome of the message whether intentional or not (McLaren, 1989). To allow for the authentic experience in the classroom, the student must be allowed to have a voice. McCoy (2003) agrees, "we must stop inadvertently training students to ignore their convictions and be passive economic servants. Instead, we must help them to clarify their personal values and to give them the tools to recognize when it is appropriate to act on them" (p. 8).

Mass Communications & Consumerism

The culture industry was borne during the 1930s as the Institute of Social Research theorists immigrated to the United States during a time of exile (Kellner, 1989). The experiences of Adorno and Horkheimer in California, as well as Marcus and Lowenthal in Washington, were those of engrossment in mass communications, commercial broadcasting systems, and advertising for commercial or political gain. Not

all too different from today, Kellner (1989) explains, "the production and transmission of media spectacles which transmitted ideology and consumerism by means of allegedly 'popular entertainment' and information were, they believed, a central mechanism through which contemporary society came to dominate the individual" (p. 130). The individual has not found a mechanism to make judgments on the personal or social worth of these experiences, whether by way of television or social media, and lacks a set of core values which would enable them to do so (Margolin, 2006).

In higher education, students are trained to use mass communication and media as a vehicle for transmitting a message. However, these same students are not contemplating whether the message is worth transmitting or considering the consequences of such transmissions within a wider social context (McCoy, 2003). The very logic of consumerism itself tends to blind students from a critical literacy or discourse outside of advertisements and becoming better consumers (McLaren, 1989). This is only propagated in the classroom by the vast majority of student design projects dealing with corporate needs, placing a heavy priority on the corporate economic sector of our society (McCoy, 2003). Is this emphasis on corporate design and design for commercial goods in higher education then part of the culture industry itself? With the decline of individual autonomy in the classroom and the administration of ideas in line with popular culture and corporate culture, students are trapped in a culture industry in the higher education classroom— absorbing only what they see as worthy of producing a desired or manipulated response from their audience (Kellner, 1989; McLaren, 1989).

The acceptance of culture industry as the norm for young adults in the 21st century is magnified by the mass illusion of what is called 'reality' in the form of television

shows, social media, and other forms of mass communication (Glaser, 2005; Sparke, 1986). The investigation of one form of media alone, television, portrays news about war, Kim Kardashian's career, global warming, and Geico commercials into events of equal importance resulting in a population that believes nothing is more important than the other (Glaser, 2005). Students are so immersed in the culture industry that they do not have the ability to see past it. In fact, students and consumers alike view the consumption of these messages and material goods as ties that bind us as a society (McCoy, 2003). Higher education must teach students that they have a choice to react to or participate in their circumstances and the life of our times (Glaser, 2005).

Can design for social change and socially responsible design curriculum provide pathways for a greater awareness of one's role in society? Could socially responsible design provide a conduit for critical discourse between students, faculty, and reflection of one's self? What design education can contribute to participatory society is the engaged and aware citizen who understands the ramifications of action and inaction, and is given the option to choose (Bush, 2003).

Summary

Socially responsible design has played a role in both education and professional practice for decades. However, with the widening of the profession and increased expectations for graduates, design schooling is focusing less on citizenship and more on commercially successful projects to fulfill requirements and insure job placement. The relationship between critical theory and the graphic design industry today is more prevalent due to the interconnectedness of user to the products that are designed to be consumed.

The designer, as the creator, has an ethical responsibility to understand the impact the image that is going to be exploited will have—this responsibility is rarely acknowledged (Holland, 2001). Design education must provide pathways for the authentic experience and socially responsible design curriculum may be one such pathway in the right direction.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

Introduction

The purpose of the study was to explore the importance and availability of factors that may influence socially responsible design curriculum in higher education throughout the USA. The following research questions guided the study: 1) What is the importance of socially responsible curriculum as perceived by design educators and 2) What is the availability of socially responsible curriculum as perceived by design educators? Research design, subject selection, instrumentation, data collection, and data analysis are reported in this chapter.

Research Design

A descriptive survey study was conducted to examine the extent to which socially responsible design is integrated into American graphic design higher education curriculum. The study was descriptive in nature, which is generally employed to measure and document the behaviors and characteristics of a group while making descriptions of educational phenomena (Creswell, 2009). Surveys provide a numeric description of a population by studying a sample of that population, while providing an economic and rapid turnaround of data collection (Creswell, 2009). In this study, data from a cross-sectional non-probability sample of graphic design faculty were collected by using a survey questionnaire to answer the research questions (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996). Due to the non-experimental nature of this study, no casual inferences were drawn.

Subject Selection

The participants were members of the American Institute of Graphic Arts (AIGA) with designated AIGA student group advisory status. The AIGA is the oldest and largest professional membership organization for design with 70 chapters and more than 25,000 members (AIGA, 2015). For the purpose of the study, undergraduate design programs were those focusing on graphic design professional practices (e.g., art, graphic design, communication design, communications design, visual communications, visual communication design, or advertising design) and offering degrees in Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Fine Arts, Bachelor of Science, and Bachelor of Environmental Design (AIGA & NASAD, 2007).

An email database of addresses for the student group advisors (n = 200) were obtained from the AIGA national student group coordinator. The AIGA student groups are student subchapters of the professional organization located at colleges and universities throughout the United States (AIGA, 2015). Student group advisors are the faculty members at their respective colleges who serve as leaders and administrators for the AIGA student group chapters. All (n = 200) current student group advisors from the 2014–2015 academic year, within the provided database, were invited to participate in the study. Permission to conduct the study was obtained from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Texas A&M University–Corpus Christi (Appendix A). Consent to participate in the study was obtained from all participants electronically. Data were obtained from 46 AIGA advisers. Two had not signed the consent form and were not included in the study.

Instrumentation

For the purposes of the study, a four-part, 40-item online survey instrument was developed by the researcher (Appendix B). *The Importance and Availability of Socially Responsible Design in Higher Education Survey (IASRD)* was designed and administered to gather data regarding, 1) the participants' teaching institutions, 2) the importance of socially responsible curriculum, using a 4-point Likert-type scaling (4 = very important, 3 = important, 2 = somewhat important, 1 = not important), 3) the availability of socially responsible curriculum, using a 4-point Likert-type scaling (4 = often, 3 = sometimes, 2 = seldom, 1 = never), and 4) the participants' selected demographic data. The items defining the importance and availability portion of the survey were derived by the researcher from the review of the related literature (Davis, 2005a; Heller, 2005; McCoy, 2003; Meggs, 2006; Swanson, 2005).

A panel of five experts in the field was employed to examine the content validity of the instrument and the feedback was used to modify the survey. The experts included professors with research and teaching experience in socially responsible design and professional designers who worked in the discipline of socially responsible design within their professional practice. Based on the feedback, wording of three items was edited and the demographic section was expanded.

The online survey was pilot-tested to examine its utility. Specifically, eight individuals, who were current faculty members at U.S. higher education institutions not listed in the AIGA advisor database, completed the survey and their input was used to refine the instrument. The study's data were used to estimate the reliability of the IASRD's scale scores. The coefficient alpha for the 12-item importance scale and the 9-

item availability scale were .81 and .77, respectively, attesting to the internal consistency of the scales.

The following demographic data that were collected to describe the participants were age, gender, ethnicity, current occupation within the institution, socially responsible experiences in personal education, years of teaching experience, professional work experience relating to socially responsible design, and total number of design faculty in the undergraduate program. The examination of background information was necessary in order to identify possible characteristics and factors contributing to significant differences in levels of socially responsible curricular integration (DeGraw, 1984).

Institutional data included geographical region of the institution, title of the department, undergraduate degrees offered, degrees or tracks specifically in socially responsible design, and required or elective curriculum in socially responsible design that appeared in the institution's catalog. Additionally, participants were asked to report information regarding their personal course load at their current teaching institution and the integration of socially responsible design projects, topics, and graded activity in their courses.

Data Collection

The data were collected via an on-line questionnaire. Data collection began on June 6, 2015 by sending the first email (Appendix E) to all potential respondents, describing the study and researcher, how they were selected, and inviting them to participate by completing the online survey. The second email (Appendix E) was sent on June 20, 2015 and was personalized by greeting the recipient individually. This email also invited the educators to participate by completing the online survey. Of the 200

AIGA faculty advisors who were invited to participate, 44 (22.00%) completed the online survey.

Data Analysis

The raw data were exported into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) that was employed for the purpose of data analysis. Data checking was done to check for coding/entry errors (Field, 2013). Descriptive statistics were used to organize, analyze, and summarize the data. Frequency and percentage distribution tables, as well as appropriate measures of central tendency and variability were reported. Skew coefficient was used to examine the normality of the data; positive and negative coefficients imply positively and negatively skewed distributions, respectively, and values around zero suggest that the distribution does not depart from normality (Field, 2013). For the skewed distributions, the median was reported as the most appropriate measure of central tendency (Field, 2013).

A scale score for each of the IASRD factors was computed, using the mean of the participants' responses to the items defining the factor. Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha was employed to estimate the internal consistency/reliability of the scale scores. Specifically, $\alpha = [k / k - 1] [1 - (\Sigma\sigma_i^2 / \sigma_x^2)]$, where k is the number of items on the tests, σ_i^2 is the variance of the item i, and σ_x^2 is the total test variance (sum of the variances plus twice the sum of the covariance of all possible parts of its components, that is, $\sigma_x^2 = \Sigma\sigma_i^2 + 2\Sigma\sigma_{ij}$) was used to compute the reliability coefficient, which may range from 0.00 to 1.00 (Crocker & Algina, 1986).

At the item level, the Wilcoxon Signed-Ranks Test, which is used to compare two sets of scores from the same participants, was used to compare the importance and

availability of the IASRD's items. The test is analogous to t-test for correlated samples. Data should be at least ordinal. When the sample size is large, approximate Z is used (Field, 2013). Effect size was computed as, $r = Z / \sqrt{N}$, where N is the total umber of observations, and was characterized as .1 = small effect, .3 = medium effect, .5 = large effect (Field, 2013).

At the scale level, t-test for Correlated Samples was used to compare the total importance and availability scores for the factors that may influence socially responsible design curriculum in higher education (Field, 2013). The mean difference effect size (Cohen's d) was used to examine the practical significance of the findings and was characterized as .2 = small effect, .5 = medium effect, and .8 = large effect (Cohen, 1988). To compute the Cohen's d, mean difference was divided by the standard deviation of the mean difference.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of the study was to explore the importance and availability of factors

that may influence socially responsible design curriculum in higher education throughout

the U.S. in a non-probability sample of concerned educators. The study was descriptive

in nature; no hypothesis was tested and no causal inferences were drawn.

Profile of the Subjects

All American Institute of Graphic Arts (AIGA) student group advisors ($n = 200$)

were invited to participate in the study, of which 44 (22.00%) completed the online

survey questionnaire. There was a fairly even response rate among male (47.70%) and

female (52.30%) respondents, while the majority was Caucasian (81.80%) and either an

assistant professor (32.60%) or associate professor (25.60%). Results are summarized in

Table 1.

Table 1

Profile of Subjects, Categorical Variables, n = 44

Variable		f	%
Gender	Male	21	47.70
	Female	23	52.30
Ethnicity	Caucasian	36	83.70
	Latino or Hispanic	4	9.30
	Asian or Pacific Islander	1	2.30
	Other	2	4.70
Occupation	Visiting Instructor	8	18.60
	Assistant Professor	14	32.60
	Associate Professor	11	25.60
	Full Professor	6	14.00
	Department Chair	3	7.00
	Dean	1	2.30

The participants ranged in age from 28 to 66 years (*Mean* = 43.47, *Median* =

42.00, *SD* = 10.74). Years of professional experience ranged from 2 to 30 (*Mean* =

12.13, *Median* = 7.70, *SD* = 7.70). Both distributions were positively skewed; thus, it is

recommended to use the median as the most appropriate measures of tendency for these

two variables. Results are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2

Profile of Subjects, Continuous Variables, n = 44

Characteristic	Mean	Median	SD	Skew Coefficient	Missing
Age	43.47	42.00	10.74	.51	3
Years of Experience	12.13	7.70	7.70	.54	3

The majority of respondents had personal experience in creating socially

responsible design works as a professional (81.80%) but did not take any courses in

socially responsible design during their undergraduate education (84.10%). Less than

half took courses in socially responsible design during their graduate education (40.90%).

