

9-1-2017

Weaving Theoretical Frameworks and Methods Together to Advance Research on Student Civic Outcomes

Lori E. Kniffin Ph.D.
Fort Hays State University, lekniffin@fhsu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholars.fhsu.edu/leadership_facpubs



Part of the [Leadership Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Kniffin, L. E. (2017). Weaving Theoretical Frameworks and Methods Together to Advance Research on Student Civic Outcomes. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 24(1), 157–164.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Leadership Studies at FHSU Scholars Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Leadership Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of FHSU Scholars Repository. For more information, please contact ScholarsRepository@fhsu.edu.

Review Essay

Weaving Theoretical Frameworks and Methods Together to Advance Research on Student Civic Outcomes

Lori E. Kniffin

University of North Carolina at Greensboro

Research on Student Civic Outcomes in Service Learning: Conceptual Frameworks and Methods

Edited by Julie A. Hatcher, Robert G. Bringle, and Thomas W. Hahn
Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, 2017

Set in the broader context of a renewed call for higher education institutions to develop students' civic capacities, the edited volume *Research on Student Civic Outcomes in Service Learning: Conceptual Frameworks and Methods* focuses on the impact of service-learning courses on student civic outcomes. Calls to cultivate student civic outcomes in higher education can be found in many places. The editors cite several of these in the introductory chapter, including national organizations (e.g., The Democracy Commitment, Community-Campus Partnerships for Health, Campus Compact), networks (e.g., Talloires Network, Europe Engage), academic institutions (e.g., Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis), and foundations (e.g., Carnegie Foundation, Kettering Foundation) working to support civic renewal in higher education. The editors point in particular to *A Crucible Moment: College Learning & Democracy's Future* (National Task Force, 2012) to articulate the "consistent call for a renewed commitment of colleges and universities to create campus cultures that support and challenge student understanding of and commitment to civic participation" (p. 3). Service-learning has emerged as a leading pedagogy for cultivating student civic outcomes. This book focuses on research related to the potential for curricular service-learning to generate student civic outcomes and does so by reviewing previous studies, theoretical frameworks, and a variety of methods of inquiry.

Research on Student Civic Outcomes in Service Learning is the third volume in the IUPUI Series on Service Learning Research. The earlier volumes included *International Service Learning; Conceptual Frameworks and Research* (Volume 1), *Research*

on Service Learning: Conceptual Frameworks and Assessment (Students and Faculty; Volume 2A), and *Research on Service Learning: Conceptual Frameworks and Assessment (Communities, Institutions, and Partnerships; Volume 2B)*. Reviews of those books may be found in this journal (Crabtree, 2011; Giles & Eyler, 2013). The series will be continued with Volume 4, *Research on Service Learning and Diversity*.

The editors of Volume 3, Julie A. Hatcher, Robert G. Bringle, and Thomas W. Hahn are, respectively, the current and former Executive Directors and the Director of Research and Program Evaluation of the Center for Service and Learning (CSL) at IUPUI. The Series Preface, included in each of the volumes, discusses the ways in which the growth of CSL has mirrored the evolution of service-learning and community engagement across U.S. higher education institutions. After receiving many national awards and designations related to service-learning, the CSL was named an IUPUI Signature Center by the campus administration in 2007 and established the associated CSL Research Collaborative. The IUPUI Series on Service Learning Research was launched as one of the primary undertakings of the CSL Research Collaborative.

As with the previous volumes, the editors brought authors together in Indianapolis to explore the overall vision for the book – "stimulating research on student civic outcomes resulting from participation in service learning courses" (p. xix) – and the contributions of their individual chapters within that vision. The authors of this volume and past volumes were asked to "develop a research agenda and recommendations for practice with-

in a particular topic area, draw upon theory from cognate areas, critique extant research, and identify methods and tools for assessment that will improve research” (p. x). The process of developing each of the volumes was designed not only to generate a product but also to strengthen a learning community around each volume topic.

This volume contains three major parts with a total of 16 chapters. It also includes the Series Preface by Bringle and a preface to this volume by Hatcher. Most of the chapters are co-authored, with a total of 30 contributors. Chapter authors include faculty, staff, campus administrators, program and project directors, independent scholars, graduate students, representatives of national civic engagement organizations, and community leaders. One author is situated primarily in community work and another outside the U.S. This group of contributors brings to the volume a wide range of personal and professional experience with civic engagement as well as multiple academic backgrounds, theoretical orientations, and preferred methods of inquiry. It is inspiring to see several graduate students as co-authors of this volume as it represents a commitment to developing new scholars in the field.

