Service Learning and Citizenship: Directions for Research

JOSEPH KAHNE   JOEL WESTHEIMER   BETHANY ROGERS
Mills College   New York University   New York University

Abstract

This essay highlights three areas of research that can deepen our understanding of the relationship between service learning and citizenship in colleges and universities. First, we discuss the need to understand the relationship between different approaches to service learning and different conceptions of "good" citizenship. Second, we discuss the need to connect research on service learning to scholarly issues and frameworks from related academic disciplines. Finally, we discuss the need to examine the relationship between the civic mission of higher education institutions and the design, implementation, and impact of curriculum designed to further civic goals (including service learning).

Joseph Kahne is an Associate Professor of Educational Policy at Mills College where he Directs the doctoral program in educational leadership and the Institute for Civic Leadership. His work focuses on the academic, social, and civic development of youth in school and community settings.   Dr. Kahne's book, *Reframing Educational Policy: Democracy, Community, and the Individual*, was published by Teachers College Press in 1996. He has worked as a high school teacher in the New York City Public Schools.

Joel Westheimer is an Assistant Professor of Teaching and Learning and Fellow of the Center for the Study of American Culture and Education at New York University. A former New

York City public schools teacher and musician, he currently works with schools and researches the design, implementation, and evaluation of experience-based curriculum, service learning, and democratic education. Dr. Westheimer's 1998 book *Among Schoolteachers: Community, Autonomy, and Ideology in Teachers' Work* was published by Teachers College Press.

Bethany Rogers is a doctoral student at New York University.   She has led school reform efforts associated with the Atlas Project and the Coalition of Essential Schools. She has published for practitioners and scholars on school reform and related topics. Her interests include history of education, school reform, and social change.

SERVICE LEARNING AND CITIZENSHIP IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Michigan Journal of Service Learning

Joseph Kahne   Joel Westheimer   Bethany Rogers
Mills College   New York University   New York University

With support from the federal government, foundations, corporations, and the public, colleges and universities are significantly expanding community service and service learning opportunities for their students. Over 600 public and private colleges and over 150 community colleges are now members of the Campus Compact, for example. Accompanying this growth in activity has been a substantial increase in related theoretical and empirical scholarship.

Many of these curricular efforts are promoted on the grounds that they will support the development of committed and thoughtful citizens who in turn will provide a solid foundation for democracy. The importance of this agenda–to reinvigorate civic life–has been detailed by many scholars and in varied ways (see, for example, Putnam, 1993; Barber, 1984; Verba, 1995). Collectively, this scholarship demonstrates the fundamental ways engaged citizens support and enable democracy, equality, and economic development.

As we detail in this article, early research on service learning and higher education provides some support for this curricular direction. At the same time, research that explores the relationship between service, learning, and citizenship is only just beginning to address many of the most interesting and important questions. In this essay, we focus on three important areas for future scholarly work. Specifically, we argue that research and scholarship on service learning in higher education will need to:

- distinguish between different conceptions of the "good" citizen and different ensuing program designs and outcomes

- build strong and well traveled bridges that connect research on service learning to scholarly discourse in related academic disciplines

- consider how features of higher education institutions (such as size, emphasis on research, religious mission, and funding base) shape the civic mission of these institutions and their use of service learning opportunities

WHAT WE KNOW

We know a great deal about the potential of service learning to support the development of citizens. These understandings derive in large part from a wealth of literature on service learning and its forebears, democratic and curriculum theory. However, this literature is generative rather than definitive. No single "correct" understanding emerges concerning the attitudes, skills, and knowledge that citizens require (Conrad & Hedin, 1991). Nor is there agreement regarding the ways different curriculum approaches might support the development of citizens, however defined. Still, the careful thinking of political and educational theorists provides a foundation for service learning and its rationale.

As a result of the multiple definitions of service learning and its aims, research focusing on different programs and priorities takes several forms. In simple methodological terms, there exist both qualitative and quantitative studies. Among these, some studies concentrate on particular initiatives; some treat service learning as a single curricular approach; and others focus on differing conceptions of the attitudes, skills, and knowledge associated with developing citizens. In our attempt to describe "what we know," we do not provide a comprehensive review, but rather discuss relevant studies representative of the broader literature.