When asked if they felt their institution does enough to emphasize socially responsible

principles or practices within the curriculum, the majority said no (70.50%) and nearly all

(90.90%) reported they would like to personally teach/integrate more socially responsible

principles/projects in their courses, given the chance. Results are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3

Profile of Subject's Experience with Socially Responsible Design, n = 44

Variable			f	%
Professional experience creating	Yes		36	81.80
socially responsible design	No		8	18.20
Took courses in socially responsible	Yes		7	15.90
design as undergraduate student	No		37	84.10
Took courses in socially responsible	Yes		18	40.90
design as graduate student	No		26	59.10
Feel your institution does enough to	Yes		13	29.50
emphasize socially responsible	No		31	70.50
principles/practices				
Would personally like to	Yes		40	90.90
teach/integrate more socially	No		3	6.80
responsible principles/practices given				
the chance				

Profile of the Institutions

The 44 respondents represented 42 institutions of higher learning in the United

States. The regions were represented as follows: Mid-Atlantic ($n = 7$), South East ($n =$

8), Southwest ($n = 5$), West ($n = 3$), North West ($n = 1$), and Mid-West ($n = 18$).

Participants were asked a series of questions regarding their teaching institution,

namely, the name of the department, degree granted within the department, degree(s) or

elective course(s) offered in socially responsible design, the total number of faculty in the

department, and the total number of courses undergraduate students may take in socially

responsible design during their matriculation.

The departmental classification reported the most was Graphic Design (43.20%), offering a B.F.A. (68.20%) degree. An astonishing majority of the respondents reported their institution did not have a degree or track specifically in socially responsible design (93.20%). Additionally, the majority of the institutions neither required courses in socially responsible design (70.5%) nor offered elective courses in socially responsible design (61.4%). A summary of results is in Table 4.

Table 4

Profile of Respondents' Institutions, n = 44

Variable		f	%
Title of department	Advertising	1	2.30
	Art	5	11.40
	Communication Design	4	9.10
	Graphic Design	19	43.20
	Visual Comm.	7	15.90
	Other	8	19.20
Undergraduate	B.A.	16	36.40
degrees offered	B.F.A	30	68.20
	B.E.D.	0	0
	B.S	5	11.40
	Other	9	20.50
Degree or track	Yes	3	6.80
specifically in socially	No	41	93.20
responsible design			
Any required courses	Yes	10	22.70
specifically in socially	No	31	70.50
responsible design	I don't know	3	6.80
Any elective courses	Yes	17	38.60
specifically in socially	No	27	61.40
responsible design	I don't know	0	0

Of the total number of courses in an institutions' undergraduate program, an average of 2.21 (*Median* = 1.00, *SD* = 3.15) courses in socially responsible design was available to students. Of those courses, an average of 1.20 was required (*Median* = 1.00, *SD* = .79) and 2.35 was elective (*SD* = 2.26). However, there was a higher number of institutions that integrated socially responsible projects or graded activity into other courses (*Mean* = 3.34, *Median* = 3.00, *SD* = 3.54). Within a faculty's personal course load, an average of 2.05 (*Median* = 2.00, *SD* = 1.93) courses integrated socially responsible projects or graded activities. As can be seen in Table 5, all distributions were positively skewed. Thus, it is recommended to use the median as the most appropriate measure of central tendency.

Table 5

Profile of the Institutions, n = 44

Characteristic	Mean	Median	SD	Skew Coefficient	Missing
Total number of courses relating to social responsibility a student will have the opportunity to take	2.21	1.00	3.15	1.96	2
Courses required in socially responsible design	1.20	1.00	0.79	1.30	34
Elective courses available in socially responsible design	2.35	2.00	2.26	2.73	27
Courses that integrate socially responsible topics or graded activity	3.34	3.00	3.54	1.65	3

Table 5 continued

Characteristic	Mean	Median	SD	Skew Coefficient	Missing
Courses that integrate socially responsible topics or graded activity in faculty's personal load	2.05	2.00	1.93	1.82	1

To answer research question 1 (What is the importance of socially responsible curriculum as perceived by design educators?), participants were asked to complete the 12-item Importance of Socially Responsible Design in Higher Education Survey, using a 4-point Likert-type scaling (4 = very important, 3 = important, 2 = somewhat important, 1 = not important). The reliability coefficient for the importance scale was .81. Results are summarized in Table 6.

Table 6

Frequency and Percentage Distributions of Participants' Responses to the Importance of Socially Responsible Design in Higher Education Survey, n = 44

Items	Response	f	%
Personally offer socially responsible project per course	Very Important	19	43.20
	Important	19	43.20
	Somewhat Important	5	11.40
	Not Important	1	2.30
Department offer sustainable printing practices	Very Important	10	22.70
	Important	11	25.00
	Somewhat Important	14	31.80
	Not Important	9	20.50
Personally allow student to choose topic based on personal experience	Very Important	22	50.00
	Important	13	29.50
	Somewhat Important	9	20.50
	Not Important	0	0

Table 6 continued

Items	Response	f	%
Dept. offer dedicated courses in socially responsible design	Very Important	6	13.60
	Important	13	29.50
	Somewhat Important	15	34.10
	Not Important	10	22.70
Dept. allow/encourage students to work with non-profits	Very Important	13	29.50
	Important	15	34.10
	Somewhat Important	11	25.00
	Not Important	5	11.40
Personally allow/encourage students to work with non-profits	Very Important	23	52.30
	Important	15	34.10
	Somewhat Important	4	9.10
	Not Important	2	4.50
Personally encourage inclusion of socially responsible projects in portfolio	Very Important	20	45.50
	Important	19	43.20
	Somewhat Important	4	9.10
	Not Important	1	2.30
Dept. to teach role of design as shaper of change/culture	Very Important	19	43.20
	Important	14	31.80
	Somewhat Important	8	18.20
	Not Important	3	6.80
Personally to teach role of design as shaper of change/culture	Very Important	37	84.10
	Important	6	13.60
	Somewhat Important	1	2.30
	Not Important	0	0
Dept. include socially responsible topics into design courses	Very Important	10	22.70
	Important	12	27.30
	Somewhat Important	13	29.50
	Not Important	8	18.20
Dept. have access to travel abroad opportunities	Very Important	13	29.50
	Important	11	25.00
	Somewhat Important	12	27.30
	Not Important	8	18.20

The 12 items were ranked from the highest to the lowest on the basis of the mean of the respondents' responses. The highest mean showed that the participants felt teaching the role of graphic design as a shaper of change/culture was the most important (*Mean* = 3.82). The lowest mean indicated that the participants felt offering dedicated courses in socially responsible design was the least important to their department (*Mean* = 2.34). The overall mean score was 2.98 (*SD* = .52). Results are summarized in Table 7.

Table 7

Participant's Ranking of Importance of Socially Responsible Design Survey, n = 44

Level of Importance	Mean*
Personally teach the role of design as shaper of change/culture	3.82
Personally allow/encourage work with non-profits	3.34
Personally encourage inclusion of socially responsible projects in portfolio	3.32
Personally allow student to choose topics based on personal experiences	3.30
Personally offer at least one project per course in socially responsible design	3.27
Department teach the role of design as shaper of change/culture	3.11
Department allow/encourage work with non-profits	2.82
Department provide study abroad opportunities	2.66
Department include socially responsible topics into design courses	2.56
Department to include sustainable printing practices into courses	2.50
Department to include socially responsible topics into design courses	2.50
Department to offer dedicated course in socially responsible design	2.34

* 4 = very important, 3 = important, 2 = somewhat important, 1 = not important

To answer research question 2 (What is the availability of socially responsible curriculum as perceived by design educators?), participants were asked to complete the 9-item Availability of Socially Responsible Design in Higher Education Survey, using a 4-

point Likert-type scaling (4 = often, 3 = sometimes, 2 = seldom, 1 = never). The

reliability coefficient for the availability scale was .77. Results are summarized in

Table 8.

Table 8

Frequency and Percentage Distributions of Participants' Responses to the Availability of
Socially Responsible Design in Higher Education Survey, n = 44

Items	Response	f	%
Availability of courses that allow projects in socially responsible design	Often	21	47.70
	Sometimes	16	36.40
	Seldom	4	9.10
	Never	1	2.30
	Missing	2	9.10
Availability of courses that allow sustainable printing practices	Often	10	22.70
	Sometimes	18	40.90
	Seldom	9	20.50
	Never	5	11.90
	Missing	2	4.0
Availability of courses that allow students to choose topics based on personal experience	Often	20	45.50
	Sometimes	14	31.80
	Seldom	7	15.90
	Never	1	2.30
	Missing	2	4.50
Availability of dedicated courses focusing on socially responsible design exclusively	Often	2	4.50
	Sometimes	12	27.30
	Seldom	20	45.50
	Never	8	18.20
	Missing	2	4.20
Available opportunities for students to work with non-profits on design projects	Often	9	20.50
	Sometimes	24	54.50
	Seldom	8	18.20
	Never	1	2.30
	Missing	2	4.50
Availability of socially responsible projects for inclusion in graduating portfolio	Often	13	29.50
	Sometimes	19	43.20
	Seldom	8	18.20
	Never	2	4.50
	Missing	2	4.60

Table 8 continued

Items	Response	f	%
Availability of learning the role of graphic design as shaper of change/culture	Often	14	31.80
	Sometimes	17	38.60
	Seldom	10	22.70
	Never	1	2.30
	Missing	2	4.60
Availability of socially responsible topics in undergraduate courses	Often	7	15.90
	Sometimes	19	43.20
	Seldom	12	27.30
	Never	4	9.10
	Missing	2	4.50
Availability of travel aboard opportunities	Often	13	29.50
	Sometimes	12	27.30
	Seldom	13	29.50
	Never	4	9.50
	Missing	2	4.20

The nine availability items were ranked from the highest to the lowest on the basis of the mean of the respondents' responses. The highest mean reflected the availability of courses that allow the professor to offer a project(s) relating to socially responsible design (*Mean* = 3.36). The lowest mean belonged to the availability of dedicated courses in socially responsible design (*Mean* = 2.19). The overall mean score was 2.90 (*SD* = .50). Results are summarized in Table 9.

Table 9

Participant's Ranking of Availability of Socially Responsible Design Survey, n = 44

Level of Availability	Mean*
Courses that allow professors to offer project(s) in socially responsible design	3.36
Allow the student to choose topics based on personal experiences	3.26
Learn the role of graphic design as shaper of change/culture	3.05
Socially responsible projects for inclusion in graduating portfolio	3.02
Students to work with non-profits or charities for design projects	2.98
Travel abroad opportunities	2.81
Courses that allow sustainable practices to be taught	2.79
Socially responsible topics in undergraduate design courses	2.69
Dedicated courses (required or elective) in socially responsible design	2.19

* 4 = often, 3 = sometimes, 2 = seldom, 1 = never

Comparison of Importance and Availability Results

Importance and availability of socially responsible curricula participant responses to the IASRD were compared, using the Wilcoxon Signed-Ranks Test, which is used to compare two sets of ordinal scores from the same participants (Field, 2013). The level of significance was set, a priori, at .05. To determine the practical significance of the findings, z-to-r transformation was employed to compute the effect sizes (.1 = small effect, .3 = medium effect, .5 = large effect).

