Experiential Learning in Sociology: Service Learning and Other Community-Based Learning Initiatives
Author(s): Linda A. Mooney and Bob Edwards
Source: *Teaching Sociology*, Vol. 29, No. 2 (Apr., 2001), pp. 181-194
Published by: American Sociological Association
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/1318716
Accessed: 24/02/2010 18:10

EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING IN SOCIOLOGY: SERVICE LEARNING AND OTHER COMMUNITY-BASED LEARNING INITIATIVES*

Despite increased popularity and a strong pedagogical tradition, the literature on community-based learning (CBL) initiatives and service learning evidences a certain conceptual imprecision. In the hopes of clarifying definitional ambiguities, we critically review the CBL literature, identifying six distinct types of CBL options and their characteristics. The result is a hierarchy of community-based learning, which while not proposed as a definitive conceptualization, is likely to be useful in terms of curricular development. Using a hypothetical sociology class, the community-based learning options identified (i.e., out-of-class activities, volunteering, service add-ons, internships, service learning, and service learning advocacy) are discussed in terms of their pedagogical differences and associated curricular benefits.

LINDA A. MOONEY
East Carolina University

BOB EDWARDS
East Carolina University

THE PRESENT RESEARCH has three complementary goals. The first is to undertake a critical reflection on recent service-learning praxis in order to distill and synthesize current thinking. In so doing, we identify distinct types of community-based learning (CBL) options, distinguish their characteristics, and develop a heuristic synthesis and typology that we hope will help clarify the ongoing definitional debate. Second, we discuss CBL options within the context of a hypothetical sociology course. This discussion is intended to illustrate the pedagogical differences between learning methodologies and curricular benefits. typically associated with particular CBL options. Third, the typology developed below is intended as a heuristic device to facilitate dialogue and reflection among those endeavoring to integrate community-based learning into sociology courses and programs as well as among administrators and researchers seeking to evaluate their impact.

*Please address all correspondence to Linda A. Mooney, Department of Sociology, East Carolina University, Greenville, NC 27585; e-mail: MooneyL@mail.ecu.edu

BACKGROUND

In recent years there has been increased interest in student volunteering and, more specifically, service learning (Chapin 1998; Hinck and Brandell 2000; Shumer and Cook 1999; Ward and Wolf-Wendel 2000). Service learning is an evolving pedagogy that incorporates student volunteering into the dynamics of experiential learning and the rigors and structure of an academic curriculum. In its simplest form, service learning entails student volunteering in the community for academic credit. It is not a new concept. As early as 1902, John Dewey extolled the values of a "progressive education"—an education where thought and action come together in classroom and real life settings (Dewey 1938).

  While not immediately embraced as a philosophy, Dewey's principles resurfaced in practice in the 1960s, popularized by such national service programs as VISTA and the Peace Corps. Student activism, and with it volunteering, waned in the 1970s and early 1980s (Shumer and Cook 1999),[1] but by the

---

[1] Brooks (1997:3) notes that sociology also fell victim to the temporary loss of a volunteer ethic: "In sociology the first signs of this change

late 1980s, "serve and learn" programs had been resurrected to renewed prominence through the establishment of such umbrella organizations as *Campus Compact,* a national collaboration of college and university presidents "pledged to encourage and support academically based community service..." (Jacoby 1994:14). Bolstered by President Bush's "thousand points of light," the 1990 National and Community Service Act, the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993, and the 'Goals 2000' educational initiative, today *Campus Compact* has over 600 institutional members offering 11,800 service-learning courses (Finn and Vanourek 1995; Perreault 1997; Rothman, Anderson and Schaefer 1998; Bringle et al. 2000).

Why has there been such a renewed interest in and institutional support for service learning, and what in general may be called community-based learning (CBL)?[2] Some commentators point to the rapidly changing social, political, and economic context of higher education. For example, Marullo and Edwards (2000a) argue that the globalizing economy increasingly demands "workers with symbol-manipulating skills," driving colleges and universities to emphasize "educational methods that promote critical thinking, complex reading and writing skills, and problem-solving and conflict-resolution abilities" (p. 747). Citing similar trends, more skeptical observers suggest that the interest in community-based learning evidenced by many universities may have less to do with student, societal, or even market

appeared as students who had flocked to sociology in the late 1960s and early 1970s to learn how to solve the social problems of the time moved just as rapidly to the schools of business in the mid 1970s to learn skills that would get them a job and allow them to make money in an increasingly unstable economy."

[2]Community-based learning refers to any pedagogical tool in which the community becomes a partner in the learning process. While all CBL initiatives are experiential, and in that way active learning, not all active learning techniques are experiential in nature.

needs than the "efficiency" of providing additional credit hours with no additional faculty costs (Gose 1997). In contrast, long-term observers of school-society relations likely see the current trend as simply the most recent ebb and flow in the tides of school reform that seek alternately to integrate schooling more tightly with current market demands and to use formal education as a tool of progressive social change (Tyack and Cuban 1995).[3]

The renewed emphasis on CBL can also be traced to a strong pedagogical tradition rooted in the works of John Dewey (1916; 1938) and William James (1907), and the more recent work of Ernest Boyer (1990; 1994) and Paulo Freire (1970; 1985). Boyer (1990; 1994), for example, argues that the university should be responsive to community needs and to society as a whole, and that faculty members should be "reflective practitioners" in the education process. "What we urgently need today is a more inclusive view of what it means to be a scholar—a recognition that knowledge is acquired through research, through synthesis, through practice and through teaching" (Boyer 1990:24). Boyer's definition of scholarship thus questions the traditionally held notion that knowledge is first discovered and then applied, asking the question: "Can social problems themselves define an agenda for scholarly investigation?" (Boyer 1990:21) His work has "moved teaching and service into the forefront in higher education" (Brooks 1997:3).