Perhaps most commonly referenced, a significant and helpful body of empirical literature draws largely on surveys of student participants. These surveys assess a broad range of issues frequently associated with citizenship, by measuring characteristics of personal, social, and civic responsibility. For example, a study by Alexander Astin and Linda Sax assessed students' civic commitments as well as their academic and skill development. The study amassed freshman and follow-up survey data from over 3,000 students–2,000 who participated in service and 1,000 who did not–hailing from 42 different institutions. Astin and Sax (1998) found that the programs achieved their desired effects: "Participating in service during the undergraduate years substantially enhances the student's academic development, life skill development, and sense of civic responsibility" (251).

Astin's study is consistent with other major national studies linking service learning with increased evidence of personal, social, or civic responsibility on the part of students

(Melchoir, 1997; Rand Corporation, 1996). Between 1993 and 1998, for example, Eyler and Giles (1999) conducted two national research projects, one for the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) and another for the Corporation for National Service (CNS). They surveyed more than fifteen hundred students and interviewed 120 including 67 "problem-solving interviews" that explored changes in students' understanding of social problems and in their critical thinking abilities. The authors found that "participation in [high quality] service-learning leads to the values, knowledge, skills, efficacy, and commitment that underlie effective
citizenship" (164). Among the program characteristics that they found made a difference in education for effective citizenship were: placement quality, application, reflection, diversity, and community voice (166-180).

These outcomes also match the results of smaller studies that target particular programs. These smaller studies affirm the positive effects of service learning on indicators of personal and social responsibility, compassion towards the disadvantaged, commitment to an ethic of service, sense of agency as a community leader, and acceptance of diversity (Fenzel and Leary, 1997; Batchelder and Root, 1994; Giles and Eyler, 1994). Studies that examine students' use of reflective judgement as related to specific social problems also find positive effects. Students who undertake more extensive service experiences, as well as those whose experiences are well integrated into the curriculum, tend to approach social problems in a more complex and thorough way than non-participants or students who participate in fleeting or discrete service opportunities (Eyler, Lynch, & Gray, 1997).

Benjamin Barber and colleagues adopted a somewhat different approach in studying the impact of service experiences (Barber, et al., 1995). In addition to examining the ways service learning influenced student commitment to the kinds of indicators noted above, they also examined how service altered students' views of democracy. Specifically, they asked students questions that distinguished between four perspectives of democracy: participatory, Madisonian, individualist, and interest group. Among their findings, they learned that service experiences tended to increase students' preference for a participatory view and that this preference was stronger for women and whites than for African-Americans and males. From our perspective, this work has two valuable features. First, unlike most survey research on service learning, these authors connected their work to the disciplines of philosophy and political science thereby bolstering the significance of their arguments by placing them in the context of accumulated work in these fields. Second, the researchers took care to consider issues of race and gender and to problematize survey items. For example, questions related to acceptance of the Ku Klux Klan's right to march are often used to assess "tolerance"–which is defined as "good." But, as the authors point out, tolerance of the Klan means something

3

dramatically different to those who are threatened by the Klan than to those who are not.

In addition to the commonly referenced survey data derived from quantitative studies, qualitative studies have also assessed the impact of service learning (see, for example, Battistoni, 1997; Kinsley, 1999; Rhoads, 1997; Rimmerman, 1997). Many of these offer case studies of successful programs and can serve as valuable windows into the potential of service experiences to impact participants' attitudes, skills, and knowledge. A few also explore complexities associated with service experiences and the multiple meanings students bring to such experiences. One particularly interesting study (Gibboney, 1996) examines how involvement in a senior honors seminar, "Altruism, Philanthropy, and Public Service," influenced participants' thinking and actions two years later. The longitudinal nature of this work, as well as its focus on future actions, make it relatively unique. The author's explicit use of theory also distinguishes the study. In considering the degree to which student narratives about the course and its significance in their lives aligned with theorists' discussions of service learning goals, the researcher found an interesting contradiction. While theorists emphasize a distinction between charity work and social action, participants described a "dynamic interaction between charity and justice and between self and community" (523).