The difference between the importance to the faculty members that their programs teach the role of graphic design in society as a shaper of change/culture and the availability of students to learn the role of design as shaper of change/culture was statistically significant and the effect size was .46, showing that the availability score was lower than the importance score. The importance score for the faculty member allowing students to work with local nonprofits was higher than the availability score, the

difference was statistically significant, and the effect size was .22. Additionally, the

importance of including socially responsible projects in graduating portfolios was

significantly higher than its availability and the effect size was .21. The other pairwise

comparisons were not statistically significant. Additionally, the difference between the

overall importance score (*Mean* = 2.98, *SD* = .52) and availability score (*Mean* = 2.90,

SD = .50) was not statistically significant, $t(41)$ = .94, p = .35, and the effect size was low

(Cohen's d = .14). Results are summarized in Table 10.

Table 10

Comparison of Importance and Availability of IASRD Items (n = 44)

Item	Importance Mean[a]	Availability Mean[a]	Z[b]	Effect Size[c]
Offering at least 1 project per course relating to socially responsible design	3.27	3.36	0.37	0.04
Incorporating sustainable printing practices	2.50	2.79	1.48	0.16
Allowing the student to choose the topics of projects based on personal experiences	3.30	3.26	0.15	0.02
The department offering dedicated courses relating to socially responsible design	2.34	2.19	0.99	0.11
Faculty member allowing students to work with local nonprofits	3.34	2.98	2.09*	0.22
Including socially responsible projects in graduating portfolios	3.32	3.02	1.97*	0.21
The program teaching the role of graphic design in society as a shaper of change/culture	3.82	3.05	4.34*	0.46
The department including socially responsible topics into courses	2.50	2.69	0.62	0.07
Study abroad opportunities	2.66	2.81	0.72	0.07

[a] Scaling for importance and availability, respectively: 4 = very important, 3 = important, 2 = somewhat important, 1 = not important. 4 = often, 3 = sometimes, 2 = seldom, 1 = never. Mean scores are reported for the ease of interpretation. Data were ordinal in nature.
[b] As calculated by the Wilcoxon Signed-Ranks Test
[c] Effect size computed by *r*, 0.1 = small, 0.3 = medium, 0.5 = large
* $p < .05$

Summary of the Results

At the item level, there were three statistically significant differences between the importance and availability scores. However, there were no statistically significant differences between the overall importance and availability scores. The terms which best described the importance and availability of the factors that may influence socially responsible design curriculum in higher education were "important" and "sometimes."

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND DISCUSSION

Introduction

The descriptive survey study explored the extent to which socially responsible design is integrated into U.S. graphic design higher education curriculum by considering the importance and availability of factors. Within graphic design programs in the United States, overall, design schooling has not helped students become broader-thinking people who can help shape a democratic society (Swanson, 2005). Higher education design programs must see design as a conduit for and a shaper of culture (Davis, 2005a; McCoy, 2003; Swanson, 2005). Socially responsible design curriculum provides pathways for personal connection, understanding of others cultural lens, and ultimately affords students a way to reduce the threat to the authentic experience (Bronner, 2011).

Critical theorists describe the loss of the individual in the culture industry perpetuated consumerism and commercialization—the removal of context and individuality from the work of art/design to serve only as a transmitter of a message void of context or cultural significance. The present day profession of graphic design continues to struggle with reconciling the grey area concerning the purpose of the profession—to serve the client or the public—and the question of whether both can be accomplished at the same time (Glaser, 2005). In direct opposition of the culture industry, socially responsible design aims to use graphic design as a tool with the ability inform, affect change, and shape perception (Nakamura, 2006).

In the review of literature, it is notable that publications surrounding socially responsible design education and graphic design education curriculum are somewhat

51

limited to seminal works and do not provide a breath of current research in the field. Since 2005, the extent of design criticism has focused mainly on professional practice with the exception of curricular conventions via quantitative studies. This allows for new research in the field and a void to be filled. The research and data collected in this study provide a starting point for future discussion on socially responsible curriculum.

The descriptive study was conducted to document factors that may influence socially responsible design curriculum in U.S. higher education.

The Importance and Availability of Socially Responsible Design in Higher Education Survey (IASRD) was to used to document such factors. The study was guided by Critical Theory and the following research questions:

1. What is the importance of factors influencing socially responsible curriculum as perceived by design educators?

2. What is the availability of factors influencing socially responsible curriculum as perceived by design educators?

The results may assist graphic design higher education administration and faculty by providing quantitative results to support a need for socially responsible curriculum as well as national groups such as The American Institute of Graphic Arts (AIGA) and the National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD).

Summary of Results

There were 44 faculty who participated in the study which represented 42 unique higher educations institutions across the United States. Graphic Design (43.20%) was the most frequently reported departmental classification offering a B.F.A. (68.20%) degree. A majority of the respondents reported their institution did not have a degree or track

52

specifically in socially responsible design (93.20%). Additionally, the majority of the

institutions neither required courses in socially responsible design (70.5%) nor offered

elective courses in socially responsible design (61.4%).

When asked if the participants felt their institution does enough to emphasize

socially responsible principles or practices within the curriculum, the majority said no

(70.50%) and nearly all (90.90%) reported they would like to personally teach/integrate

more socially responsible principles/projects in their courses, given the chance.

Faculty ranked the importance of 12 IASRD factors contributing to socially

responsible design curriculum. The highest mean showed that the participants felt

teaching the role of graphic design as a shaper of change/culture was the most important

(*Mean* = 3.82).   The lowest mean indicated that the participants felt offering dedicated

courses in socially responsible design was the least important to their department (*Mean*

= 2.34).   Participants also ranked the availability of 9 IASRD factors contributing to

socially responsible design curriculum. The highest mean reflected the availability of

courses that allow the professor to offer a project(s) relating to socially responsible

design (*Mean* = 3.36). The lowest mean belonged to the availability of dedicated courses

in socially responsible design (*Mean* = 2.19).

At the scale level, three pairwise comparisons were statistically significant. The

difference between the importance to the faculty members that their programs teach the

role of graphic design in society as a shaper of change/culture, and the availability of

students to learn the role of design as shaper of change/culture a significant and the effect

size was .46, showing that the availability score was lower than the importance score.

The importance score for the faculty member allowing students to work with local

nonprofits was higher than the availability score, the difference was statistically

significant, and the effect size was .22. Additionally, the importance of including

socially responsible projects in graduating portfolios was significantly higher than its

availability and the effect size was .21. The other pairwise comparisons were not

statistically significant.

Conclusions

At the item level, there were three statistically significant differences between the

importance and availability scores. However, there were no statistically significant

differences between the overall importance and availability scores. The terms which best

described the importance and availability of the factors that may influence socially

responsible design curriculum in higher education were "important" and "sometimes."

Discussion

This section explores the three significant pairwise comparisons found in the

study. In the following discussion, each of these is reviewed in relation to critical theory

and higher education practices. The difference in the importance and availability of the

following will be discussed: *programs teach the role of graphic design in society as a*

shaper of change/culture, allowing students to work with local nonprofits, and *the*

inclusion socially responsible projects in graduating portfolios.

Programs Teach the Role of Graphic Design in Society as a Shaper of Change/Culture

As evidenced in the review of literature, it is an unfortunate—yet widely

accepted—understanding that present day graphic design higher education programs in

the United States prepare students to be commercially successful, employable, and a jack-

of-all-trades—master of none—in the workforce. After all, students enroll in colleges or universities with the understanding that the curriculum they are presented with will undoubtedly lead to a job at the end of their four to five-year matriculation. But what students do not expect, or demand, is an education filled with critical thinking, questioning, and cultural context. In fact, students often view this curriculum as a waste of time or delay to getting to the 'real world' application of projects or the digital computer making of the assignment. According to Heller (2005) and McCoy (2005) what is lacking for undergraduate students is a belief that design is more than a visual communication tool to convey a marketing strategy to a targeted audience. The belief that design can move society in a new direction—create a divergence—look at something in a new way (Irwin, 2003). The unfortunate piece of design education is the curriculum and faculty who perpetuate the culture industry within the nearly 2,000 programs themselves. Whether by choice or consequence, the so-called 'tools' students are provided to complete a vast, yet particular, set of commercially successful portfolio projects leads the student to believe that those which employ are the most powerful.

Socially responsible design curriculum provides opportunities for dialogue, critical personal reflection, and the consideration of cultural context. All of which help students define themselves in larger social and cultural forms (McLaren, 1989). A challenge in higher education, however, is how to achieve the objectivity and consistency of professional projects without completely removing the individual and critical context (McCoy, 2003).

The most significant finding in the IASRD the was difference between the importance to the faculty members that their programs teach the role of graphic design in

55

society as a shaper of change/culture and the availability of students to learn the role of design as shaper of change/culture with the availability score lower than the importance score. In fact, 97.70% of participants ranked the importance of this item as 'very important' or 'important.' However, most participants felt that teaching the role of graphic design in society as a shaper of change/culture was not available to students. This unavailability could be due to several factors. First, the survey revealed that 70.50% of participants felt their institution did not do enough to emphasize socially responsible principles/practices even though 90.90% would personally like to teach/integrate more socially responsible principles/practices given the chance. It is apparent that faculty did not feel supported by their institutions to teach or integrate more socially responsible curriculum which could attribute to their feelings of socially responsible design simply not being as available as they felt it should be.

Secondly, the IASRD asked the participants about the availability of a degree track or major in socially responsible design specifically at their institution as well as the availability of elective or required courses with this focus. Nearly 93% said that there was no specific degree or track in socially responsible design, 70.20% with no required courses available in socially responsible design, and 61.40% with no elective courses. The lack of a specific track or coursework in design for social change could have contributed to participants feeling that socially responsible design was unavailable to their students.

However, it is interesting that when asked the number of courses that integrate socially responsible in their personal load, the median was only 2 courses. Of the 44 participants, 39 were in a full-time teaching positions, according to the survey.

Typically, full-time teaching positions require faculty to teach between 3 to 5 studios/courses per semester thus attributing to 6 to 10 studios/courses per year. Even though 90.90% of the faculty participants agreed they would like to personally integrate more socially responsible coursework into their personal load, of the 6 to 10 courses taught each year, a median of only 2 courses are actually integrating socially responsible topics. Perhaps it is the faculty that need to feel empowered and supported to follow their personal beliefs that the addition of socially responsible design curriculum is essential to a students undergraduate career.

Perhaps the lack of socially responsible design curriculum in the participant's own undergraduate career also contributes to the lacking of integrating socially responsible topics into courses. The ISARD revealed that only 15.90% of participants had experiences with socially responsible design as an undergraduate themselves, whereas 40.90% did as graduate students. It is likely that the participants felt the higher order thinking and critical reflection required for socially responsible design topics and projects should be reserved for graduate work, similar to their own personal experiences.

Allowing Students to Work with Local Nonprofits

The client-designer relationship is a valuable lesson to learn during a student's undergraduate education. Without an internship or industry-related job during a students matriculation, most will not truly understand the industry pitfalls and processes that may/should occur. In most undergraduate design studio courses, students are assigned a mock client by their professor to lead the creative direction for the project. In this case, the graphic designer acts as the neutral transmitter of the client's messages where clarity

and objectivity are the goal—this perpetuates the myth of universal, value-free design of the apolitical designer (McCoy, 2003).

One way to accomplish cultural relevancy, yet account for the necessary client learned experiences, is incorporating service-learning into design projects. Service-learning, much like socially responsible design, aims to empower both students and communities for social justice and change (Stanton et al., 1999). Working with local non-profits as the clients in the higher education design classroom satisfies this need.