Not surprisingly, CBL options, all of which come under the larger rubric of active learning methodologies and specifically, ex-

[3]Other institutional pressures include concerns over the quality of undergraduate teaching, esoteric research agendas (Hinck and Brandell 2000; Jacoby 1996; Lena 1995; Marullo and Edwards 2000a), apathetic and alienated students (Wade 1997; Wallace 2000), an emphasis on materialism and individual well-being (Bellah et al. 1985; Myers-Lipton 1998), and the non-responsiveness of colleges and universities to community needs (Edgerton 1994; Edwards and Marullo 1999; Plater 1995; Ward 1996).

periential learning, appeal to social scientists and sociologists in particular (Corwin 1996; Lena 1995; Parker-Gwin and Mabry 1998). First, sociologists have traditionally adhered to an "underdog ideology" rooted in the social problems legacy of the Chicago School and the activism it promoted (Pestello et al. 1996). Second, given the abstract nature of sociological theories and concepts, faculty members have turned to the "real world" in order to ground their discipline in a framework to which students can relate. Indeed as Keith (1994:312) notes, experiential learning serves as a "mechanism to promote the active involvement of students in a learning process which is integrative and eschews artificial divisions between developmental and academic tasks and between classroom and life experiences." Finally, and related to the above, sociology's movement toward an applied and practical discipline (Brooks 1997) and the accompanying use of practica, co-ops, and internships in helping students do sociology, provides a transition to other experiential learning options.

However, despite increased popularity and a strong theoretical foundation, the CBL literature evidences a certain conceptual imprecision (Finn and Vanourek 1995). Definitions of service learning abound and run the gamut from such vague and all-inclusive definitions as "academically-based service," to others so narrowly conceived that much of what is thought of as service learning would be excluded from consideration. Because of its recent popularity, the "service-learning" label is often applied to any existing form of CBL, further muddying the ongoing definitional debate. Fortunately, the very definitional and programmatic diversity lamented by some commentators provides the raw materials needed to synthesize current thinking.

SERVICE LEARNING AND OTHER COMMUNITY-BASED LEARNING INITIATIVES

Mintz and Hesser (1996) note that there is an important debate going on—a debate over what service learning is and, thus, how it should be defined:

> We continue to grapple with and learn about service learning's diverse and sometimes divergent aspects, and a consensus is far from being reached. The debate about the definition of service learning continues; some still question whether service learning can be both cocurricular and curricular; classifications of who and what compose "the community" is often diffuse and unclear; and the distinctions among internships, practica, cooperative education, and service learning remain blurred (26).

This problem of definition was empirically documented by Hinck and Brandell (2000, see Table 1). The two researchers surveyed 225 directors of randomly selected service-learning centers affiliated with *Campus Compact*. Asked to define service learning, the directors' responses varied significantly—"co-op education," "specialized internship courses," "experience gained in the non-profit or government sector," "faculty requiring students to take part in community projects and give credit in course work," and "community volunteer placements in an approved site" (p. 874).

Kendall (1990) reports identifying 147 different terms associated with service learning and other CBL options. For example, Shumer and Belbas (1996) include a variety of programs under the rubric of experiential/service-learning programs. They also use service learning and community learning interchangeably. Similarly, Parker-Gwin (1990) refers to service learning as one of many types of experiential learning. Easterling and Rudell state that service learning can be "integrated in a variety of...courses as internship assignments, consultancies, or participant/observer volunteer activities" (1997:58), Enos and Troppe (1996) refer to "service-learning internships," McCarthy (1996) discusses "one-time and short-term service-learning projects," and Shumer (1997), in a review article on the impact of service learning, includes such varied initiatives as internships, tutoring programs, ad-

Figure 1. Hierarchy of Community Based Learning (CBL)

CBL Options	Out-of-Class Activities	Volunteering	Service Add-ons	Internships	Service Learning	Service-Learning Advocacy
Social Action						X
Structured Reflection					X	X
Apply/Acquire Skills				X	X	X
Curricular Credit			X	X	X	X
Service Rendered		X	X	X	X	X
In Community	X	X	X	X	X	X

venture education, mentoring, hospital field work, and dropout prevention programs.

For those who have had occasion to develop or oversee a variety of CBL options, the differences between internships, experiential learning, volunteering, cocurricular community service, preprofessional experiences, practica, co-ops, community service, and applied learning may seem to be relatively clear-cut. However, among faculty members and administrators considering the full range of CBL endeavors for the first time, such distinctions may not be obvious.

Marullo (1998), in his discussion of "bringing home diversity" in a race and ethnic relations class, describes three CBL options: service-learning credits, group projects, and intensive service learning. Criteria Marullo identifies in distinguishing between the three learning types include variations in the service rendered, integration of out-of-class experiences into the course, and level of curricular credit received for participation. Marullo's typology, however, is limited to the "three primary models to integrate community service into a course" available at Georgetown (1998:264). What is needed is an expansion of his continuum through the identification of conceptually distinct CBL initiatives. Fortunately, the

service-learning literature reveals several common dimensions of service learning that distinguish it from other types of CBL. Figure 1 summarizes our categorization of these essential components.