To date, research provides clear indications that engaging students in service learning may support the development of individuals who are more committed to civic involvement. However, the field lacks a deeper, more discriminating sense of what such commitment implies and of the differing impact of particular service learning approaches.[1]

WHAT WE NEED TO KNOW

Although, questions about citizenship and democracy have long been of interest to philosophers, sociologists, political theorists, and educators, the literature on service learning currently lacks the conceptual complexity associated with those disciplinary inquiries. To be sure, the research that exists provides a starting point. Moving the field forward, however, demands more detailed exploration and analysis of the many concepts that inform our understanding of service and its effects. We suggest three areas of inquiry, each of which represents a significant gap in the current literature. Each area is framed by a question that may help to guide researchers, practitioners, and policy-makers in their attempts to understand the rich and complex experiences of service learning participants and, in particular, how those experiences relate to citizenship and democracy.

1. **What Conceptions Of "Good" Citizenship Drive Various Service Learning Programs?**

    One important direction for further research lies in a more thorough understanding of the diverse assumptions about citizenship that ground various service learning initiatives. For example, some attention has been brought to bear on the need to distinguish service learning activities aimed at promoting charity and voluntarism from those concentrating on root causes of social problems, politics, and the need for structural change (Eyler and Giles, 1999; Kahne and Westheimer, 1996; Boyte, 1991, for example**)**. However, the difficult theoretical and practical questions associated with these differences, as well as their political significance and relationship to varying conceptions of citizenship, have gone largely unexamined. Another important distinction could be made between notions of citizenship that emphasize actions of individuals and those that focus on collective action and social movements. Related to this are distinctions put forth by Boyte and Kari (1996). They eschew both liberal and communitarian conceptions of citizenship in favor of a third possibility that considers the role of public work in forging

civic unity. By public work, they mean "patterns of work that have public dimensions (that is work with public purposes, work by a public, work in public settgins), as well as the 'works' or products themselves" (202). This perspective, they argue, can diminish civic fragmentation and rebuild our sense of common civic purpose. The focus on experience in public work makes their conception of citizenship particularly relevant for those interested in promoting service learning on college campuses.

    Attending to multiple–and at times conflicting–conceptualizations of citizenship requires careful consideration of questions such as (1) What kind of citizens do service learning programs aim to develop? (2) What conception of themselves as citizens, capacities, and commitments do students develop? In short, what conception of "good" citizenship is fostered by participating in service tied to an academic curriculum?

    We know that citizenship is understood in a wide variety of ways. For example, in our recent national study of programs emphasizing the development of effective citizens, three conceptions of citizenship emerged that can help us make sense of the variation (Westheimer, Kahne, and Rogers, 2000). One common conception portrays a *responsible citizen*–someone with a job, who votes, pays taxes, gives blood, and obeys the law. Another, which we refer to as the *participatory citizen*, describes someone who is active in community affairs–planning community events and participating on local boards, for example. A third image that emerged was that of a *social reformer*–someone who seeks to understand the

causes of societal problems and address them at the root. These programs might engage participants in critical analysis of social and economic structures in relation to power and varied interest groups. We know that even among those who share the common belief that citizens should be active participants in community life, many differences exist. Some advocates stress the importance of personal responsibility and individual effort on the part of citizens while others focus more on the key role of collective efforts. Each of these conceptions of citizenship (and they are not necessarily mutually exclusive) requires a different focus for research.

An example of this "under-conceptualization" is instructive. A decade ago, Fred Newmann and Robert Rutter (1989) studied a wide cross-section of community service programs. They found these programs supported students' individual personal development, but not their sense of civic responsibility. Interviews with the students suggested that the service experiences were interpreted in terms of individual rather than public goals. For instance, many students enjoyed the opportunity to take on leadership roles or explore possible future careers.

When Newmann and Rutter uncovered this lack of a "public" orientation in service, they complicated and broadened the possibilities of service, and made new questions pertinent. How do students think about and act on their role in furthering the public good? How do the experiences change the way they think about civic duty and civic engagement? Partly owing to this study, service learning research and program implementation over the intervening ten years have sought increasingly to consider civic duty and a sense of social responsibility.

Citizenship and the idea of what a good citizen does, however, continue to be narrowly construed (Westheimer & Kahne, 1998). While service learning programs have increasingly responded to what Newmann and Rutter identified as the lack of civic duty among participants, the form and content of such civic participation can be broadened still further. For example, as the literature testifies, the vast majority of large service learning initiatives emphasize voluntarism and charity but do not teach about social movements, analysis of social and economic structures, and systemic change. Accordingly, research has concentrated on a conception of citizenship that privileges individual acts of compassion and kindness over social action and the pursuit of social justice.