Exploring Definitions and Context

Part One, “Service Learning and Student Civic Outcomes,” consists of three chapters that lay the foundation for the remainder of the book. The authors give an overview of student civic outcomes and discuss the relationships between such outcomes and service-learning course design and implementation. In Chapter 1.1, “Introduction to Research on Service Learning and Student Civic Outcomes,” Bringle, Hatcher, and Hahn establish what they mean by “civic outcomes,” conceptualizing it as one of three learning domains in service-learning, alongside and sometimes integrated with academic and personal outcomes. They also provide the common definition of service-learning they asked authors to use:

a course or competency-based, credit-bearing educational experience in which students (a) participate in mutually identified service activities that benefit the community, and (b) reflect on the service activity in such a way as to gain further understanding of course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of personal values and civic responsibility. (Bringle & Clayton, 2012, p. 105; adapted from Bringle & Hatcher, 1996). (p. 10)

In Chapter 1.2, “Student Civic Outcomes in Higher Education,” Kevin Hemer and Robert Rea-

son examine the complexities in defining civic outcomes and the consequent difficulties in measuring and assessing these outcomes. Civic outcomes are inquired about through several academic disciplines and theoretical frameworks, which the authors suggest contributes to the lack of a shared definition. For the purposes of this chapter, the authors, drawing on various conceptions of civic outcomes, provide a review of literature organized into four categories – (a) knowledge, (b) skills, (c) attitudes and values, and (d) behaviors and participation – and also explore work related to the concept of civic identity. The chapter concludes with calls for research on how experiences in college and beyond foster such civic outcomes across the full range of student types (e.g., traditional and non-traditional age, veterans, first-generation).

In Chapter 1.3, “Student Civic Learning through Service Learning,” Stephanie Stokamer and Patti Clayton look closely at the processes of teaching and learning that may lead to civic learning outcomes. The chapter opens with three questions that frame their discussion: (a) “What is meant by the term civic learning in service-learning?” (b) “What do we know about cultivating it through service-learning courses?” and (c) “What do we still need to learn about how the variables of course design influence civic learning?” (p. 45). They provide example conceptions of civic learning, including their own (focused on inclusivity, criticality, and co-creation); explore three arenas of course design (service, academic activities, and critical reflection); and provide example design variables and associated questions to guide future research on the relationship between course design and civic learning outcomes.

Exploring Theoretical Frameworks

As noted in Part One, there are scholars in many academic disciplines articulating and studying student civic outcomes, which makes defining it complex. Part Two, “Theoretical Frameworks for Research on Service Learning and Student Civic Outcomes,” includes a set of chapters highlighting theoretical frameworks from these diverse bodies of work. In each chapter,

authors identify key relevant cognate theories from various disciplinary or theoretical perspectives on civic outcomes, provide a critical evaluation of past research on service learning from that perspective, identify a research agenda for future research based on the theoretical perspectives and what has not been studied in past research, and identify implications for good practice for service learning based on the analysis. (p. 7)

The bodies of work¹ examined in Part One include psychology, political science, education, philanthropic studies, well-being, critical theories, and work-related boundary zones and activity theory. Many of the chapters examine theoretical frameworks being used to inform research on student civic outcomes and also call for future research on the particular course design elements and other practices that lead to civic outcomes.

Below I provide a summary of each chapter in Part Two. I address breadth, including the main theory or theories explored, as well as depth, featuring topics the authors most deeply discuss; identify the connections they make between their own topic and the volume's overall focus on student civic outcomes; and provide as an illustrative example an important future research question or concept they address. I spend more time with Chapter 2.6 as I believe its content raises questions particularly relevant to the task of advancing student civic outcomes.