Figures 1 and 2 identify six CBL options, criteria for differentiating between types, and benefits to students most likely to be associated with each initiative. Obviously, exceptions exist, and the boundaries between some types may be fuzzy. In practice, one service-learning program may be closer to an internship and another to service-learning advocacy. Others still may not neatly fit the mold.[4] It is worth emphasizing that our purpose in developing this typology is not to settle the current definitional debate by offering a definitive conceptualization. Rather, our aim is to help clarify the issues at stake in that debate and to facilitate reflection and dialogue among practitioners that can lead to improved praxis. As Figure 1 suggests, moving from out-of-class activities to service-learning advocacy increases the

[4]Others still may not fit the mold at all. For example, Marullo's (1998) "Group Projects," Parker-Gwin and Mabry's (1998) "Consultant Model," and Rundblad's (1998) "Community Exploration Project" would be CBL hybrids according to our typology.

structure and complexity of the learning experience as well as students' commitment to individuals and organizations. It should be noted that to meet the threshold require-ments of service-learning advocacy, CBL endeavors need to evidence the attributes listed in all six columns of Figure 1.

Out-of-Class Activities
Field trips are perhaps the base line example of *out-of-class activities*. While most field trips take place in a community setting, they tend to be like having class somewhere else, as students go on location to hear a guest speaker or see an exhibit. Though students seldom render services, apply existing skills, or engage in systematic reflection while on field trips (for an exception see Scarce 1997), field trips do enable students to see, hear, and smell places and meet the people who frequent them. Students with no such prior experiences no longer have to imagine a place, its people, or its sights, sounds, and smells. From field trips, a class shares a stock of common images that facilitates discussion and can foster camaraderie among students and between students and the instructor.

Volunteering
Similarly, *volunteering* may be a course requirement, but rarely is additional aca-demic credit offered for it as "there is no explicit focus on the educational value to be gained through involvement in the particular [volunteer] projects" (Waterman 1997:3). *Volunteering* also takes place in the commu-nity, but contrary to out-of-class activities, assumes that some service has been pro-vided. Much like the traditional notion of charity, volunteering often establishes a giver-receiver relationship as students "help" others defined as in need (Marullo and Edwards 2000b; Perreault 1997). Vol-unteers, however, are unlikely to apply or enhance existing skills (e.g., handing out sandwiches at the local homeless shelter) or to engage in any organized and meaningful reflection (Hironimus-Wendt and Lovell-Troy 1999). As Everett notes:

Service learning is not simply volunteer-ing...Many people volunteer in their communi-ties without critically examining their beliefs or the structural causes of the need for such services to exist. Simply "doing" is not suffi-cient for learning to occur (1998:299).

Service Add-On
When student participation results in addi-tional credit, as when instructors offer extra credit or additional points for volunteering, such a CBL option is called a *service add-on* (Jacoby 1996). Similar to a "fourth credit option" (Enos and Troppe 1996; Marullo 1998) (i.e., three-hour classes that become four-hour classes when a volunteer compo-nent is added), whether tutoring second graders or participating in a city beautifica-tion project, service add-ons take on another dimension of CBL—academic credit. Since not all students may be participating in the often optional exercise, one of the disadvan-tages of service add-ons is the tendency for the volunteer activity to remain peripheral to the course, particularly if there is relatively low student involvement. One potential com-munity impact of add-ons is indirect. Stu-dents who gain through volunteering experi-ences with add-ons may well be more likely to do so again in another context. Yet, compared to more substantive forms of CBL, the direct community impact of add-ons is likely to be reduced because the service is optional, involving fewer students than in classes where a service component is required of all students. Moreover, the lim-ited duration of add-ons also suggests a reduced community impact (Marullo 1998:264) than with either traditional intern-ships, or the 10-month, 20-hour per week service-learning placements required of the Washington study-service year assessed by Aberle-Grasse (2000).

Internships
Internships, sometimes called practica, co-operative learning or field placements, are pre-professional experiences often offered as stand-alone courses (Hironimus-Wendt and Lovell-Troy 1999; Marullo 1996; 1998). Internships are a common component of

sociology departments, particularly with the growth of applied sociology programs (Parilla and Hesser 1998). Students serve the community by relating course content, existing skills, and expertise to real life settings and receive credit for doing so. Structured reflection, however, is often not required. In contrast, ongoing structured reflection in general distinguishes service learning from other CBL options (Enos and Trope 1996; Everett 1998; Fertman 1994; Gardner 1997; Gere and Sinor 1997; Giles, Migliori, and Honnett 1991; Gronski and Pigg 2000; Jacoby 1996; Koulish 1998; Marullo 1996; 1998; Migliore 1991; Parker-Gwin and Mabry 1998; Perreault 1997; Saltmarsh 1996; Sax and Astin 1997; Shumer and Belbas 1996; and Wade 1997).[5]

Service Learning
The 1990 Community Service Act defines service learning as a method of learning in which students render needed services in their communities for academic credit, using and enhancing existing skills with time to "reflect on the service activity in such a way as to gain further understanding of the course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of civic responsibility" (Bringle and Hatcher 1995:112). Although some commentators question the extent to which service learning must be integrated into the curriculum (Fertman 1994; Jacoby 1996; Perreault 1997; Rubin 1996; Scheuermann 1996; Ward and Wolf-Wendel 2000), most published definitions of service learning implicitly include the first five components identified in Figure 1 (see, for example, Astin 1997; Bringle and Hatcher 1995; Burns 1998; Fertman 1994; Gardner 1997; Howard 1998; Kahne and Westheimer 1996; Marullo [1996] 1998; Marullo and Edwards

[5] Hutchings and Wutzdorff (1988:15), in defining reflection as "the ability to step back and ponders one's own experience, to abstract from it some meaning or knowledge relevant to other experiences," argue that "the capacity for reflection is what transforms experience into learning."