Program evaluation–by far the most prevalent form of service learning research–has emphasized the contribution of service learning to individual growth in areas like self esteem, willingness to volunteer, and personal responsibility for the environment. Far less investigated is the degree to which service learning programs contribute to participants' understandings of organized movements, both historical and contemporary, and the ways

government and corporate sectors constrain and enable solutions to social problems. Consider the following commonly-asked questions on surveys of participants in K-12 service learning programs[2]:

(1)   Taking care of people who are having difficulty caring for themselves is (everyone's responsibility, including mine/is not my responsibility)

(2)   Being actively involved in community issues is (everyone's responsibility including mine/is not my responsibility)

(3)   Keeping the environment safe and clean is (something I <u>don't</u> feel personally responsible for/is something I <u>do</u> feel personally responsible for)

These questions (and many more like them) emphasize individual actions or a vague sense of individual participation. They ignore the fact that social movements, government policy, and corporate behavior, for example, represent important concerns for citizens who hope to improve society.

Another question from this same scale further illustrates this point:

(4)   The problems of pollution and toxic waste (are not my responsibility/are everyone's responsibility including mine).

This question exemplifies the way in which social action and corporate or government responsibility (reasonable levers for substantive change) are obscured by the narrow focus on the individual. Toxic waste, of course, is rarely the responsibility of individuals but rather the result of industrial pollution, corporate irresponsibility, and inadequate legislation protecting the environment. The focus on personal responsibility obscures corporate or collective responsibility and the ways social movements and collective action might work to combat toxic waste.

Since studies rarely measure other aspects of citizenship, such as a group's ability to accomplish a task or an individual's capacity to organize a group, surveys that rely on the kinds of questions described above are incomplete. In addition, these surveys rarely examine the impact of a curriculum on students' ability to analyze the roles played by government and industry. Thus a study that demonstrates no gain in students' interest in volunteer work or recycling may be missing important program gains in students' ability to identify root causes of problems and begin to work with others toward ameliorating them.

Fortunately, recent empirical research on service learning in higher education has begun considering some of these issues. Eyler and Giles' recent study (1999) examines the transformational potential of service learning experiences. They surveyed and interviewed college students who participated in a broad range of service learning experiences to consider

these questions. They found statistically significant, though sometimes modest, changes associated with students' emphasis on systemic problems, specifically the importance they placed on political structures, on social justice, and on changing policy. They were also able to identify programmatic features that promoted greater impact such as placement quality, opportunities to link classroom and service experiences, opportunities for reflection, and exposure to individuals of diverse backgrounds.

The importance of scholarship that focuses on students' commitment to systemic analysis and action is also made clear by recent findings from the 1999 Freshman survey of over a quarter million college students. Sax et al (1999) found that while a record 75.3% of freshman reported performing volunteer work as high school seniors, that interest in social activism is declining. Only 35.8% felt it "very important" or "essential" to "influence social values" (its lowest point since 1986) and students desire to participate in community action programs fell to 21.3% (its lowest point in over a decade). Thus, one must question the assumption that students who volunteer will necessarily participate in other crucial civic arenas.

To date, findings indicate that service learning has potential to foster analysis of social structures and commitment to working for social change, but such outcomes are not guaranteed. Indeed, some programs in our recently completed study of 10 service learning initiatives produced statistically significant and sizable strides in this regard, while others did not (Westheimer, Kahne, and Rogers, 2000). As a result, there is a need for studies that focus more fully on varied goals in relation to citizenship and provide a finer grained analysis of the curriculum to better understand program qualities and how they can enable or constrain varied results.

Of course, for many relevant questions regarding citizenship, there are not right or wrong answers. We are not arguing that one conception of citizenship is necessarily better than another; only that research on service learning as it relates to citizenship must attend to different beliefs and capacities regarding citizenship, improving society, and social change (Barber, et al., 1997; Westheimer, Kahne, & Rogers, 2000). Future empirical research can enrich our understanding of service and citizenship by focusing not on the question "Are they better citizens after completing this program?" but rather on the question "Have participants' beliefs and capacities regarding citizenship changed?" And if survey research continues to be a principal component of large-scale investigations into program efficacy, we would encourage a broader repertoire of questions such as:
- In the next three years I will work with others to challenge unjust laws
- Government should fund social programs for those in need
- Employers should pay employees a living wage

Even with more varied items included, surveys alone–now a common practice in evaluations of service learning programs–continue to be informative but insufficient. Detailed qualitative work that includes interviews and observations have the potential to surface multiple, even discrepant, rationales that might otherwise go undetected.