In Chapter 2.1, "Social Psychology and Student Civic Outcomes," Bringle discusses social psychology, a subdiscipline of psychology that focuses on "how people perceive and relate to one another" (p. 69). He highlights four theoretical perspectives – identity, emotions, motivations, and attitudes – explaining each, summarizing the role of each in research on service-learning to date, and suggesting implications of each for service-learning practice. As an example of past research on identity, Bringle discusses a qualitative study (Jones & Abes, 2004) that showed that two to four years after service-learning experiences, "students reported a more integrated identity in regard to thinking about self and relationships with others, openness to new ideas and experiences, and future civic commitments" (p. 75). Bringle also presents several questions for future research related to civic outcomes and the processes that generate them, including one related to how to motivate civically unmotivated students, which he offers as an example of the need to shift research beyond its predominant focus on students who already have positive civic attitudes and motives.

In Chapter 2.2, "Political Theory and Student Civic Outcomes," Steven Jones explores the tensions that emerge when bringing political science education and civic education together and notes that some of the civic outcomes associated with political science theories may be better suited to political than to civic engagement (the former being within the realm of government and politics and the latter outside that realm). He reviews political science theories and focuses on three: liberalism, civic republicanism, and critical theories. Further,

he points to several instruments that can be used to assess civic learning outcomes in the framework of political science theories, explicitly mapping them in table form to the outcomes and the related theories to which each is best suited. He suggests more research is needed to understand the degree to which service-learning produces political knowledge as well as the kinds of political knowledge needed for effective civic engagement.

In Chapter 2.3, "Educational Theory and Student Civic Outcomes," Marcia Baxter Magolda and Lisa Boes examine aspects of adult and student development – including transformative learning, student developmental capacity, and self-authorship – in terms of their relationship to civic outcomes. They unpack the developmental processes leading to civic outcomes, stating that outcomes of service-learning are influenced by the nature of the experience, sociocultural perspectives of the learner, developmental capacity of the learner, support provided by the educator, and meaningfulness of the interactions with community members. The authors caution researchers that service-learning does not always have a positive impact on students and does not guarantee civic outcomes. They call for more research on students' developmental capacity to engage with dissonance in productive ways that are likely to lead to significant civic outcomes.

In Chapter 2.4, "Philanthropic Studies and Student Civic Outcomes," Julie Hatcher provides an overview of the civic outcomes associated with the multidisciplinary field of philanthropic studies. In contrasting service-learning with volunteering, she explains that service-learning courses may include volunteering, but that service must be balanced with learning; be inclusive of reflection designed to generate academic, personal, and civic learning; and be equally beneficial to the student and community organization. She then dives deeply into unpacking the three stages of the Volunteer Process model (Musick & Wilson, 2008; Snyder & Omoto, 1992; Wilson, 2012) – antecedents of, experiences of, and consequences of volunteering – which is helpful in understanding the relevance of volunteer activities within service-learning courses.

In Chapter 2.5, "Well-Being and Student Civic Outcomes," Claire Berezowitz, Alisa Pykett, Victoria Faust, and Constance Flanagan conceptualize well-being at three levels – individual, relational, and collective – and examine opportunities students have to develop civic outcomes in these areas through service-learning. They discuss these levels as part of an ecological perspective of well-being utilizing an ecological model of justice and well-being developed by Prilleltensky (2012), which places justice and fairness at the core of well-being

and brings light to optimal conditions for justice. The authors outline a research agenda that aligns with the ecological perspective, including raising questions about: (a) “whose well-being is being considered,” (b) “how critical consciousness developed through service-learning influences well-being,” and (c) “what kinds of service-learning contexts support individual, relational, and collective well-being” (p. 155).

In Chapter 2.6, “Critical Theories and Student Civic Outcomes,” Tania Mitchell and Colleen Rost-Banik use critical theory to call into question the assumptions that underlie much of the research on student civic outcomes. They question “who and what informs our conceptions of the civic and of civic outcomes” (p. 186) as well as who holds the power in “deciding how *knowledge* is defined and measured” (p. 188, emphasis added). The authors use the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) Civic Engagement VALUE Rubric as an example to demonstrate how rubrics generally provide power – to determine what is valuable knowledge and who has it – to faculty members and “[ignore] community members, who may have different values and perceptions in the evaluation of students’ capabilities” (p. 188). This rubric is used in many of the other chapters as an exemplary model of a student civic outcomes research instrument. Shifting the power in civic outcomes research might bring community members, faculty/staff, and students into conversation about civic outcomes in ways that value and draw upon multiple ways of knowing. The authors also encourage collecting more specific demographic data when conducting research on student civic outcomes to avoid reporting marginalized voices as “homogeneous ‘other[s]’” (p. 191). They also draw from Sperling’s (2007) work that troubles the practice, for example, in tutoring programs in which youth of color (those being tutored) help White college students (those doing the tutoring) become more aware of their own racism and “how these interactions might unfairly burden youth of color and their families” (p. 191). Overall, this chapter calls us to think critically about our basic assumptions regarding civic outcomes and the research practices employed to measure and understand them.