2000a; Roschelle, Turpin and Elias 2000; Rudell 1996; Sax and Chapin 1998; Waterman 1997).

The integration of service learning into the curriculum is a dialectical process whereby material appropriate to the content of a specific course is, through structured reflection, put into dialogue with the experiential input from the service-learning setting, activities, and community partners. Student experiences in the service-learning setting shape their understanding of course content while the course content in turn shapes their understanding of the kinds of social contexts and relations characteristic of their service-learning placements. The sense of knowing that emerges from this type of process transcends the knowledge attainable by either mastering the content or independently experiencing the service placement (Freire 1973; Palmer 1983). Optimally, subsequent dialogues would include individuals representing both the organizational host of the service-learning placement and the beneficiary constituency from the community.[6]

[6] Structured reflection is a crucial means for facilitating the process sketched above. It entails the integration of both individual and group processes. For individuals, structured reflection requires students to turn the nature and result of their prior reflection into an object of subsequent critical reflection–individual meta-reflection. The goal of this activity, which can be accomplished in part by journalling, is to critically analyze our own reflection in order to improve our critical faculties. Structured reflection also has a collective or group aspect succinctly described as "shared praxis in praxis." We first encountered this succinct descriptor in Groome (1980) where he ably discusses five movements in a praxis-based educational pedagogy. Though articulated from within a faith-based context of educating for social justice, this remains one of the more thorough and accessible discussions of the philosophical, psychological, and social bases of the educational approach sketched here. For those seeking other points of access into this long-standing pedagogical tradition, see also Freire 1974; Horton and Freire 1990. For parallel discussions applied to research, see Gaventa 1993; Merrifield 1993; and Park 1993.

Service-Learning Advocacy

As Figure 1 indicates, *service-learning advocacy* requires social action whereby students become "citizen leaders" (Perreault 1997) through a "pedagogy of civic involvement" (Koulish 1998:563). Unlike service learning in general, service-learning advocacy "should be critical of the status quo, challenge unjust structures, and oppressive institutional operations, and provide an opportunity for institutionalizing social justice activism on college campuses" (Marullo 1996:117). Consistent with Dewey's statement that "schools have a role in the production of social change" (1937:409), service-learning advocacy encourages students to become actors in the drama of producing a more just society by taking charge of their education, appropriating campus-based resources available to them, and taking collective action to confront the root causes of social injustice. A key pedagogical enhancement of service-learning advocacy owes to its explicit social change agenda the assumption that people begin to appreciate fully the relations of power in a society as they endeavor to affect social change in the context of critical reflection and dialogue with others who are similarly engaged.

Advocates of this position (e.g., Boyer 1983; Giles, Honnet, and Migliore 1991; Goodlad 1984; Koliba 2000; Newmann 1975; Wade and Saxe 1996), responding to an entrenchment of social problems (Boyer 1994: Jacoby 1996; Gronski and Pigg 2000; Wade 1997) caused in large part by economic globalization and the continued withdrawal of the state from responsibility for social welfare (Edwards and Foley 1997), are not without critics. Given its value-laden position, commentators have noted that

> ...much of what passes for service learning involves political activism. But that should not be surprising, because, in the eyes of its advocates, such activism–always, in practice, on the liberal-to-Left end of the political spectrum–is service learnings' most desirable form (Finn and Vanourek 1995:46)

Clearly, each of the CBL options identified is likely to be instituted differently depending on faculty members' goals and institutional resources. Variations within categories are also likely. As practiced, each of the CBL options vary in terms of: 1) the number of students served, 2) individual versus group involvement, 3) optional or required participation, 4) level of site supervision, 5) class assignments, 6) method of evaluation, 7) integration of out-of-class experiences and course material, 8) long- versus short-term commitments (for example, weeks versus months), 9) number and type of community organizations involved, and 10) the relationship between the various constituencies—the department, the community, the college or university, and the organization(s) served. What they have in common, however, is that each provides the curricular benefits of experiential learning.

CURRICULAR BENEFITS OF SERVICE LEARNING AND OTHER COMMUNITY-BASED LEARNING INITIATIVES

Figure 2 identifies potential benefits to students of using CBL options in sociology courses. Some have argued that in order for "service learning to achieve its greatest potential as an instructional component...a common definition *must* be adopted" (Burns 1998:38). We disagree. Rather, we offer this typology as a heuristic device to facilitate the reflection and discussion of what is involved in integrating CBL initiatives into teaching undergraduate sociology. As suggested above, the types of curricular benefits gained from CBL participation vary directly as one moves up the hierarchy of CBL.[7]

---

[7]Studies on student outcomes have linked service learning and other CBL options to 1) better grades, more effective learning, and student retention (Blyth, Saito, and Berkas 1997; Boss 1994; Calabrese and Schumer 1986; Conrad and Hedin 1982; Greco 1992; Miller 1994; Sax and Astin 1997; Shumer 1990; 1994; Waterman 1997); 2) collaboration skills (Brandon and Knapp 1999; Sax and Astin 1997); 3) a stronger commitment to service, volunteerism, and civic

While students participating in service-learning advocacy would stand to gain all benefits that would accrue to those in out-of-class activities or service add-ons, the reverse is unlikely. Students engaged in more substantive CBL options have greater opportunity to experience higher order curricular benefits. For example, internships afford students more opportunity to acquire new skills than do field trips or service add-ons. By the same token, the greater prevalence of structured reflection in service learning makes students more likely to apply critical thinking, synthesize information from classroom and community settings, and examine structural/institutional antecedents of social issues than would tend to be the case among volunteers or interns.