In the IASRD survey, 86.40% of participants felt personally encouraging/allowing students to work with nonprofits was 'very important' or 'important.' However, 78.00% of participants felt that these experiences were only 'seldom available' or simply 'not available' to students. This could be due to many contributing factors.

The literature review did not reveal specific studies linking graphic design in higher education to service learning and therefore this could indicate an area for future research. It is possible that faculty and departments need to better understand the value of service learning and the ways in which an undergraduate's skillset can be used to engage and impact their communities. Although the data indicated over 86% of participants felt working with non-profits was valuable, the data does not imply to what extent the participant has tried to integrate such pedagogical techniques. It is possible that the communities the participants teach within are not aware of such partnership opportunities and therefore do not seek out faculty or department assistance in establishing these relationships. It is also possible that the faculty themselves simply do

not have the community connections garner needed support for service learning opportunities in their classrooms.

Additionally, if the colleges and universities the participants teach within do not have a service learning initiative, as do many public 4-year institutions, it is likely they are following preset curricular conventions that indicate studio projects paired with specified learning outcomes. These projects, as revealed in the literature review, are those surrounding portfolio-building works and may not align specifically with service learning initiatives. Unless the faculty member is given the autonomy to rewrite the requirements or graded activity in such courses, it is likely that socially responsible projects, which could include service learning projects, may not be integrated unless specifically requested or required.

The Inclusion Socially Responsible Projects in Graduating Portfolios

The portfolio is a visual representation of a students' body of work and skillset that should be used in the interview process to showcase ways the student can contribute to the employers business. Most well rounded portfolios consist of 15 to 20 works exhibiting a wide range of media—from print 2D design works on paper to interactive user-interface multi-media projects. 'Well rounded' is typically what most design programs hope to achieve in their graduates (Heller, 2005)—an array of commercial projects that typically includes; logo design, brochure, magazine, or publication design, advertising design, packaging design, poster design, app design, website design, and environmental design among many others. The above projects are used to put into practice a learned skill in a particular design course and later refined, most often in a capstone portfolio course, to be included in the graduates printed or online portfolio.

Most often, the projects included in the students' portfolios are commercially aligned to produce as real-to-industry results as possible. The point being that a potential employer will appreciate the likeness to his/her business displayed in the work exhibited. It is easy to understand why socially responsible design projects are too often omitted from students' portfolios as only a small, yet growing, percentage of corporate businesses create work themselves in this arena as discussed in the review of literature.

Interestingly, 88.70% of participants felt it was 'very important' or 'important' to encourage socially responsible projects in graduating portfolios, however, most felt this was not available to students. One reason the participants may have felt the inclusion of such projects in portfolios was not available is the obvious lack of curriculum surrounding socially responsible design at their institutions. With little to no elective courses or required courses in socially responsible design—the median was only 1 course when asked *how many courses relating to socially responsible design a students would have the opportunity to take during their matriculation* on the IASRD—perhaps students simply do not have the projects to showcase such work in a portfolio.

Additionally, faculty are concerned with their students employability, which is why so many commercial projects are created in courses and reflected in portfolios, then, it is likely the lack of knowing what professional practice is looking for in a current portfolio is to blame. As discussed in the review of literature, 70% of consumers surveyed in a study by CSR has reported social responsibility was important to them when choosing a product or service (Singh et al., 2012). A shift toward conscious capitalism is on the rise as corporations and business respond to consumers demand. The transmission of this important information to faculty and administration may help to

further emphasize the need for higher education curriculum that incorporates socially responsible principles and practices within commercially driven projects. This is an area for further research.

Implications

The study was conducted to explore the importance and availability of factors that may influence socially responsible design curriculum in U.S. higher education. While there has been much critical writing on the graphic design industry itself, little critical exploration of design education has been published. Furthermore, there have been no studies found that investigated how socially responsible design is integrated into U.S. higher education curriculum. The results of this study revealed how the importance and availability of factors influence faculty and students in teaching and learning socially responsible design principles and practices today and may serve as a baseline for future research.

The IASRD revealed three statistically significant comparisons of importance and availability for socially responsible design curriculum; the importance versus the availability for programs to teach the role of graphic design in society as a shaper of change/culture, the importance versus the availability for allowing students to work with local nonprofits, and the importance versus the availability for the inclusion socially responsible projects in graduating portfolios. Each of these has the potential to provide a more critical dialogue in the classroom with the inclusion of culturally significant and self-reflective processes.

The study reveled that the majority of participants felt that socially responsible design curriculum was not only important, but they would like to integrate these concepts into their own curriculum given the chance. However, it is clear that these faculty, represented by 42 unique institutions across the United States, did not feel their specific institutions supported such implementation or they did not have the necessary tools needed to integrate and make available socially responsible design principles and practices found in the survey.

Another area to consider is self-efficacy among design faculty. As cited in the literature review, faculty have autonomy in developing curriculum that supports learning outcomes in higher education classrooms. The extent to which faculty believe in their own ability, regardless of departmental support, may affect whether they attempt to incorporate socially responsible principles or practices in their courses. Since less than 16% of participants themselves had undergraduate experiences in socially responsible design, the lack of personal confidence in the pedagogy needed to support socially responsible curriculum could be a critical factor influencing attitudes toward availability in all areas of the IASRD.

With such a likeminded population of educators, perhaps the results of the IASRD can be used in coordination with the AIGA to advocate for additional support of socially responsible curriculum. The Design Educators Community (DEC), within the AIGA, works to publish and hold conferences on issues concerning design education in the United States. The results of the study can provide a baseline for further research within the DEC to explore ways to support faculty training, program development and

implementation and discussion with school administration of socially responsible principles and practices.

Additionally, the study provides quantitative data on the number of degree tracks specifically in socially responsible design, required courses, elective courses, and general courses that integrate socially responsible curricula. These results will be useful to track the progress or regression of socially responsible curriculum over the next decade.

As a shift in the profession toward a more conscious and sustainable business practice grows, the IASRD can be utilized in the future to gauge if curricular shifts also occur. The review of literature revealed that design curriculum tends to imitate the trends and needs of professional practice; therefore, the results can serve as a baseline for future research in this area.

Recommendations for Further Research

The limitations of the study offer opportunities for further research. Due to non-probability nature of sampling, external validity was limited to study participants. To expand the generalizability of the results, the researcher recommends: 1) expanding the population of participants beyond AIGA design educator members to include design educators currently employed in U.S. higher education institutions presently teaching in a graphic design program; 2) examining the perception of program/department administrators specifically; and 3) comparing the responses from the program/department administrators with those of design faculty. Further investigation in these areas may be useful in better understanding why the participants in the current study perceived many factors as being unavailable. It will also allow connections between program/departmental attitudes and faculty attitudes to be made that are likely to assist in

a constructive conversation considering the best ways to move forward with incorporation and implementation of socially responsible design principles in higher education undergraduate programs.

Additionally, the study found the importance score for the faculty member allowing students to work with local nonprofits was higher than the availability score, the difference was statistically significant, and the effect size was .22. In further investigation of what it means to work with socially responsible community projects, the benefits of service-learning were revealed including students' critical thinking about social issues to help them uncover the complexity and multidimensionality of social problems (Batchelder & Root, 1994). Within higher education, service-learning has been found to increase reasoning, logic, confidence, and leadership (Prentice & Robinson, 2010). Further research in this area will provide pedagogies to overcome the oppressive nature of schooling as defined in critical theory (McLaren, 1989) and allow a broader context for socially responsible design practices in higher education.

Lastly, many participants expressed interest in being contacted for further research in this area. A future qualitative or mixed methods study with these participants may provide a deeper understanding of faculty sentiment toward socially responsible design, departmental support, and uncover what is holding back higher education from greater implementation of socially responsible design principles and practices.2

Final Remarks

Richardson said it best (2005), "we often look, but we just don't see; we listen, but we just don't hear" (p. 229). Not only must we pay particular attention to serving our students in preparation for a successful career, but we must also provide them with the

tools to truly see and hear the world in which they exist. Higher education design

programs must teach design as a conduit for and a shaper of culture and create pathways

for meaningful connections between the student and their work. Socially responsible

design principles and practices allow the understanding of ones ontology within a greater

social context and open new possibilities for critical discussion and meaning making with

a students' work.

The research presented in this study provided the perspectives of faculty members

who obviously see value in socially responsible design education yet feel that it is simply

not as available to their students as they would like. As it can be difficult in higher

education to add a specific track or degree plan in a timely manner, faculty may lack the

necessary tools to integrate socially responsible principles and practices in their current

course load in a meaningful way. The results obtained from the IASRD will hopefully

provide a springboard for discussion with the AIGA and NASAD to provide faculty

support with such integration and training.

REFERENCES

Adorno, T. W., & Horkheimer, M. (1972). *Dialectic of enlightenment*. New York, NY: Herder and Herder.

AIGA. (2015). About the AIGA. Retrieved August 29, from http://www.aiga.org/about/

AIGA, & NASAD. (2007). Making Choices About the Study of Graphic Design. *National Association of Schools of Art and Design*: NASAD.

Austin, N. (2009). *Towards a genealogy of visual cultuer at the rhode island school of design, 1975-1900.* (Doctor of Philosophy), Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island.

Batchelder, T. H., & Root, S. (1994). Effects of an undergraduate program to integrate academic leaning and service: Cognitive, prosocial cognitive and identity outcomes. *Journal of Adolescence*(17), 341-356.

Benjamin, W. (2009). *The work of art in the age of mechanical reproduction*. New York, NY: Classic Books America.

Bierut, M. (1988). Why designers can't think. *American Center for Design Journal, 3*(2).

Blauvelt, A. (2006). Towards critical autonomy, or can graphic design save itself? In M. Bierut, W. Drenttel & S. Heller (Eds.), *Looking Closer Five, Critical Writings on Graphic Design*. New York, NY: Allworth Press.

Boyer, E. (1994). Creating the new american college. *Chronicle of Higher Education, A48*. doi: http://chronicle.com/che-data/articles. dir/articles-40.dir/issue-27.dir/27a04801.htm

Bridges, A. W. (2013). *Identification of perceived 21st century graphic design skills, content knowledge, and tools needed in an effective university-level graphic design program.* (Doctor of Education), Gardner-Webb University.

Bringle, R., & Hatcher, J. (1996). Implementing service learning in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education, 67*(2), 221-239.

Bronner, S. E. (2011). *Critical theory a very short introduction.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Buchanan, K. (2013). Creative practice and critical reflection: Productive science in design research. *Design Issues, 29*(4). doi: 10.1162/DESI_a_0027

Bush, A. (2003). Beyond pro bono: Graphic design's social work. In S. Heller & V. Vienne (Eds.), *Citizen Designer: Perspectives on Design Responsibility.* New York, NY: Allworth Press.

Chaudhuri, A., & Holbrook, M. (2001). The chain of effects from brand trust and brand affect to brand performance: The role of brand loyalty. *Journal of Marketing, 65*(2), 81-93.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (2011). 'Design' in principle and practice: A reconsideration of the terms of design engagement. *The Design Journal, 14*(1), 45-63.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design, qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Crocker, C., & Algina, J. (1986). *Introduction to classical and modern test theory.* New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Davis, M. (2005a). *The Education of a Graphic Designer* (S. Heller Ed. 2 ed.). New

    York, NY: Allworth Press.

Davis, M. (2005b). What is professional about professional education? In S. Heller (Ed.),

    The Education of a Graphic Designer. New York, NY: Allworth press.

DeGraw, D. (1984). *Job motivational factors of educators within adult correctional*

    institutions from various states. University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska.

Dewey, J. (1934). *Art as experience.* New York, NY: Perigee Books.

Dewey, J. (1978). *The middle works*, *Vol. 5 of the collected works of John Dewey*.

    Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics* (4 ed.). Thousand Oaks,

    CA: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Findeli, A. (1990). Moholy-Nagy's design pedagogy in chicago (1937–46). *Design*

    Issues, 7(1), 4-19.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Herder and Herder.

Freire, P. (1985). *The politics of education: Culture, power, and liberation*. South

    Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey.

Gall, M. D., Borg, W. R., & Gall, J. P. (1996). *Educational research an introduction* (6th

    ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman Publishing.

Giroux, H. A. (2005). *Border crossings: Cultural workers and the politics of education*

    (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Glaser, M. (1987). Some thoughts on modernism: Past, present and future. *AIGA Journal*

    of Graphic Design, 5(2).

Glaser, M. (2004). AIGA design legends speech. from http://www.miltonglaser.com

Glaser, M. (2005). *Since then.* Paper presented at the AIGA National Design Conference, Boston, MA.

Held, D. (1980). *Introduction to critical theory Horkheimer to Habermas*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

Heller, S. (1994). Introduction looking closer at design criticism. In M. Bierut, W. Drenttel, S. Heller & D. Holland (Eds.), *Looking Closer Critical Writings on Graphic Design* (Vol. 1). New York, NY: Allworth Press.

Heller, S. (2005). *The Education of a Graphic Designer* (2 ed.). New York, NY: Allworth Press.

Heller, S. (1985). Seymour chwast biography by steven heller. *AIGA Journal of Graphic Design*. Retrieved from AIGA website:

Holland, D. K. (2001). Keeping promises: The impact of brands on society. In D. K. Holland (Ed.), *Design Issues*. New York, NY: Allworth Press.

Irwin, T. (2003). A crisis in perception. *Communication Arts*(44), 168-179.

Kellner, D. (1989). *Critical theory, marxism and modernity*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Kelly, R. R. (2001). The early years of graphic design at yale university. *Design Issues, 17*(3).

Keys, W. (Writer). (2008). Milton glaser: To inform and delight. In A. Films (Producer).

Kincheloe, J. L. (2008). *Critical pedagogy primer* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Lupton, E. (2005). The designer as producer. In S. Heller (Ed.), *The Education of a Graphic Designer* (pp. 214-129). New York, NY: Allworth Press.

Margolin, V. (2006). The citizen designer. In M. Bierut, W. Drenttel & S. Heller (Eds.), *Looking Closer Five, Critical Writings on Design*. New York, NY: Allworth Press.

McCarron, C. (2001). First things first: A second look. In D.K. Holland (Ed.), *Design issues* (pp.113-124). New York, NY: Allworth Press.

McCoy, K. (2003). *Good Citizenship: Design as a social and political force*. New York, NY: Allworth Press.

McCoy, K. (2005). Education in an adolescent profession. *The Education of a Graphic Designer* (pp. 3-12). New York, NY: Allworth Press.

McLaren, P. (1989). *Life in schools*. New York, NY: Longman.

McLaren, P., & Giarelli, J. (1995). *Critical theory and educational research.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

McLaren, P., & Kincheloe, J. (2007). *Critical pedagogy: Where are we now?* New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Meggs, P. (2006). *Meggs' history of graphic design* (4th ed.). Hoboken, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Nakamura, R. (2006). The grand unified theory of nothing: Design, the cult of science, and the lure of big ideas. In M. Bierut, W. Drenttel & S. Heller (Eds.), *Looking Closer Five, Critical Writings on Design* (Vol. 5). New York, NY: Allworth Press.

Phillips, A., Bolduc, S., & Gallo, M. (2013). Curricular placement of academic service-learning in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 17*(4), 75-96.

Pinar, W.F., Reynolds, W.M., Slattery, P., & Taubman, P.M. (2008). *Understanding curriculum*. New York, NY: Peter Lang International Publishing, Inc.

Prentice, M., & Robinson, G. (2010). Improving student learning outcomes with service learning. from Retrieved from American Association of Community Colleges website:

http://www.aacc.nche.edu/Resources/aaccprograms/horizons/Documents/slorb_jan2010.pdf

Poyner, R. (1999). First things first revisited. *Emigre, 51*.

Singh, J., Iglesias, O., & Batista-Foguet, J. (2012). Does having an ethical brand matter? The influence of consumer perceived ethicality on trust, affect and loyalty. *Journal of Business Ethics, 111*(4), 541-549. doi: 10.1007/s10551-012-1216-7

Sparke, P. (1986). *An introduction to design and culture: 1900 to the present* (2 ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Stanton, T. K., Giles, D. E., & Cruz, N. I. (1999). *Service-learning: A movement's pioneers reflect on its origins, practice, and future.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Stroud, S.R. (2008)*.* John Dewey and the question of artful communication. *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, *41*, 153-183. Retrieved from:

http://muse.jhu.edu.manowar.tamucc.edu

/journals/ philosophy_and_rhetoric/v041/41.2.stroud.html

Stroud, S. R. (2014). The art of the experience: Dewey on the aesthetic. *Value Inquiry*

    Book Series, 275, 33-46. Retrieved from:

    http://eds.a.ebscohost.com.manowar.tamucc. edu/eds/ pdfviewer/ pdfviewer?sid

    =6c68a37a-6e72-4f0a-b9d3 4df085917db3%40

    sessionmgr4004&vid=13&hid=4102

Swanson, G. (1994). Graphic design education as a liberal art: Design and knowledge in

    the university and the "real world". *Design Issues, 10*(1), 53-63.

Swanson, G. (2005). *The Education of a Graphic Designer* (S. Heller Ed. 2 ed.). New

    York, NY: Allworth Press.

Victore, J. (Producer). (2012). Your work is a gift. Retrieved from

    https://vimeo.com/46112891

Wang, S. Y. (2006). *Identification of the significant competencies in graphic design.*

    (Doctor of Philosophy), University of Missouri-Columbia.

Wineburg, S. (2001). *Historical thinking and other unnatural facts: Charting the future*

    of teaching the past. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Figure 1

Institutional Areas of Focus

Focuses	TOTAL	private institutions	public institutions		
		total	total	research universities	other
Graphic design, visual communication design, or similar	179 53%	79 68%	85 58%	29 47%	56 66%
Interaction design, digital media design, or similar	58 17%	28 24%	27 18%	8 13%	19 22%
Combination of both	122 36%	42 36%	68 46%	33 53%	35 41%
Something else	72 21%	28 24%	34 23%	11 18%	23 27%
Indicated one or more	289 86%	114 98%	147 100%	62 100%	85 100%
No answer	46 14%	2 2%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
Base: Institutions Offering Undergraduate Degree(s)	335 100%	116 100%	147 100%	62 100%	85 100%

Figure 2

Institutional Degrees Granted

Degrees Granted	TOTAL	private institutions	public institutions		
		total	total	research universities	other
Undergraduate Degrees (NET)	335 95%	116 97%	147 99%	62 97%	85 100%
Undergraduate Certificate	29 8%	13 11%	9 6%	1 2%	8 9%
Associate's (AA/AAS)	52 15%	16 13%	25 17%	0 0%	25 29%
Bachelor's (NET)	298 85%	110 92%	123 83%	62 97%	61 72%
Bachelor's (BA/BS)	130 37%	56 47%	51 34%	19 30%	32 38%
Bachelor's of Fine Arts (BFA)	210 60%	68 57%	93 62%	47 73%	46 54%
Bachelor's of Graphic Design or Design (BGD/BDes)	24 7%	5 4%	8 5%	7 11%	1 1%

Figure 3

Institutional Areas Required

Areas Required	TOTAL	private institutions	public institutions		
		total	total	research universities	other
Graphic design	281 84%	111 96%	145 99%	62 100%	83 98%
Interactive media design	218 65%	89 77%	111 76%	48 77%	63 74%
Information design	176 53%	70 60%	90 61%	43 69%	47 55%
Time-based media design	164 49%	65 56%	86 59%	40 65%	46 54%
Design planning or strategy	155 46%	61 53%	78 53%	35 56%	43 51%
Advertising	144 43%	66 57%	67 46%	21 34%	46 54%
Experience design	90 27%	34 29%	49 33%	24 39%	25 29%
Other specialty	114 34%	49 42%	50 34%	24 39%	26 31%
Cross-disciplinary	73 22%	29 25%	34 23%	12 19%	22 26%
Indicated one or more	287 86%	113 97%	147 100%	62 100%	85 100%
No answer	48 14%	3 3%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
Base: Institutions offering Undergraduate Degree(s)	335 100%	116 100%	147 100%	62 100%	85 100%

Figure 4

Institutional Program Orientations

Program Orientations	TOTAL	private institutions	public institutions		
		total	total	research universities	other
General applied practice orientation resembling professional practice	23 19%	13 38%	10 18%	7 17%	3 20%
Specialized practice orientation, Designer as Author	29 24%	11 32%	16 29%	13 32%	3 20%
Specialized practice orientation, Social Model of Design	5 4%	2 6%	2 4%	1 2%	1 7%
Specialized practice orientation, Invention of Visual Form	11 9%	2 6%	7 13%	5 12%	2 13%
Specialized practice orientation, other	31 26%	9 26%	22 39%	14 34%	8 53%
Academic research orientation	13 11%	4 12%	9 16%	6 15%	3 20%
Indicated one or more	92 76%	32 94%	56 100%	41 100%	15 100%
No answer	29 24%	2 6%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
Base: Institutions Offering Graduate Degree(s)	121 100%	34 100%	56 100%	41 100%	15 100%

Figure 5

Nature of the Institution

Nature Of Institution	TOTAL	private institutions	public institutions		
		total	total	research universities	other
Public Associate's college (2-year)	24 7%	0 0%	24 16%	0 0%	24 28%
Private Associate's college (2-year)	4 1%	4 3%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
Public independent school or college of art & design	2 1%	0 0%	2 1%	0 0%	2 2%
Private non-profit independent school or college of art & design	27 8%	27 23%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
Private for-profit independent school or college of art & design	9 3%	9 8%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
Public Baccalaureate college	19 5%	0 0%	19 13%	0 0%	19 22%
Private non-profit Baccalaureate college	22 6%	22 18%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
Private for-profit Baccalaureate college	15 4%	15 13%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%

Figure 6

Number of Full-Time Faculty Teaching Undergraduate Courses

Number Of Full-Time Faculty Teaching Undergraduate Courses	TOTAL	private institutions	public institutions		
		total	total	research universities	other
10 or more	27 8%	17 14%	8 5%	5 8%	3 4%
5-9	50 14%	24 20%	25 17%	13 20%	12 14%
3-4	53 15%	13 11%	38 26%	15 23%	23 27%
1-2	34 10%	18 15%	16 11%	4 6%	12 14%
None	2 1%	1 1%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
No answer	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%
No undergraduate offering	3 1%	2 2%	1 1%	1 2%	0 0%
Answered faculty questions inconsistently	98 28%	39 33%	57 38%	25 39%	32 38%
Provided no faculty data	85 24%	6 5%	4 3%	1 2%	3 4%

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="3">

FOR COMPLIANCE OFFICE USE ONLY:

IRB#

Date Received:

☐ Revision

</td><td>

Application for Review of Research Involving Human Subjects
Institutional Review Board (IRB)

Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi

</td><td>

TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY CORPUS CHRISTI

RESEARCH COMMERCIALIZATION OUTREACH

</td></tr>
</table>

INSTRUCTIONS

1. Complete CITI Training
CITI training is required for all researchers and faculty advisors listed on the protocol. Completion reports DO NOT need to be sent with protocol application if CITI was completed through TAMUCC.