In Chapter 2.7, “Boundary Zones, Activity Theory, and Student Civic Outcomes,” Janice McMillan brings a perspective from the global South (South Africa), calling attention to the complex world in which we live and learn and the corollary importance of considering cultural and historical contexts. She discusses the need to understand service-learning as boundary work by exploring what she calls the “boundary zone” – the context that exists

at the intersection of university and community. She proposes Activity Theory – which locates learning as a social practice within social, cultural, and historical contexts – as a particularly useful framework for thinking about civic outcomes. These concepts are well-suited for future research on how students develop as boundary workers within specific cultural and historical contexts.

Exploring Research Methods

In similar fashion to Part Two, Part Three demonstrates that there are a variety of ways to investigate student civic outcomes. The authors describe designs and methods that can be utilized to improve research on student civic outcomes in service-learning. Additionally, they apply their methodological perspectives to the review and critique of past research and offer recommendations for future research. Below I summarize each chapter of Part Three by pointing (non-exhaustively) to the primary methods discussed as well as how the authors suggest using the methods to improve research and highlighting some of the implications for practice and suggestions for future research they offer.

In Chapter 3.1, “Quantitative Research on Service Learning and Student Civic Outcomes,” Dan Richard focuses on the role of quantitative research methods in contributing to our understanding of how service-learning can lead to student civic outcomes. He begins by presenting the foundations, theoretical imperatives, and essential elements of quantitative research. Then, drawing upon the work of Mortensen and Cialdini (2010) and Newman and Benz (1998), he presents the range of quantitative research design options as a continuum – a conceptualization of research design that acknowledges interactive components in building knowledge – rather than as a hierarchy that privileges the traditional research design option (e.g., experimental design) as the scientific ideal. He advises service-learning researchers to draw on multiple methods and disciplinary lenses in their research to examine a construct fully.

In Chapter 3.2, “Qualitative Research on Service Learning and Student Civic Outcomes,” Susan Jones and Zak Foste discuss the contributions qualitative inquiry can offer to understanding the “how” and “why” behind student civic outcomes. They acknowledge that quantitative research has helped establish that service-learning contributes to student civic outcomes and assert that qualitative research is also needed to help increase understanding of the developmental processes involved. The authors then discuss hallmarks of qualitative research, including design strategies, data collec-

tion and fieldwork strategies, and analysis strategies, and provide three exemplars illustrating them. They suggest that future qualitative research should clearly articulate research design, utilize existing theory, and avoid claims of generalization.

In Chapter 3.3, “Institutional Characteristics and Student Civic Outcomes,” Emily Janke and Jennifer Domagal-Goldman call readers’ attention beyond the role of service-learning courses in developing student civic outcomes to a broader view of how institutional characteristics (e.g., climate, culture, policies, practices, structures) also influence those outcomes. They present Astin’s (1993) Input-Environment-Outcomes model to describe the role of institutional context on student civic outcomes. They suggest that establishing institutional variables – beyond size or Carnegie Classification type – for cross-institutional research could potentially lead to better understanding of the impact of institutional level characteristics on student civic outcomes and the ways campus units such as public relations, marketing, advancement, and alumni affairs can be part of creating institutional climates that foster student civic outcomes.

In Chapter 3.4, “Longitudinal Research and Student Civic Outcomes,” Patrick Hill, Kira Pasquesi, Nicholas Bowman, and Jay Brandenberger explore how university experiences impact civic development and how to assess those impacts over time – both throughout time in college and post-college. The authors provide specific analytical techniques for assessing longitudinal change, such as the Autoregressive Latent Trajectory model (Bollen & Curran, 2004), which allows for studies with more than one variable and more than one measurement occasion (e.g., linking first-year volunteering with sophomore civic identity). They provide five recommendations for conducting longitudinal research on civic outcomes of higher education: (a) consider multisite collaborations, (b) focus on mediators and moderators, (c) support causal claims, (d) measure the same constructs over time, and (e) measure development after graduation.