In teaching an upper division sociology of crime course, a faculty member might have students interview police officers, take a tour of the local jail or observe a day in court. Each constitutes an *out-of-class activity* and would facilitate student observations of social actors and their interactions in a socio-legal setting, ideally providing students with "real life" examples of material presented in class. Students might also have the opportunity *to volunteer* or to earn additional academic credit through *service add-ons*, for example, by tutoring incarcerated youths or preparing meals at a halfway house. These experiences combine all the benefits of out-of-class activities with the additional benefit of providing students with a stock of experience, exposure to diverse groups, and, perhaps a sense of satisfaction that comes from meeting the immediate needs of others. Such experiences may also lead to an awareness of community needs and a heightened consciousness of social issues.

An internship, practicum, or cooperative

experience is another faculty option. Students may be placed in relevant work sites to hone their existing skills or to acquire new ones. Ideally, it is here that students get "hands on" practical experience as they apply abstract theories and concepts and use methodological skills at the work site. Development of a needs assessment survey of inmates, participation in a state-level research project on juvenile delinquency, or acting as a liaison between a community watch group and the police department is sure to help students understand course material in a new way. However, 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" (Bringle and Hatcher 1996:222).

Service learning in such a class might entail students serving in a non-profit mediation center. Working side by side in a collaborative effort, students, teachers, lawyers, mediation staff, agency volunteers, and community leaders might, for example, design and implement a school mediation program. Class assignments would include researching the social, historical, political, and economic forces that gave rise to mediation as an alternative to traditional methods of adjudication. Students would record observations in reflective journal entries, classroom activities would be designed to help process out-of-class experiences within the context of course material, and critical thinking and problem solving skills would be sharpened by the everyday hurdles of program development and implementation. It is here that students develop a sense of "knowing" as perspectives are broadened and important linkages are made.

Depending on the desired curriculum

responsibility (Blyth, Saito and Berkas 1997; Boss 1994; Rand Education 1999; Sax and Astin 1997; Waterman 1997); 4) enhanced moral and ethical reasoning (Delve, Mintz, and Stewart 1990; Zlotkowski 1996); 5) employment benefits (e.g., clarity in career path, networking, placement); and 6) the development of such "soft

skills" as increased tolerance of diversity, multicultural sensitivity, promotion of racial equality and conflict resolution (Aberle-Grasse 2000; Blyth, Saito and Berkas 1997; Easterling and Rudell 1997; Myers-Lipton 1998; Zlotkowski 1996).

Figure 2. Curricular Benefits of Different Community-Based Learning Initiatives for Sociology Students

CBL Type		Curricular Benefit for Students
Out-of-Class Activities	➤	observes group dynamics/interactions
	➤	sees new statuses and roles acted out
	➤	experiences concrete examples of social phenomena
	➤	gains knowledge and insights through "real world" experiences
Volunteering/ Service Add-Ons[a]	➤	gains awareness of community needs
	➤	encounters diverse groups
	➤	sees symptoms of problems
	➤	addresses immediate concerns
	➤	participates in community
	➤	heightens consciousness of social problems
Internship/Practica/Co-op	➤	illustrates practical application of skills/knowledge
	➤	fosters development of new skills/knowledge
	➤	acquires practical "hands-on" experience
	➤	applies discipline specific theory and methodological skills
Service Learning	➤	develops important social and intellectual linkages
	➤	hones problem solving skills
	➤	examines structural and institutional causes of problems
	➤	applies critical thinking
	➤	synthesizes information from class and "real world"
	➤	learns lessons of civic responsibility
	➤	implements abstract concepts
Service-Learning Advocacy	➤	enhances citizen education/civic literacy
	➤	develops/hones leadership skills
	➤	acts as an agent of social change
	➤	gains experiential knowledge of power relations
	➤	enhances political socialization
	➤	becomes empowered
	➤	enhances moral character development
	➤	gains collaborative skills
	➤	adopts an interdisciplinary approach

[a]These two CBL options were combined since they differ only in the curricular credit received.

benefits for students, a faculty member might initiate a program of *service-learning advocacy*. Such pedagogy could include students working at a battered-women's shelter as court companions. In addition to the service provided, as with service learning in general, students would be encouraged to critically examine the socio-historical context in which violence against women occurs, and the effectiveness of institutional responses. Students might also evaluate the adequacy of facilities available to abused women, and based upon their findings, begin a fund-raising and media campaign de-

signed to increase public awareness and raise needed revenues. It is in this final CBL initiative that students act collaboratively as agents of social change, and in which they are most likely to develop leadership skills, political awareness, and civic literacy.

CONCLUSION

In different contexts, each of us has struggled with the promise and difficulties of integrating CBL options into our teaching. We have critically reflected on our own

praxis and on the collective praxis reflected in the recent service-learning literature. The hierarchy of community-based learning options outlined in Figure 1 grew out of that process as an effort to conceptualize an empirical basis for differentiating between various CBL endeavors. Such differentiation is important as CBL and service learning become more popular. Faculty members approaching such endeavors for the first time, program evaluators, and researchers seeking to assess their effectiveness will all need to differentiate among forms of CBL in order to clearly understand the benefits and limitations of each type. Careful delineation also clarifies the ways lower level CBL options can provide the base of skills and experience needed to pursue higher level CBL options. Such an understanding is important for sequencing curricular offerings. Programs or departments seeking to implement CBL and service learning into their curricula may want to integrate lower level CBL options, for example, out-of-class activities and service add-ons, into lower division courses with internships and integrate service learning into upper division courses. Students in such programs would take a series of courses culminating in service-learning advocacy as part of a capstone experience.