2. Complete Form
All sections of the form are required. The protocol review will not begin if any section is incomplete.

3. Submit Application & Completed Supplemental Documents: *IRB protocol application forms are ONLY accepted in electronic format. Please utilize digital signatures and email form with the IRB Protocol Application Form to IRB@tamucc.edu. Review of application will not begin until all required documentation is received.*

Please contact Kassandra Brown at (361)825-2892 or kassandra.brown@tamucc.edu or Erin Sherman at (361)825-2497 or erin.sherman@tamucc.edu for questions or assistance completing this application.

INVESTIGATOR INFORMATION

	Name	Email (USE TAMUCC EMAIL ADDRESS)	College	Category	Category (Other)
PI	Amanda Garcia	amanda.garcia@tamucc.edu	Education	Graduate Student	
Co-PI (1)	Dr. Bryant Griffith	Bryant.Griffith@tamucc.edu	Education	Faculty	
Co-PI (2)					
Co-PI (3)					
Co-PI (4)					
Co-PI (5)					

PROJECT INFORMATION

A. Research Classification: Doctoral Dissertation   **Other:**

Please review the Human Subject Research Categories at the end of the protocol form before completing B.

B. Review Classification: Exempt (1)

Submit copies of external funding proposal with IRB protocol application, if applicable.

C. Is the project externally funded? No   **Funding Start Date:**   **Funding Agency:**

D. Project Title: The Role of Socially Responsible Design Within the Graphic Design Higher Education Curriculum

E. Starting Date: Upon IRB Approval   F: Estimated Completion Date: March 2016

PROJECT PURPOSE & OBJECTIVES

A. Describe Project Purpose. *Be specific and thorough.*

The primary purpose of this study is to measure the availability of socially responsible curriculum in graphic design higher education courses throughout the U.S. The secondary purpose of this study is to uncover relationships or contributing factors to socially responsible curricular availability.

B. Describe Project Objectives and/or Research Questions. *Be specific and thorough.*

The following questions inform this research study:
1. What is the level of availability for courses specifically designated to teach socially responsible design?
2. What is the level of availability for socially responsible projects integrated into graphic design courses?
3. What factors contributed to higher rates of socially responsible curricula?

RESEARCH SUBJECTS & RECRUITMENT (Description, Source and Recruitment of Research Subjects)

A. Indicate whether the following populations will be specifically targeted for inclusion in the project. Inclusion and exclusion criteria needs to be described in detail in Section B. **Select Y or N for each participant category.**

Adults over the age of 18 (ABLE to legally consent)	Y ☒ N ☐	Prisoners (adults or juveniles)	Y ☐ N ☒
Adults over the age of 18 (UNABLE to legally consent)	Y ☐ N ☒	Participants whose first language is NOT English	Y ☐ N ☒
Individuals under the age of 18 (minors)	Y ☐ N ☒	Students enrolled in a researcher's course(s)	Y ☐ N ☒
Pregnant Women, fetuses, and/or neonates Note: Projects including this vulnerable population are *generally* health care/medical studies specifically targeting research of pregnant women, fetuses, and/or neonates. Pregnant women can be included in projects if all inclusion criteria is met and a specific exclusion is not part of the project design. Select "No" unless the project specifically involves the inclusion of pregnant women, fetuses, and/or neonates.	Y ☐ N ☒	Employees under the direct supervision of a researcher	Y ☐ N ☒

B. Describe the inclusion and exclusion criteria that will be used to define who is included or excluded in the final participant population (ex. minimum age, grade range, physical characteristics, learning characteristics, professional criteria, etc.)

Quantitative survey data will be provided by the participants, who will be faculty teaching within an undergraduate graphic design higher education program in the United States. These faculty will be identified using the American Institute of Graphic Arts (AIGA) database of design educators. Participants have identified themselves as design educators upon membership to the AIGA. The AIGA has agreed to provide the researcher with their design educator database upon IRB approval.

For the purposes of this study, undergraduate graphic design programs are defined as Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Fine Arts granting programs who's emphasis is aligned with graphic design professional practices but may be labeled as the following majors according to the American Institute of Graphic Arts and the National Associates of Schools of Art and Design; graphic design, communication design, communications design, visual communications, visual communication design, or advertising design.

C. Target number of participants (Include minimum target if a specific target is not appropriate for project design.)

300

☐ N/A - Not conducting research or recruiting participants from non-TAMUCC facilities

Specify location(s) of project and/or recruitment of participants.
See notes for off-campus locations above.

Participants will be identified using the American Institute of Graphic Arts (AIGA) database of design educators. The AIGA has agreed to provide the researcher with their design educator database upon IRB approval. Those who would like to participate in the study will voluntarily complete the survey instrument.

E(1). Describe the methods that will be used to identify pool of potential participants.

Participants will be identified using the American Institute of Graphic Arts (AIGA) database of design educators. Participants have identified themselves as design educators upon membership to the AIGA. The AIGA has agreed to provide the researcher with their design educator database upon IRB approval.

E(2). Describe when, where and how potential participants will be recruited.

Participants will be recruited as soon as IRB approval is given.
Participants will be recruited in the United States only.
Potential participants will be recruited using the AIGA database via email.
A link to the survey will be included in the email.
Subjects will consent to voluntarily participate in the study by completing the survey.

E(3). Describe materials that will be used to recruit participants.
See note above regarding submission of recruitment materials.

An email will be sent to participants briefly describing the purpose of the study and what to expect in the survey. (see attached)
Those who would like to participate in the study will voluntarily complete the survey instrument.

E(4). Describe how materials to recruit participants will be distributed/how participants will be contacted (ex. online, via email, through faculty members, through a professional association, etc.). Include description of any assistance that will be needed to distribute recruitment materials (ex. listserv owners, faculty permission for classroom recruitment, etc.)

The AIGA has agreed to provide the researcher with their design educator database. Participants will be contacted via email and directed to the on-line Qualtrics survey instrument. The email will describe the purpose of the study and have an electronic link to the Qualtrics survey. The consent form to participate in the study is included in the on-line survey questionnaire.

E(5). Describe the amount, source and timing(s) of any payment(s)/incentive(s) to participants, if applicable.

NA

RESEARCH DESIGN, METHODS, & DATA COLLECTION/PROTECTION PROCEDURES

A. Select the appropriate description for data collection and project records below.
DEFINITIONS:
Anonymous: the collection of data in a manner where no one, including the researcher(s), will be able to identify the participant providing responses/data
Confidential: the collection of data in a manner where data may be linked to individual participants through the use of codes, audio/video recordings, or other identifiers

Confidential ▾

B. Describe the study design including methods and procedures step-by-step in common terminology. Describe each procedure in detail, including frequency, duration and location of each procedure. The methods must be described completely and in detail (ex. type of data collected, how data will be collected, who will conduct interaction/data collection, etc.).

For projects with multiple participant classifications (ex. students and teachers, athletes and coaches, etc.): Describe the study design including methods and procedures step-by-step for each classification of participants.

A descriptive survey study will be used to examine the extent to which socially responsible design is integrated into American

graphic design higher education curriculum.

A two-part survey has been developed by the researcher (see attached). Part I is designed to gather data regarding socially responsible curriculum at the participant's current teaching institution. Questions are used to gather data concerning the amount of required courses in socially responsible design, elective courses in socially responsible design, and the content that each includes type of course includes. Specific questions are used to measure the number of total courses an undergraduate may take in socially responsible design at the participant's institution, the number of courses that integrate socially responsible projects into other courses, and the participant's perception of socially responsible practices at her/his teaching institution. Additionally, a survey consisting of a four-point Likert-type scaling will be used to measure the level of importance of ten related socially responsible practices at the participant's teaching institution (4 = very important, 3 = important, 2 = somewhat important, and 1 = not important). Five experts in the field will examine the content validity of the instrument and the feedback will be used to modify the survey. Additionally, the on-line survey will be pilot-tested to examine its utility. Part II of the instrument will gather demographic data from the participant. The following demographic data will be collected: age, gender, ethnicity, current occupation within the institution, socially responsible experiences in their personal education, years of teaching experience, professional work experience relating to socially responsible design, and total number of design faculty in their undergraduate program. The participant has the option to provide his/her name and contact email at the end of the survey if he/she would like to be involved in future research regarding this topic. The examination of background information is important to this study in order to identify possible characteristics and factors contributing to significant differences in levels of socially responsible curricular integration (DeGraw, 1984).

An on-line version of the survey will be used to collect the quantitative data. The primary investigator's contact information and voluntary consent are included in the survey instrument. The participants will be contacted via email, provided with access to the survey, and asked to complete it. Two weeks later, a second email will be sent to all subjects, thanking those who have already completed the survey and encouraging the others to complete the survey. The third and final email will be sent four weeks after the initial email.

The data will be exported into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Upon completion of data checking, descriptive statistics will be used to organize, analyze, and summarize the data. Frequency and percentage distribution tables, as well as appropriate measures of central tendency and variability will be employed. Appropriate correlation data will be used.

C. Describe any equipment (including audio and video equipment) utilized during the project. Note whether the equipment is owned by the researcher(s), university, or other source. Include description of how and where equipment is stored throughout the study (including any security such as password protection on equipment).

A password-protected external hard drive, owned by the researcher, will be used to store the data. The password-protected external hard drive will be locked in a cabinet.

D. Describe data protection methods including a minimum of the following: location of data storage, methods for data protection, names of individuals who will have access to data, etc.

*For projects utilizing video and/or audio recordings: Describe, at a minimum, the methods for storage or recordings, transcription of recordings, whether recordings will be erased following transcription, etc.

The password-protected external hard drive will be stored in a locked cabinet in the researcher's locked office. Only the PI and dissertation chair will have access to the raw data. Only the PI will have access to the locked drive. The PI will use her personal password-protected laptop computer for data analysis.

E. Describe retention methods, including at a minimum how long project materials (including consent documents, project data, etc.) will be retained, format of storage (digital, paper, etc.), etc.

*Note: All project materials must be retained for a minimum of three years beyond the completion of the project. Completion of the project is defined as no longer collecting, using, studying or analyzing data.
*Note: **Completion report must be submitted at the completion of the project. Please submit to IRB@tamucc.edu.**

All data will be retained for five (5) years in a locked filing cabinet. Only the PI and Dr. Bryant Griffith (dissertation chair) will have access to to the information.

RISKS & PROTECTION MEANS

A. Select all levels of risk that apply to the project. **Select Y or N for each risk category.**

No risk	Y ☐	N ☒

Minimal risk Definition: the probability and magnitude of harm or discomfort anticipated in the research are not greater in and of themselves than those ordinarily encountered in daily life or during the performance of routine physical or psychological examinations or tests.	Y ☒	N ☐
Greater than minimal risk	Y ☐	N ☒

B. Describe each potential risk and the steps taken to protect human subject participants from the risk (ex. breach of confidentiality, possibly injury, psychological distress, pressure to conform, pressure to participate/coercion, etc.). Consider physical, psychological, social, legal and economic risk.

	Risk	Protection Mechanism
1.	Breach of confidentiality	Only the PI will have access to the returned survey data which includes the participant's name and teaching institution if the participant opted to provide this information. Each survey name will be given a unique identifier and only the PI will have access to this information. The data will be stored on the password-protected hard drive (as mentioned above) and locked in a cabinet. Additionally, a description of the voluntary nature of participation will be provided. Subjects are allowed to withdraw from the study or skip questions without negative consequences.
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		
7.		
8.		
9.		
10.		

C. Describe the protection means specifically and how participants will be provided information regarding and gain access to any necessary outside assistance (ex. medical care, counseling, etc.) if available.

No outside resources will be provided as no risks have been identified that would require outside assistance.

BENEFITS

A. Describe the potential benefits individual participants may experience from taking part in the research, or note no potential benefits to individual participants. *Benefits DO NOT include payments/incentives for participation. See research subjects section for payments/incentives.*

Individual participants may see no direct benefits. However, the results of the study would be useful to undergraduate graphic design programs at colleges, universities, and other higher education institutions that would like to incorporate socially responsible practices in their curriculum.