In Chapter 3.5, “Documenting and Gathering Authentic Evidence of Student Civic Outcomes,” Ashley Finley and Terrel Rhodes call us to inquiry that not merely gathers student reports of what they say they have learned but rather seeks evidence of the civic outcomes students can demonstrate. Such an approach might involve gathering authentic evidence from curricular and/or co-curricular products – such as course assignments and ePortfolios derived from and connected to specific learning experiences – and applying rubrics to them to gauge quality of evidence. Additionally, they suggest that

assessment of learning should include input from community partners.

In Chapter 3.6, “Using Local and National Datasets to Study Student Civic Outcomes,” Steven Graunke and Michele Hansen discuss approaches for inquiry into service-learning courses and programs (e.g., institutional research, program evaluation, and outcomes assessment) that higher education leaders utilize to demonstrate the value of service-learning. They also point to data available at multiple levels (e.g., course, program, institution) that can aid in investigating student civic outcomes, including data for multilevel studies, for inquiry into student engagement, and for longitudinal designs. The authors call for increased intentionality about where data is stored, where to obtain data, what specific data fields mean, and how to use data, and they also point to the value of existing local (e.g., transcripts) and national [e.g., Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) from the National Center for Education Statistics] data sets.

Discussion

The stated purpose of this volume is to identify and critique extant research, assemble relevant methods and theoretical frameworks, and develop future research agendas and recommendations related to enhancing our understanding of the role of service-learning in cultivating student civic outcomes. The editors and authors successfully met these goals, and, therefore, this book will serve as an excellent resource for people new to service-learning and for those wanting to deepen their understanding of research on service-learning. I will come back to certain chapters throughout my graduate career to explore theoretical frameworks that can shed light on civic outcomes and to find methods applicable to civic outcomes research (and other areas of inquiry). The book’s organization and structure makes it easy for readers to skim through or to choose particular chapters that best suit their needs at the time without having to read cover-to-cover. Additionally, most chapters are well-written and well-organized, which makes them accessible for readers wanting information about specific theoretical frameworks or methods.

The inclusion of authors and ideas from several disciplines makes the volume relevant to a wide audience. Engaged practitioner-scholars could use it as a tool for exploring with colleagues the potential connections between their own work, service-learning, and developing student civic outcomes. Although the book is primarily written for higher education audiences, Parts One and Two might

also be useful for pre-service and K-12 teachers as it could help them think about the potentially similar processes through which youth develop civic outcomes. Part Three would benefit people tasked with assessment, evaluation, and/or research on service-learning because these chapters in particular provide new perspectives on ways to use multiple methods.

Another strength of this volume is the direction it provides for future research. Readers will gain new ways to think about civic outcomes, new tools for investigating them, and new directions of inquiry. For example, in Chapter 1.3 the authors provide a table that outlines sample research questions and sample descriptors/variables for inquiry into service-learning course design (see p. 61). Several chapters end with specific research questions that could be studied, such as in Chapter 2.2, for example: “How do students with various meaning-making capacities perceive, interpret, and react to dissonance they encounter in service-learning experiences?” (p. 130). The methods-oriented chapters in Part Three support pursuit of these future research agendas by speaking to future practices that need to be employed; Chapter 3.3, for example, highlights the need to build a stronger theory base and to refine measurement approaches. Scholars interested in future research on student civic outcomes in service-learning will have ample direction and resources for launching new lines of inquiry.

Although this volume has many strengths, the focus on student civic outcomes has important implications to consider. One of our understandings of reciprocity in service-learning is that “knowledge generation is a process of co-creation, breaking down the distinctions between knowledge producers and knowledge consumers” (Saltmarsh, Hartley, & Clayton, 2009, p. 10). As long-time service-learning community partner Amy Mondloch (2009) has written, “We are all teachers, learners, and leaders” (p. 146), drawing our attention to the reality that students are not the only learners in service-learning. Therefore, civic learning outcomes can be developed – and could be researched, measured, and/or assessed – not only vis-a-vis students but also for staff at community organizations, faculty, campus administrators, and community residents. Indeed, in Chapter 1.1, the editors acknowledge the importance of looking at the processes of producing civic outcomes across all constituencies, which leads me to wonder about their clearly chosen, narrow focus on student civic outcomes.