In identifying and describing a hierarchical typology of community-based learning options that culminates with service-learning advocacy, we want to avoid two common pitfalls: the reification of the typology itself, and the mirage that definitional consensus is a prerequisite of improved praxis. Typologies like the one developed here are useful deductive propositions that enable investigators and practitioners alike to make provisional sense out of the complex social realities represented by the increasing popularity of CBL in higher education. The typology developed here is heuristic, intended to stimulate discussion and reflection and in turn facilitate improved praxis. Yet, typologies of this sort often become counterproductive. If pushed beyond their heuristic limits, they foster definitional disputes about

what fits which type and to what extent. Such "boundary maintenance" efforts lead to ever more fine-grained description, but not to ever-improving praxis. Thus, any inclination that common definitions must be adopted as a necessary condition for improved CBL practices should be resisted. Conceptual refinement comes through praxis—the critical reflection upon past struggles that orients subsequent rounds of practice upon which CBL practitioners will later reflect. Indeed, we make the road by walking (Horton and Freire 1990).

REFERENCES

Aberle-Grasse, Melissa. 2000. "The Washington Study-Service Year of Eastern Mennonite University: Reflections on 23 Years of Service Learning." *American Behavioral Scientist* 43 (5):848-57.

Bellah, Robert, Richard Madison, William Sullivan, Ann Swidler, and Steven Tiptoe. 1985. *Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life.* New York: Harper Row.

Blyth, Dale A., Rebecca Saito, and Tom Berkas. 1997. "A Quantitative Study of the Impact of Service Learning Programs." Pp. 39-56 in *Service Learning: Applications from the Research,* edited by Alan Waterman. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Boss, J. 1994. "The Effect of Community Service Work on the Moral Development of College Ethics Students." *Journal of Moral Education* 23:183-98.

Boyer, Ernest. 1983. "High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America." New York: Harper Row.

———. 1990. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professorate.* Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

———. 1994. "Creating the New American Education." *Chronicle of Higher Education* March 9, p. A48.

Brandon, Richard N. and Michael S. Knapp. 1995. "A Service Learning Curriculum for Faculty." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 2:112-22.

———. 1999. "Interprofessional Education and Training: Transforming Professional Preparation to Transform Human Services." *American Behavioral Scientist* 45(5):876-93.

Bringle, Robert and J. Hatcher. 1996. "Implementing Service Learning in Higher Education." *Journal of Higher Education* 67(2): 221-239.

Bringle, Robert, Richard Games, Cathy Ludlum, Robert Osgood, and Randall Osborne. 2000. "Faculty Fellows Program: Enhancing Integrated Professional Development through Community Service." *American Behavioral Scientist* 45(3):882-94.

Brooks, J. Michael. 1997. "Sociology and Virtual Teaching and Learning. " *Teaching Sociology* 27:1-14.

Burns, Leonard T. 1998. "Make Sure it's Service Learning Not Just Community Service." *The Education Digest* 64(2):38-41.

Calabrese, R. L. and H. Schumer. 1986. "The Effects of Service Activities on Adolescent Alienation." *Adolescence* 21:675-87.

Chapin, June R. 1998. "Is Service Learning a Good Idea? Data from the National Longitudinal Study of 1988." *Social Studies* 89(5):205-12.

Conrad, D. and D. Hedin.1982. "The Impact of Experiential Education on Adolescent Development." *Child and Youth Services* 4(3/4):57-76.

Corwin, Patricia. 1996. "Using the Community as a Classroom for Large Introductory Classes." *Teaching Sociology* 24:310-15.

Delve, C.I., S.D. Mintz, and G.M. Stewart. 1990. "Promoting Value Development through Community Service: A Design." *New Directions for Student Services* 50:7-9.

Dewey, John. 1916. *Democracy and Education.* New York: Macmillan.

_____. 1937. *Education and Social Change in the Later Works of John Dewey*, Vol. 2. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

_____. 1938. *Experience and Education.* New York: Collier Books.

Easterling, Debbie and Frederic Rudell. 1997. "Rationale, Benefits and Methods of Service Learning in Marketing Education." *Journal of Education for Business* 73(1):58-61.

Edgerton, Russell, 1994. "The Engaged Campus: Organizing to Serve Society's Needs." *ACHE Bulletin* 47:3-4.

Edwards, Bob and Michael W. Foley. 1997. "Social Capital and the Political Economy of our Discontent." *American Behavioral Scientist* 40(5):668-77.

Edwards, Bob and Sam Marullo. 1999. "Universities in Troubled Times: Institutional Responses." *American Behavioral Scientist* 42(5):748-59.

Enos, Sandra and Marie Troppe. 1996. "Service Learning in the Curriculum." Pp. 156-81 in *Service Learning in Higher Education*, edited by Barbara Jacoby. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Everett, Kevin. 1998. "Understanding Social Inequality through Service Learning." *Teaching Sociology* 26:299-309.

Fertman, C.I. 1994. *Service Learning for All Students*. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Finn, Chester E. and Gregg Vanourek. 1995. "Charity Begins at School." *Commentary* 100(4):46-49.

Franklin, B.A. 1995. "In Our National Loss of Community, the Political Parties are Becoming a Wasteland Too." *The Washington Spectator*, February 15, pp. 1-3.

Freire, Paulo. 1970. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed.* New York: Continuum.

_____. 1973. *Education for Critical Consciousness.* New York: Siberia.

_____. 1974. "Conscientization." *Cross Currents* 24(1):23-31.

_____. 1985. *The Politics of Education.* New York: Bergin and Garvey.

Gardner, Bonnie. 1997. "The Controversy over Service Learning." *NEA Today* 16(2):17-18.