B. Describe the potential benefits to society, others and/or generalizable knowledge.

> Potential benefits to society could be contributing to a growing body of knowledge and producing better prepared graduates into the field of graphic design as a conduit for and a shaper of culture.

INFORMED CONSENT PROCESS

A(1). Is a waiver of signed informed consent requested *(ex. information sheet, online consent, etc.)*? **Select Y or N for waiver of signed consent.**	Y ☒	N ☐	**A(2).** If yes, select the appropriate criteria from description at end of IRB protocol form.	D ▾

B. Describe methods for obtaining informed consent from human subject participants.

Be specific and thorough. At minimum, describe how researcher(s) will gain access to participants, how participants will be provided the consent documentation, in what format the consent will be provided, any discussion that will take place with participants, and methods of communication utilized to keep participants aware of their rights throughout the study, if applicable.

*Note:
(1) Participants must be given time to review the consent/informational documents and ask questions.
(2) Projects involving minors must include parental consent and a separate assent written at a level appropriate to the age group of participants. Parental consent must be available in English and Spanish when the possibility exists that English may not be the first language of parents/guardians.
(3) Information sheets should be utilized for exempt studies in which the only record of participants would be signed consent forms.
(4) The online consent template should be utilized as a guide for online survey consent.

> The AIGA has agreed to provide the researcher with their design educator database (as noted above) upon IRB approval. The consent form to participate in the study is included in the on-line survey questionnaire. A 'live button' will be provided to the subjects to demonstrate their consent.

INVESTIGATOR(S) QUALIFICATIONS

A. Describe qualifications or attach CVs/resumes of ALL researchers and faculty advisers to conduct human subjects research.

> The Principal Investigator, Amanda Garcia, is a Doctoral candidate in the Curriculum and Instruction at Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi. The PI has completed the CITI course on the protection of human research participants. The study is supervised by Dr. Bryant Griffith, Regents Professor at TAMUCC, who has also completed the CITI course on the protection of human research participants. Amanda Garcia, MFA, has taught graphic design for 11 years in higher education.

SIGNATURES: INVESTIGATOR(S) RESPONSIBILITIES & CONFLICT OF INTEREST CERTIFICATION

	Typed Name	Conflict of Interest (SELECT ONE)	Date
PI	Amanda Garcia	No conflict of interest with this proje▾	April 13, 2015
	PI Signature: Amanda Garcia	Digitally signed by Amanda Garcia DN: cn=Amanda Garcia, o=Texas A&M University Corpus Christi, ou=Department of Art, email=amanda.garcia@tamucc.edu, c=US Date: 2015.04.13 10:07:30 -05'00'	
Co-PI (1)		▾	
	Co-PI (1) Signature:		
Co-PI (2)		▾	
	Co-PI (2) Signature:		
Co-PI (3)		▾	
	Co-PI (3) Signature:		
Co-PI (4)		▾	
	Co-PI (4) Signature:		
Co-PI (5)		▾	
	Co-PI (5) Signature:		

Human Subject Research Categories

Please Note

The following types of studies do not qualify for exempt reviews and are subject to expedited or full reviews:
1) Studies involving a faculty member's current students
2) Studies involving the following and similar sensitive subject matters which can potentially cause discomfort and stress to the participant: Abortion, AIDS/HIV, Alcohol, Body Composition, Criminal Activity, Psychological Well-being, Financial Matters, Sexual Activity, Suicide, Learning Disability, Drugs, Depression

Studies involving audio taping and/or videotaping _DO NOT_ qualify for exempt review.

Exempt Review Categories

1) Research conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings, involving normal education practices, such as (i.) research on regular and special education instructional strategies, or (ii.) research on the effectiveness of or the comparison among instructional techniques, curricula, or classroom management methods.

2) Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless (i.) information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; and (ii.) any disclosure of human subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

3) Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public behavior that is not exempt under the previous paragraph, if (i.) the human subjects are elected or appointed public officials or candidates for public office; or (ii.) federal statute(s) require(s) without exception that the confidentiality of the personally identifiable information will be maintained throughout the research and thereafter.

4) Research involving the collection or study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens, if these sources are publicly available or if the information is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that subjects cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects.

5) Research and demonstration projects that are conducted by or subject to the approval of federal department or agency heads, and that are designed to study, evaluate, or otherwise examine (i.) public benefit or service programs (ii.) procedures for obtaining benefits or services under these programs (iii.) possible changes in or alternatives to those programs or procedures; or (iv.) possible changes in methods or levels of payment for benefits or services under those programs

6) Taste and food quality evaluation and consumer acceptance studies (i.) if wholesome foods without additives are consumed or (ii.) if a food is consumed that contains a food ingredient at or below the level and for a use found to be safe, or agricultural chemical or environmental contaminant at or below the level found to be safe, by the Food and Drug Administration or approved by the Environmental Protection Agency or the Food Safety and Inspection Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture

Expedited Review Categories

(1) Clinical studies of drugs and medical devices only when condition (a) or (b) is met.
   a. Research on drugs for which an investigational new drug application (21 CFR Part 312) is not required. (Note: Research on marketed drugs that significantly increases the risks or decreases the acceptability of the risks associated with the use of the product is not eligible for expedited review.)
   b. Research on medical devices for which (i) an investigational device exemption application (21 CFR Part 812) is not required; or (ii) the medical device is cleared/approved for marketing and the medical device is being used in accordance with its cleared/approved labeling.

(2) Collection of blood samples by finger stick, heel stick, ear stick, or venipuncture as follows:
   a. from healthy, nonpregnant adults who weigh at least 110 pounds. For these subjects, the amounts drawn may not exceed 550 ml in an 8 week period and collection may not occur more frequently than 2 times per week; or
   b. from other adults and children' considering the age, weight, and health of the subjects, the collection procedure, the amount of blood to be collected, and the frequency with which it will be collected. For these subjects, the amount drawn may not exceed the lesser of 50 ml or 3 ml per kg in an 8 week period and collection may not occur more frequently than 2 times per week.

(3) Prospective collection of biological specimens for research purposes by noninvasive means.
   Examples: (a) hair and nail clippings in a nondisfiguring manner; (b) deciduous teeth at time of exfoliation or if routine patient care indicates a need for extraction; (c) permanent teeth if routine patient care indicates a need for extraction; (d) excreta and external secretions (including sweat); (e) uncannulated saliva collected either in an unstimulated fashion or stimulated by chewing gumbase or wax or by applying a dilute citric solution to the tongue; (f) placenta removed at delivery; (g) amniotic fluid obtained at the time of rupture of the membrane prior to or during labor; (h) supra- and subgingival dental plaque and calculus, provided the collection procedure is not more invasive than routine prophylactic scaling of the teeth and the process is accomplished in accordance with accepted prophylactic techniques; (i) mucosal and skin cells collected by buccal scraping or swab, skin swab, or mouth washings; (j) sputum collected after saline mist nebulization.

(4) Collection of data through noninvasive procedures (not involving general anesthesia or sedation) routinely employed in clinical practice, excluding procedures involving x-rays or microwaves. Where medical devices are employed, they must be cleared/approved for marketing. (Studies intended to evaluate the safety and effectiveness of the medical device are not generally eligible for expedited review, including studies of cleared medical devices for new indications.)

Examples: (a) physical sensors that are applied either to the surface of the body or at a distance and do not involve input of significant amounts of energy into the subject or an invasion of the subject's privacy; (b) weighing or testing sensory acuity; (c) magnetic resonance imaging; (d) electrocardiography, electroencephalography, thermography, detection of naturally occurring radioactivity, electroretinography, ultrasound, diagnostic infrared imaging, doppler blood flow, and echocardiography; (e) moderate exercise, muscular strength testing, body composition assessment, and flexibility testing where appropriate given the age, weight, and health of the individual.

(5) Research involving materials (data, documents, records, or specimens) that have been collected, or will be collected solely for nonresearch purposes (such as medical treatment or diagnosis). (NOTE: Some research in this category may be exempt from the HHS regulations for the protection of human subjects. 45 CFR 46.101(b)(4). This listing refers only to research that is not exempt.)

(6) Collection of data from voice, video, digital, or image recordings made for research purposes.

(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. (NOTE: Some research in this category may be exempt from the HHS regulations for the protection of human subjects. 45 CFR 46.101(b)(2) and (b)(3). This listing refers only to research that is not exempt.)

(8) Continuing review of research previously approved by the convened IRB as follows:
a. where (i) the research is permanently closed to the enrollment of new subjects; (ii) all subjects have completed all research-related interventions; and (iii) the research remains active only for long-term follow-up of subjects; or
b. where no subjects have been enrolled and no additional risks have been identified; or
c. where the remaining research activities are limited to data analysis.

(9) Continuing review of research, not conducted under an investigational new drug application or investigational device exemption where categories two (2) through eight (8) do not apply but the IRB has determined and documented at a convened meeting that the research involves no greater than minimal risk and no additional risks have been identified.

Criteria for Waiver of SIGNED Consent

(c) An IRB may approve a consent procedure which does not include, or which alters, some or all of the elements of informed consent set forth above, or waive the requirement to obtain informed consent provided the IRB finds and documents that:
(1) The research or demonstration project is to be conducted by or subject to the approval of state or local government officials and is designed to study, evaluate, or otherwise examine: (i) public benefit or service programs; (ii) procedures for obtaining benefits or services under those programs; (iii) possible changes in or alternatives to those programs or procedures; or (iv) possible changes in methods or levels of payment for benefits or services under those programs; **and**
(2) The research could not practicably be carried out without the waiver or alteration.

(d) An IRB may approve a consent procedure which does not include, or which alters, some or all of the elements of informed consent set forth in this section, or waive the requirements to obtain informed consent provided the IRB finds and documents that:
(1) The research involves no more than minimal risk to the subjects;
(2) The waiver or alteration will not adversely affect the rights and welfare of the subjects;
(3) The research could not practicably be carried out without the waiver or alteration; and
(4) Whenever appropriate, the subjects will be provided with additional pertinent information after participation.

TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY CORPUS CHRISTI

Human Subjects Protection Program	Institutional Review Board

APPROVAL DATE:	May 5, 2015
TO:	Ms. Amanda Garcia
CC:	Dr. Bryant Griffith
FROM:	Office of Research Compliance Institutional Review Board
SUBJECT:	Initial Approval

Protocol Number:	57-15
Title:	The Role of Socially Responsible Design Within the Graphic Design Higher Education Curriculum
Review Category:	Expedited
Expiration Date:	May 5, 2016

Approval determination was based on the following Code of Federal Regulations:

Eligible for Expedited Approval (45 CFR 46.110): Identification of the subjects or their responses (or the remaining procedures involving identification of subjects or their responses) will NOT reasonably place them at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the their financial standing, employability, insurability, reputation, or be stigmatizing, unless reasonable and appropriate protections will be implemented so that risks related to invasion of privacy and breach of confidentiality are no greater than minimal.

Criteria for Approval has been met (45 CFR 46.111) - The criteria for approval listed in 45 CFR 46.111 have been met (or if previously met, have not changed).

(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. (NOTE: Some research in this category may be exempt from the HHS regulations for the protection of human subjects. 45 CFR 46.101(b)(2) and (b)(3). This listing refers only to research that is not exempt.)

Provisions:

Comments:	The TAMUCC Human Subjects Protections Program has implemented a post-approval monitoring program. All protocols are subject to selection for post-approval monitoring.

This research project has been approved. As principal investigator, you assume the following responsibilities:
1. Informed Consent: Information must be presented to enable persons to voluntarily decide whether or not to participate in the research project unless otherwise waived.
2. Amendments: Changes to the protocol must be requested by submitting an Amendment Application to the Research Compliance Office for review. The Amendment must be approved by the IRB before being implemented.