2. How Can Service Learning Research Inform And Be Informed By Broader Disciplinary Research On Citizenship And Democracy?

In the previous section, we called for careful consideration of the varied conceptions of "citizenship" embedded in diverse service learning experiences and curriculum. In this section, we want to highlight the ongoing need to link these efforts to similar work in related fields. Service learning research can both inform and be informed by current research and theory in disciplines such as psychology, sociology, history, gender studies, and political science. For example, Eyler, Root, and Giles (1998) draw on cognitive science and scholars' knowledge of "expert" and "novice" behavior to develop the notion of an "Expert Citizen." They identify ways curriculum should be structured to help students learned to address social problems effectively. The AAHE series on service learning in the disciplines provides a valuable point of departure for this work. This 18 volume series makes the case for using service learning when teaching in these disciplines and provides a theoretically and practically grounded perspective on ways to proceed.

Service learning research will benefit from even stronger ties to important disciplinary concepts and issues. Currently, service learning is viewed with suspicion by many academics as soft "feel good" curriculum with little clarity regarding purpose and simplistic assumptions regarding impact. Combating this skepticism is growing recognition of the need to bolster civic orientations and countless testimonies of positive experiences associated with this approach. Linking research on service learning to other scholarly fields may provide helpful checks on advocates' enthusiasm and better conceptualized documentation of service learning's potential. We offer several examples here as a starting point.

Sociologists and political scientists, have long been interested in the dynamics of political and social participation in community affairs. The work of Robert Bellah and his colleagues, for example, explores patterns of participation in American life and suggests that participation and social and civic engagement can satisfy a longing for community that most everyone shares. In their book *Habits of the Heart* (1985) and, more recently, *The Good*

Society (1991) they present compelling accounts of Americans' need for a sense of affiliation and efficacy in community affairs. Does service learning help citizens recover what many feel they have lost?

In *Voice and Equality* (1996), Sidney Verba and colleagues explore the connections between American democracy and civil society. Through some 15,000 surveys, and 2,500 interviews, they found, for example, dramatic differences among cultural, religious, racial, and ethnic groups' participation in civic affairs. Their account of how people become active in community affairs and why some groups are less active is one of the richest sources of data available to those interested in educational questions of service and citizenship. Similarly, Pierre Bourdieu's (1984) studies of the relationship of social capital and political participation–specifically of why people opt out of voting and participating in the democratic process–finds that many "self-eliminate" from political participation because of a perception of their own lack of competence. This work can provide useful frames for future research on service learning programs. For example, through studies of students who do and don't engage in service learning, scholars can deepen their understanding of dynamics related to civic participation more broadly conceived as well as identify possible responses. Two sample questions include:

- How can sociological studies of race or gender help us understand differences in impact of service learning programs (especially since women are far more involved in service learning experiences than men)?
- How are social trust (confidence in social institutions and in community members) and other forms of social capital affected by different kinds of service experiences?

Work by psychologists can help frame the cognitive and socio-emotional impacts of service and other experiential learning over "book learning." Some, such as Yates and Youniss (1996; also see Youniss and Yates, 1997), have explored the connections between service and adolescent development. Others, Egan (1997) or philosopher of education Maxine Greene, for instance, call for greater curricular attention to the development and use of imagination and suggest important implications for democracy and citizenship. Again, studies of those engaged in service learning might enrich our understanding of these and related issues. For example, they could help us better understand the difference between preadolescent and adolescent development in relation to civic participation.

In short, stronger links between discipline based scholarship and service learning could improve the quality of research on service learning while enriching our understanding of many issues that are currently receiving attention from scholars in varied academic disciplines. As an additional benefit, such work may bolster the legitimacy of service

learning and service learning research since it will help demonstrate tight links between this pedagogical practice and priorities that drive the academy.