Gaventa, John. 1993. "The Powerful, the Powerless, and the Experts: Knowledge Struggles in an Information Age." Pp. 21-40 in *Voices of Change*, edited by Peter Park, Mary Brydon-Miller, Budd Hall, and Ted Jackson. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education Press.

Gere, Anne Ruggles and Jennifer Sinor. 1997. "Composing Service Learning." *The Writing Instructor* Winter:53-63.

Giles, Dwight, E. Porter Honnet, and S. Migliori, eds. 1991. *Research Agenda for Combining Service and Learning in the 1990s.* Raleigh, NC: National Society for Experiential Educations.

Goodlad, J. 1984. "A Place Called School." New York: McGraw-Hill.

Gose, Ben. 1997. "Many Colleges Move toward Linking Courses up with Volunteerism." *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 44(12):A45-A46.

Greco, N. 1992. "Critical Literacy and Community Service: Reading and Writing in the World." *English Journal* 81:83-85.

Gronski, Robert and Kenneth Pigg. 2000. "University and Community Collaboration." *American Behavioral Scientist* 43(5):781-93.

Groome, Thomas H. 1980. *Christian Religious Education: Sharing Our Story and Vision.* San

Francisco, CA: Harper & Row.

Hinck, Shelly Schaefer and Mary Ellen Brandell. 2000. "The Relationship between Institutional Support and Campus Acceptance of Academic Service Learning." *American Behavioral Scientist* 43(5):868-81.

Hironimus-Wendt, Robert J. and Larry Lovell-Troy. 1999. "Grounding Service Learning in Social Theory." *Teaching Sociology* 27:360-72.

Horton, Myles and Paulo Freire. 1990. *We Make the Road by Walking: Conversations on Education and Social Change*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Howard, J.P.F. 1998. "Academic Service Learning: A Counternormative Pedagogy." Pp. 21-29 in *Academic Service Learning: A Pedagogy of Action and Reflection*, edited by R.A. Rhoads and J.P.F. Howard. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Hutchings, P. and A. Wutzdorff. 1988. "Experiential Learning across the Curriculum: Assumptions and Principles." Pp. 5-19 in *Knowing and Doing: Learning through Experience*, edited by P. Hutchings and A. Wutzdorff. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Jacoby, Barbara. 1994. "Bring Community Service into the Classroom." *Chronicle for Higher Education*, August 15, p. B2.

Jacoby, Barbara, ed. 1996. *Service Learning in Higher Education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

James, William. 1907. *Pragmatisim, a New Name for Some Old Ways of Thinking*. New York: Longman's, Green, and Co.

Kahne, Joseph and Joel Westheimer. 1996. "In the Service of What? The Politics of Service Learning." *Phi Delta Kappa* 77(9):592-603.

Keith, Novella. 1994. "School-Based Community Service: Answers and Some Questions." *Journal of Adolescence* 17:311-320.

Kendall, Susan. 1990. *Combining Service and Learning: A Resource Book for Community and Public Service*, Vol. 1. Raleigh, NC: National Society for Experiential Education.

Koliba, Christopher J. 2000. "Moral Language and Networks of Engagement." *American Behavioral Scientist* 43(5):825-38.

Koulish, Robert. 1998. "Citizenship Service Learning: Becoming Citizens by Assisting Immigrants." *Political Science and Politics* 31(3):562-68.

Lena, Hugh. 1995. "How Can Sociology Contribute to Integrating Service Learning into Academic Curricula." *The American Sociologist* 26:107-17.

Marullo, Sam. 1996. "The Service Learning Movement in Higher Education: An Academic Response to Troubled Times." *Sociological Imagination* 33:117-37.

_____. 1998. "Bringing Home Diversity: A Service-Learning Approach to Teaching Race and Ethnic Relations." *Teaching Sociology* 26:259-75.

Marullo, Sam and Bob Edwards. 2000a. "Editors Introduction." *American Behavioral Scientist* 43(5):746-55.

_____. 2000b. "From Charity to Justice: The Potential of University-Community Collaboration for Social Change." *American Behavioral Scientist* 43(5):895-912.

McCarthy, Mark. 1996. "One-Time and Short-Term Service Learning Experiences." Pp. 113-34 in *Service Learning in Higher Education*, edited by Barbara Jacoby. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Merrifield, Juliet. 1993. "Putting Scientists in their Place: Participatory Research in Environmental and Occupational Health." Pp. 65-84 in *Voices of Change*, edited by Peter Park, Mary Brydon-Miller, Budd Hall, and Ted Jackson. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education Press.

Miller, Jerry. 1994. "Linking Traditional and Service Learning Course: Outcome Evaluations Utilizing Two Pedagogically Distinct Models." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 1:29-36.

Mintz, Suzanne and Garry W. Hesser. 1996. "Principles of Good Practice in Service Learning." Pp. 26-51 in *Service Learning in Higher Education*, edited by Barbara Jacoby. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Myers-Lipton, J. Scott. 1998. "Effects of a Comprehensive Service Learning Program on College Students' Civic Responsibility." *Teaching Sociology* 25:243-58.

National and Community Service Act of 1990. Pub. L. No. 101-610.

Newmann, Fred. 1975. *Education for Citizen Action: Challenges for Secondary Curriculum*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Palmer, Parker. 1983. *To Know as We Are Known: A Spirituality of Education*. San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row.

Park, Peter. 1993. "What is Participatory Research? A Theoretical and Methodological Perspective." Pp. 1-20 in *Voices of Change*, edited by Peter Park, Mary Brydon-Miller, Budd Hall and Ted Jackson. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education Press.