APPENDIX C: IMPORTANCE AND AVAILABILITY OF SOCIALLY

RESPONSIBLE DESIGN INSTRUMENT

Definitions for Participant:

For the purpose of the study, **socially responsible design** is defined as the practice of graphic design for the purposes of bringing awareness to or eliciting change for human rights, social justice, and environmental consciousness for the betterment of society.

For the purposes of this study, **undergraduate design programs** are defined as Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Fine Arts granting programs whose emphasis is aligned with graphic design professional practices but may be labeled as the following majors according to the American Institute of Graphic Arts and the National Association of Schools of Art and Design; graphic design, communication design, communications design, visual communications, visual communication design, or advertising design (AIGA, 2007).

Section 1: Institutional Data

Please choose the title that best describes your department:

- Advertising
- Art
- Communication Design
- Graphic Design
- Visual Communication (s)
- Other _____

Please select the undergraduate degrees offered within your department from the choices below, multiple selections are allowed:

- B.A.
- B.F.A.
- B.E.D.
- B.S.
- Other _____

Does your teaching institution offer a degree, track or emphasis specifically in design social responsibility, social activism, design for social change or a related area?
- Yes
- No

What is the nature of the degree/track/or emphasis selected previously?

- Degree relating to socially responsible design/practices
- Track relating to socially responsible design/practices
- Area of emphasis relating to socially responsible design/practices

What is the specific name of this degree/track/emphasis at your institution?

Does your undergraduate curriculum *require* any form of socially responsible design courses which would appear in the course catalog for your institution?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

If yes, how many courses are required in socially responsible design?

Of the below choices, which best *describes the content/description* of most courses that require some form of socially responsible design:

- Sustainable / reusable / or production design practices or
- Social awareness design, and/or design activism, and/or design for social change

Does your undergraduate curriculum have any form of socially responsible design *elective courses* which would appear in the course catalog for your institution?

- Yes
- No

How many elective courses in socially responsible design are available?

Of the below choices, which best *describes the content/description* of most courses that require some form of socially responsible design:

- Sustainable / reusable / or production design practices or
- Social awareness design, and/or design activism, and/or design for social change

How many total courses relating to social responsibility will an undergraduate student have the opportunity to take during his/her time at your institution?

Of the total number of undergraduate courses offered in your program, how many integrate *projects/graded activity* relating to socially responsible design?

Of the total number of undergraduate courses offered in your personal course load, how many integrate *projects/graded activity* relating to socially responsible design?

Do you *personally feel* your institution does enough to emphasize socially responsible principles or practices in the undergraduate curriculum?

- Yes
- No

Given the chance, would *you personally* like to teach/integrate more socially responsible principles or practices in the courses you teach?

- Yes
- No

Section 2: Importance and Availability

Level of Importance

Please indicate the level of importance of the following:

	Not Important	Somewhat Important	Important	Very Important
How important is it to **you personally** to offer at least one project per course relating to socially responsible design **independent** of the course title?	○	○	○	○
How important is it to **your department** to incorporate sustainable printing practices/ techniques in courses?	○	○	○	○
How important is it to **you personally** to allow the student to choose topics for projects based on personal experiences?	○	○	○	○
How important is it to **your department** to offer dedicated courses (either required or elective) focusing on socially responsible design exclusively?	○	○	○	○
How important is it to **your department** to allow/encourage students to work with local non-profits or charities for their design projects?	○	○	○	○
How important is it to **you personally** to allow/encourage students to work with local non-profits or charities for their design projects?	○	○	○	○
How important is it to **you personally** to encourage the inclusion of socially responsible projects in graduating portfolios?	○	○	○	○
How important is it to **your department** that your program teaches the role of graphic design in society as a shaper of change/culture?	○	○	○	○
How important is it to **you personally** that your courses teach the role of graphic design in society as a shaper of change/culture?	○	○	○	○
How important is it to **your department** to include socially responsible topics into undergraduate design courses?	○	○	○	○
How important is it to **your department** to include socially responsible topics into undergraduate design courses?	○	○	○	○
How important is it to **your department** that students have travel abroad opportunities?	○	○	○	○

Level of Availability

Please indicate the level of importance of the following:

	Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Often
How ==available== are courses that allow **you** to offer a project(s) relating to socially responsible design?	○	○	○	○
How ==available== are courses that allow sustainable printing practices/ techniques to be taught?	○	○	○	○
How ==available== are courses that allow the student to choose topics for projects based on personal experiences?	○	○	○	○
How ==available== are dedicated courses (either required or elective) focusing on socially responsible design exclusively?	○	○	○	○
How ==available== are opportunities for students to work with local non-profits or charities for their design projects?	○	○	○	○
How ==available== are socially responsible projects, during a students' matriculation, for inclusion in their graduating portfolio?	○	○	○	○
How ==available== is learning the role of graphic design in society as a shaper of change/culture?	○	○	○	○
How ==available== are socially responsible topics in undergraduate design courses?	○	○	○	○
How ==available== are travel abroad opportunities for students?	○	○	○	○

Section 3: Demographic Data

What is the total number of design faculty in your undergraduate program?

Do you have personal experience creating socially responsible design works as a *professional*?

- Yes
- No

Did you take courses in socially responsible design during your undergraduate career?

- Yes
- No

Did you take courses in socially responsible design during your graduate career?

- Yes
- No

Which of the following most accurately describes your *current occupation* within your institution?

- Visiting Instructor
- Assistant Professor
- Associate Professor
- Full Professor
- Department Chair
- Dean

How many years of teaching experience do you have?

What is your age?

What is your gender?

- Female
- Male
- Trans-genered
- Other

What is your ethnicity?

- Caucasian

- African-American

- Native American

- Latino or Hispanic

- Asian or Pacific Islander

- Other

Please enter your current teaching institution below:

Would you like to participate in further research regarding design for social change, socially responsible design or design activism?

- Yes
- No

If yes, please provide the researcher with your full name and best email address for further research. *This information will be kept confidential and only the researcher, Amanda Garcia, will have access to this data. All data will be stored on a password-protected hard drive in a locked cabinet.*

- Name _____
- Email _____
- Contact Phone Number _____

Thank you for participating in this study! Once again, if you have questions regarding this study, you may contact Amanda R. Garcia at Amanda.garcia@tamucc.edu, 361-825-2865.

This research study has been reviewed by the Research Compliance Office and/or the Institutional Review Board at Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi. For research-related problems or questions regarding your rights as a research participant, you can contact Erin Sherman, Research Compliance Officer, at (361) 825-2497 or erin.sherman@tamucc.edu

CONSENT FORM
The Role of Socially Responsible Design
Within the Graphic Design Higher Education Curriculum

Introduction

The purpose of this form is to provide you information that may affect your decision as to whether or not to participate in this research study. If you decide to participate in this study, this form will also be used to record your consent.

You have been asked to participate in a research project studying the availability of socially responsible curriculum in graphic design higher education courses. The purpose of this study is to assess the level of availability courses specifically designated to teach socially responsible design and the level of which socially responsible projects are integrated into other design courses. You were selected to be a possible participant because you are a member of the AIGA.

What will I be asked to do?

If you agree to participate in this study, you will be asked to complete a 40-question survey regarding socially responsible curriculum at your current teaching institution. This one-time survey will take approximately 15 minutes to complete.

What are the risks involved in this study?

The risks associated in this study are minimal, and are not greater than risks ordinarily encountered in daily life.

What are the possible benefits of this study?

You will receive no direct benefit from participating in this study; however, your information will aid in the future development of design curriculum.

Do I have to participate?

No. Your participation is voluntary. You may decide not to participate, skip any question, or to withdraw at any time without your current or future relations with Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi being affected.

Who will know about my participation in this research study?

This study is confidential and only the primary researcher will have access to personal data. You are not required to provide your name or contact information, however, if you would like to be involved in future research regarding this subject or contacted regarding this research, an area to enter your name and contact email address is available at the end of the survey. All data will be kept on an external hard drive and locked in cabinet. No identifiers linking you to this study will be included in any sort of report that might be published. Research records will be stored securely and only Amanda R. Garcia will have access to the records.

Whom do I contact with questions about the research?

If you have questions regarding this study, you may contact Amanda R. Garcia at Amanda.garcia@tamucc.edu, (361) 825-2865.

Whom do I contact about my rights as a research participant?

This research study has been reviewed by the Research Compliance Office and/or the Institutional Review Board at Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi. For research-related problems or questions regarding your rights as a research participant, you can contact Erin Sherman, Research Compliance Officer, at (361) 825-2497 or erin.sherman@tamucc.edu

Agreement to Participate

You agree to participate in the study by completing the following survey. Participants must be 18 years of age or older. Please do not complete the survey if you do not wish to participate in this study.

Voluntary Consent

I certify that I have been informed about the study's purpose, procedures, possible risks and benefits. Additionally, I know that if I have any questions about my rights as a research participant, I can contact Erin Sherman, Compliance Officer, at Texas A&M University- Corpus Christi, at (361) 825-2497.

By Checking this box, I voluntarily agree to participate in the study and I am authorizing the use of my responses for research purposes. Checking the box serves as an electronic signature.

_ I Voluntarialy Agree   _ I Do Not Agree, End Survey

APPENDIX E

Email sent on June 6, 2015

Dear Professor,

My name is Amanda Garica. I am a 12-year graphic design professor and program coordinator at Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi and I am also completing my **dissertation research on the availability of socially responsible design curriculum in U.S. higher education.**

Because you are a design educator and are/were a part of the AIGA, you are the ideal participant! I would very much **appreciate** if you would take a quick **10 min.** survey to help me collect data for my dissertation research.

Please see the link below to the Qualtrics survey. Once you open the link, a further description of the study, etc. will be displayed. The **confidential survey** is **40 short questions and will take approximately 10 mins. to complete.**

https://qtrial2015az1.az1.qualtrics.com/SE?Q_DL=e5QqWmdRUws21BH_9YSzV4PWFaxPUNv_MLRP_0OlqY19btLqAZBb

If there are any questions, you may contact the principal investigator, (myself) Amanda Garcia, at Amanda.garcia@tamucc.edu or 361-945-6202.

You assistance is beyond appreciated,

Amanda Garcia

. . . .
Amanda Garcia, M.F.A.
Associate Professor of Graphic Design
Texas A&M University – Corpus Christi
School of Arts + Media & Communication

Email sent on June 20, 2015

Dear Professor,

My name is Amanda Garica. I am a 12-year graphic design professor and program coordinator at Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi and I am also completing my **dissertation research on the availability of socially responsible design curriculum in U.S. higher education.**

Because you are a design educator and are/were a part of the AIGA, you are the ideal participant! I would very much **appreciate** if you would take a quick **10 min.** survey to help me collect data for my dissertation research.

I would like to thank those of you who have already completed my online survey. Due to the anonymous nature of data collection, I do not know who has completed the survey. The survey is still active, thus, I would still greatly appreciate your participation in my study.

Please see the link below to the Qualtrics survey. Once you open the link, a further description of the study, etc. will be displayed. The **confidential survey** is **40 short questions and will take approximately 10 mins. to complete.**

https://qtrial2015az1.az1.qualtrics.com/SE?Q_DL=6KxdazSMJPe0UrH_9YSzV4PWFax
PUNv_MLRP_9Rlo1FOqvT2ekXH

If there are any questions, you may contact the principal investigator, (myself) Amanda Garcia, at Amanda.garcia@tamucc.edu or 361-945-6202.

Your assistance is beyond appreciated,

Amanda Garcia

. . . .
Amanda Garcia, M.F.A.
Associate Professor of Graphic Design
Texas A&M University – Corpus Christi
School of Arts + Media & Communication