3. How Does the Civic Mission of Higher Education Institutions Enable or Constrain Service Learning?

It is often said that reforms don't change educational institutions as much as educational institutions change reforms. The congruence between service learning initiatives and the institutions that house them is ripe for investigation. Specifically, how do the norms and values of higher education institutions shape the reception and impact of service learning initiatives?

We know a good bit about the culture and practices of higher education institutions, but little work has been done to understand these institutions as settings for service learning. Pollack (1999) outlines some preliminary connections between service and higher education's commitments to education and democracy. Benjamin Barber sketches an arc of influence: citizenship served as a central goal of early higher education institutions; it persists today as a common rationale for university reform.[3] Many advocates eagerly claim historical antecedents for service learning in American history. For example, Waterman (1997) draws on the writings of thinkers such as Thomas Jefferson and William James to characterize the "American tradition of service to the community" as an important historical influence in the development of service learning. Yet a closer look at the history reveals a more complicated genesis.

The early theme of service (especially in the antebellum colleges) took its character and motivation as much from religious as from secular ideals. And when this early college tradition of "discipline and piety" waned in the latter part of the 19th century, a number of competing influences arose to fill the vacuum. Though service was among those influences, vying to define the purpose of the newly emergent research university, it came up against and was tempered by opposing factors, such as pure research or the advocacy of liberal culture. (Veysey, 1965)

Moreover, the interpretation of the university's mission that privileged service was timebound: it crested during the Gilded Age, when public rage and rebellion against corruption reached their height. As an answer to such abuses, particularly as they occurred under the auspices of public positions, universities aimed to graduate students capable of combating corruption and improving society. Thus, each graduate was to be made into a force for civic virtue. Yet reformers had far more in their sights than replacing destructive

public figures with more virtuous ones. Reformers (many of them university men) hedged their bets about the likelihood of inculcating virtue on any broad basis. They meant to transcend altogether the vagaries of personality and partisanship - not a view with much faith in the polity. Through its newly "scientific" scholarship, the university would create "rational substitutes . . . for political procedures subject to personal influences" (Veysey, p.72).

With reformers' eventual success in turning public matters over to scientifically trained "experts" and the passing of the Progressive ethos, the case for service as a defining purpose of the university significantly dampened. The ideology of service left a legacy, however, in the establishment of disciplinary departments such as political science, economics, and anthropology. Such social sciences were originally conceived as means of serving and improving society; only later did they embrace objectivity over advocacy. (Furner, 1975)

We share this to highlight the risk of assuming that higher education contexts will be receptive to service learning initiatives and that such receptiveness exists as a consequence of broad ideological currents and long established norms. In addition, service learning curriculum that aims to develop citizens (particularly those interested in social change) inevitably invokes values. If the last hundred years is any lesson, universities and colleges have bent over backwards to avoid the kinds of choices that values impose. For example, universities and colleges tend to add courses and departments rather than make hard choices about what knowledge is of most worth. They have been accused of using the notion of "objective" scientific knowledge as an excuse to abdicate their role as moral compasses in modern society. And last, the emphasis many schools and professors now place on research productivity may constrain use of labor intensive curriculum such as service learning.

Context, then, has critical implications for the implementation and maintenance of service learning initiatives that aim to support the development of citizens. Scholarship that examines the influence of university contexts on service learning is worthy of substantial attention. Varlotta (1996) makes a start, as does Harkavy (1996), in establishing the contrast between existing higher education contexts and the kinds of democratic communities and institutions they believe service learning could inspire (also see Persell & Wenglinsky, 2000).

But much remains unstudied:
- Do educators in community colleges hold a different set of civic goals for their

students than those in more elite settings?

- Are there differences in the ways religious and secular institutions pursue the democratic purposes of higher education?
- How do the relationships between institutions of higher education and under-resourced communities differ from those formed with the business community or more affluent neighborhoods?

Focusing on the role universities and colleges may play in developing citizens raises an additional set of questions. How might service learning experiences compare with other experiences students have in college, particularly from the standpoint of developing citizens? In what ways, for example, are service learning experiences similar to and different from part-time employment, intercollegiate athletics, or other extracurricular activities? Many courses that do not involve service learning also contain material and experiences that might influence civic attitudes, knowledge, and skills. From the perspective of developing citizens, how do service learning experiences compare with courses that emphasize social critique or careful readings of popular history or analysis of contemporary film? In short, the explicit focus of service learning on citizenship provides higher education scholars with a point of entry into a broad and potentially rich set of questions associated with the ways colleges and universities can and do help to shape citizens.