Parker-Gwin, Rachel. 1996. "Connecting Service

to Learning: How Students and Communities Matter." *Teaching Sociology* 24:97-101.

Parker-Gwin, Rachel and J. Beth Mabry. 1998. "Service Learning as Pedagogy and Civic Education: Comparing Outcomes of Three Models." *Teaching Sociology* 26:276-91.

Parilla, Peter F. and Garry W. Hesser, 1998, "Internships and the Sociological Perspective: Applying Principles of Experiential Learning." *Teaching Sociology* 26:310-29.

Perreault, Gerri E. 1997. "Citizen Leader: A Community Service Option for College Students." *NASPA Journal* 34(2):147-55.

Pestello, Frances G., Dan E. Miller, Stanley Saxton, and Patrick G. Donnelly. 1996. "Community and the Practice of Sociology." *Teaching Sociology* 24:148-56.

Plater, W.M. 1995. "Future Work: Faculty Time in the 21st Century." *Change* May-June:22-23.

Porter, Judith R. and Lisa B. Schwartz. 1993. "Experiential Service-Based Learning: An Integrated HIV/AIDS Education Model for College Campuses." *Teaching Sociology* 21:409-15.

Rand Education. 1999. "Combining Service and Learning in Higher Education: Summary Report." *Combining Service Learning and Higher Education: Evaluation of the Learn and Serve America, Higher Education Program.* Washington, DC.

Roschelle, Anne, Jennifer Turpin, and Robert Elias. 2000. "Who Learns from Service Learning?" *American Behavioral Scientist* 43(5): 839-47.

Rothman, M., E. Anderson, and J. Schaefer. 1998. *Service matters: Engaging Higher Education in the Renewal of America's Communities and American's Democracy.* Providence, RI: Campus Compact.

Rubin, Sharon. 1996. "Institutionalizing Service Learning." Pp. 297-316 in *Service Learning in Higher Education*, edited by Barbara Jacoby. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Rudell, Frederic. 1996. "Students Also Reap Benefits for Social Work." *Marketing News* 30(17):12-13.

Rundblad, Georganne. 1998. "Addressing Social Problems, Focusing on Solutions: The Community Exploration Project." *Teaching Sociology* 26:330-40.

Saltmarsh, John. 1996. "Education for Critical Citizenship: John Dewey's Contribution to the Pedagogy of Community Service Learning." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 3:13-21.

Sax, Linda and Alexander W. Astin. 1997. "The Benefits of Service: Evidence from Undergraduates." *The Educational Record* 78(3/4):25-32.

Scarce, Rik. 1997. "Field Trips as Short-Term Experiential Education." *Teaching Sociology* 25:219-26.

Scheuerman, Cesie. 1996. "Ongoing Curricular Service Learning." Pp. 135-55 in *Service Learning in Higher Education*, edited by Barbara Jacoby. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Shumer, Robert. 1990. "Community-Based Learning: An Evaluation of a Drop-Out Prevention Program." Report submitted to the City of Los Angeles Community Development Department. Los Angeles, CA: UCLA Field Studies Development.

_____. 1994. "Community-Based Learning: Humanizing Education." *Journal of Adolescence* 17:357-67.

_____. 1997. "Learning From Qualitative Research." Pp. 27-38 in *Service Learning: Applications from the Research*, edited by Alan S. Waterman. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Shumer, Robert and Brad Belbas. 1996. "What We Know about Service Learning." *Education and Urban Society* 28(2):208-23.

Shumer, Robert and Charles Cook. 1999. "The Status of Service Learning in the United States: Some Facts and Figures." National Service Learning Clearinghouse. Retrieved June 17, 2000 (http://www.nicls.coled.umn.edu/res/mono/status.html).

Tyack, David and Larry Cuban. 1995. *Tinkering toward Utopia: A Century of Public School Reform.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wade, Rahima C. 1997. "Community Service Learning and the Social Studies Curriculum: Challenges to Effective Practice." *Social Studies* 88(5):197-202.

Wade, Rahima C. and David W. Saxe. 1996. "Community Service Learning in the Social Studies: Historical Roots, Empirical Evidence and Critical Issues." *Theory and Research in Social Education* 24:331-59.

Wallace, John. 2000. "A Popular Education Model for College in Community." *American Behavioral Scientists* 43:756-66.

Ward, Kelly, 1996. "'Service Learning' Reflections on Institutional Commitment." *Michigan Journal of Service Learning* 3:55-65.

Ward, Kelly and Lisa Wolf-Wendel. 2000. "Community-Centered Service Learning: Moving from *Doing for* to *Doing with.*" *American Behavioral Scientist* 43(5):767-81.

Waterman, Alan S., ed. 1997. *Service Learning:*

Applications from the Research. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Zlotkowski, Edward. 1996. "Opportunity for All: Linking Service-Learning and Business Education." *Journal of Business Ethics* 1:5-19.

Linda A. Mooney is an associate professor of sociology at East Carolina University in Greenville, NC. Her research and teaching areas include sociology of law, criminology, social problems, and mass media. She has published articles in *Social Forces, Sociological Inquiry, Sex Roles,* and *The Sociological Quarterly*, and is presently working with co-authors on the third edition of the textbook *Understanding Social Problems* (Wadsworth).

Bob Edwards is graduate director of sociology at East Carolina University. His research interests center around social movements and advocacy organizations and their relationship to political participation and social change. He is co-editor with Sam Marullo of a two-issue series of the *American Behavioral Scientist*: "The Service Learning Movement: Response to Troubled Times in Higher Education" 43(5):741-912 (February 2000); and "Universities in Troubled Times: Institutional Responses" 42(5):743-901 (February 1999).