* * *

Two common critiques of the research on service learning are that it is often disconnected from broader discourse on fundamental and related issues in education and the disciplines, and that it is largely advocacy research (mostly evaluation) focused on proving that service learning "works." Research on citizenship provides an opportunity to address both of these concerns. The civic purposes of education and broader goals of citizenship and democracy have long been central concerns of educators and of scholars in the disciplines. We have argued that research on service learning in institutions of higher education should (1) consider the implications of different notions of the "good" citizen such as the *responsible citizen*, the *participatory citizen*, or the *social reformer*; (2) connect more

substantively to related research in the disciplines; and (3) examine the civic mission of institutions of higher education. These foci provide an opportunity to engage scholars in both education and the disciplines. Furthermore, these areas of inquiry would broaden the focus of service learning research, moving it away from questions of whether service learning "works" and towards richer conceptualizations of service, of learning, of citizenship, and of the relationship between them.

In a nation increasingly obsessed with standardized measures of academic success and economic outcomes, the challenges for those who believe in the democratic purposes of schooling are substantial. Research on service learning–and specifically on the relationship between citizenship and service experiences–can provide support. It can focus our attention on democratic ideals and on strategies for supporting the development of informed, thoughtful, and active citizens.

References

Astin, A. and Sax, L. (1998). How undergraduates are affected by service participation. *Journal of College Student Development*. 39(3): 259-63.

Barber, B. (1994). A proposal for mandatory citizen education and community service. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*. 1(1), 86-93.

Barber, B., Higgens, R., Smith, J., & Ballou, J. with Dedrick, J. & Downing, K. (1997). Democratic theory and civic measurement: a report on the measuring citizenship project. Walt Whitman Center: Rutgers, NJ.

Batchelder , T.H., and Root, S. (1994). Effects of an undergraduate program to integrate academic learning and service: Cognitive, prosocial cognitive, and identity outcomes. *Journal of Adolescence.* 17, 341-355.

Battistoni, R. (1997). Service learning and civic learning: Lessons we can learn from our students. In Reeher, G. and Cammarano, J. (eds.) *Education for citizenship: ideas and innovations in political learning*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield. 31-49.

Bellah, R. et al. (1985). *Habits of the heart: Individualism and commitment in American life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bellah, R. et al. (1991) *The good society.* New York: Knopf: Distributed by Random House.

Berry, J., Portney, K. and Thomson, K. (1993). *The rebirth of urban democracy*. Washington, D.C. : Brookings Institution.

Boyte, H.C. (1991). Community service and civic education. *Phi Delta Kappan*. 72(10), 765-67.

Boyte, H. & Kari, N. (1996). _Building America: the Democratic Promise of Public Work_. Philadelphia: Temple Univ Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste.* (R. Nice, Trans.). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Conrad, D. and Hedin, D. (1991). School-based community service: What we know from research and theory, *Phi Delta Kappan*. 72(10), 743-49.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York: The MacMillan Company.

Eyler, J. and Giles, D.E. (1999). *Where's the learning in service-Learning?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Eyler, J., Giles, D. E. and Braxton, J. (1997). The impact of service learning on college students. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*. 4, 5-15.

Eyler, J. Lynch, C., and Gray, C. (1997). Service learning and the development of reflective judgment. Chicago, IL: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

Eyler, J., Root, S., and Giles, D.E., Jr. (1998). Service-learning and the development of expert citizens: Service-learning and cognitive science." In R. Bingle and D. Duffey (eds.), *With Service in Mind*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Higher Education.

Egan, K. (1997). *The educated mind: How cognitive tools shape our understanding*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Fenzel, L. and Leary, T. (1997). Evaluating outcomes of service-learning courses at a parochial college. Chicago, IL: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

Furner, M. (1975). *Advocacy and objectivity: A crisis in the professionalization of American social science, 1865-1905*. Lexington : Published for the Organization of American Historians [by] The University Press of Kentucky.

Gibboney (1996). Service learning and commitment to community: Exploring the implications of honors students' perceptions of the process two years later. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*. 25(4), 506-24.

Giles, D. E., & Eyler, J. (1994). The impact of a college community service laboratory on students' personal, social, and cognitive outcomes. *Journal of Adolescence.* 17, 327-339.

Greene, M. (1995). *Releasing the imagination : essays on education, the arts, and social change.* San Francisco : Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Harkavy, I. (1996). Back to the future: From service learning to strategic, academically-based community service. *Metropolitan Universities.* 7(1), 57-70.

Kahne, J. & Westheimer, J. (1996). *In the service of what? The politics of service learning. Phi Delta Kappan.* 77(9), 592-599.

Kilpatrick, W. H. (1918). The project method; the use of the purposeful act in the educative process, *Teachers College Record.* 19(4).

Kinsley, C. (1999). Empowering Teacher Education Students Through Service Learning: A Case Study. In Claus, J. and Ogden, C. (eds.) *Service Learning for Youth Empowerment and Social Change.* New York: Peter Lang.

Melchoir, A. (1997). *National evaluation of Learn and Serve America school and community-based programs.* Interim Report, April.

Morton, K. (1995). The irony of service: Charity, project and social change in service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning.* 2, 19-32.

Newmann, F. and Rutter, R. (1989). The potential of community service to enhance civic responsibility. *Social Education.* 53(6), 371-74.

Perreault, G. (1997). Citizen leader: A community service option for college students. *NASPA Journal.* 34(2), 147-56.

Pollack, S. (1999). Early connections between service and education. In Stanton, T., Giles, D., & Cruz, N. *A movements' pioneers reflect on its origins, practice, and future.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Persell, C.H. and Wenglinsky, H. (2000). Unpublished paper. Department of Sociology, New

York University.

Rand Corporation (Eds.) (1996). Coupling service and learning in higher education: The final report of the evaluation of the Learn and Serve America, Higher Education Program. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation Institute on Education and Training.

Rhoads, R. A. (1997). Community service and higher learning: Explorations of the caring self. Albany: SUNY Press.

Rimmerman, C. (1997). Teaching American politics through service: Relfections on a pedagogical strategy. In Reeher, G. and Cammarano, J. (eds.) *Education for citizenship: ideas and innovations in political learning*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield. 17-29.

Sax, L.J., Astin, A. W., Korn, W.S., & Mahoney, K. (1999). The American Freshman: National Norms for Fall 1999. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA.

Schudson, M. (1998). *The good citizen: A history of American civic life*. New York: Martin Kessler Books.

Varlotta, L. (1996). Service-learning: A catalyst for constructing democratic progressive communities. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*. 3, 22-30.

Verba, S. (1995). *Voice and equality: Civic voluntarism in American politics*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Veysey, L. R. (1965). *The emergence of the American university*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Waterman, A. (1997). *Service Learning: Applications from the research*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Westheimer, J. & Kahne, J. (1998). "Education for action: Preparing youth for participatory democracy." In W. Ayers and T. Quinn (Eds.), *Democracy and education: A teaching for social justice reader*. New York: New Press and Teachers College Press. 1-20.

Westheimer, J., Kahne, J., & Rogers, B. (2000). What kind of citizen? The politics of

assessing democratic values. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. New Orleans.

Wiebe, R. (1995). *Self rule: A cultural history of American democracy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wurtzdorff, A. and Giles, D. (1997). Service learning in higher education, in Schine, J. (ed.), *Service learning: 96th yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 105-117.

Yates, M. and Youniss, J. (1996). Community service and political-moral identity in adolescents. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*. 6(3), 271-84.

Youniss, J. and Yates, M. (1997). *Community Service and Social Responsibility in Youth*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Endnotes:

[1] There are exceptions. See, for example, Keith Morton (1995) and Gerri Perreault (1997). Morton argues that there are distinct models for community service including "charity," "project," and "social change" and that these models each have their own logic, strengths, and limitations. Similarly, Perreault compares three approaches to service: charity, service learning, and citizen leader.

[2] These survey questions are from the Search Institute's National Learning Through Service survey scale on "Personal and Social Responsibility" (which was adapted from Conrad and Hedin's scale).

[3] This can be seen, for example, in the call of Campus Compact and its organization of college presidents for universities to "reclaim" their social mission; see also Harkavy's argument (1996).