Furthermore, focusing on student learning as distinct from community learning or from the role of students as educators, perpetuates the idea that “students learn” and “communities are served.”

Understandably, a researcher may feel it is best to isolate the phenomenon of student learning to measure it, but it is important to recognize that this process further privileges the academy’s gain. We must find ways to work within our institutions of higher education to de-center the academic benefits of service-learning and attend equally to developing ways to effectively co-produce and measure beneficial civic and other outcomes for the full range of partners, including those who are situated primarily in communities.

The scope of this volume is further narrowed to service-learning. The IUPUI definition used limits the realm of consideration even further to “credit-bearing educational experiences” – excluding co-curricular service-learning. These parameters seem appropriate considering the volume is located within the IUPUI Series on Service Learning Research. However, my experience combining curricular and co-curricular learning experiences for students makes it difficult for me to place them in siloes. The concept of colleges and universities as seamless learning environments argues that blending curricular and co-curricular learning opportunities can lead to better outcomes than viewing these contexts as separate. While credit-bearing courses often allow for more focused and structured time (i.e., 15 weeks with an instructor) and ready accountability mechanisms (e.g., regular gatherings, assignments, grades), there is little question that co-curricular service-learning may also lead to civic outcomes (e.g., see Keen & Hall, 2009). My previous work in a seamless learning environment left me wanting more discussion about co-curricular experiences and their integration with curricular experiences. Additionally, the book left me wondering how civic learning outcomes are developed as a result of participating in other activities such as community-engaged research.

Interdisciplinary Perspectives: Civic Leadership

This book speaks to me as a practitioner-scholar who comes from an interdisciplinary background. It is exciting to see theoretical frameworks from several disciplines that have informed my learning and developed my interest in community-engaged work together in one volume. I have gained insight as to how these diverse disciplines can be utilized in inquiry about student civic outcomes. The interdisciplinary nature of the service-learning and community engagement (SLCE) movement is one of its strengths, and it continues to become more inclusive of boundary spanners – practitioners and scholars who span disciplines and sectors (Post,

Ward, Longo, & Saltmarsh, 2016). Although this book reflects the contributions many disciplines make to service-learning and student civic outcomes, the book and the SLCE movement would benefit from drawing more connections among various disciplines. Many of the pioneers of the SLCE movement resided within a singular academic discipline and later helped develop or adopted SLCE practices; the next generation of scholars is coming to the movement without siloed disciplinary identities (Post et al., 2016). The concept of boundary zones – the unique space that exists between and among bounded areas as described by McMillan in Chapter 2.7 – highlights the value of the work of boundary spanners who draw upon strengths from several disciplines to address complex issues. Many of the community issues (e.g., food security, racial equity) that service-learning practitioner-scholars and community members work to address require knowledge and skills from a variety of disciplines. SLCE practitioner-scholars could potentially enhance their ability to address complex community issues by viewing the disciplines presented here not as seven separate bodies of work but as seven areas that can be integrated toward a broader collective aim.

Drawing on my own background in civic leadership – leadership within the context of social, political, economic, and moral spheres of society (Bergner, 2011) – and specifically community-engaged work around food security, I have experienced the benefits of weaving components from several disciplines together in conceptualizing and facilitating the development of civic outcomes. Civic leadership is a practice that encourages people to exercise leadership around issues in which they care (Kliwer & Priest, 2017). It often places the community priority – in my practice, food security – at the center of the work and benefits from dialogue and action among multiple stakeholders (e.g., community organizations, students, faculty) and multiple disciplines such as those illustrated in this text.

For example, Marshall Ganz (2010) states that leaders must accept their responsibility for both the individual and collective – similar to the individual, relational, and collective levels of well-being presented in Chapter 2.5. Leadership requires observing and diagnosing all three levels and the ability to move amongst them. We can draw upon social psychology as presented in Chapter 2.1 to develop understanding of one’s civic identity or one’s role within a community (e.g., “I have organizing skills that can be leveraged through my student group.”). Changing systemic elements such as policies that constrain equal access to food requires knowledge of the political system (e.g., how to contact

your representatives) as presented in Chapter 2.2. Understanding what laws are systemically oppressive (e.g., minimum wage, immigration and refugee laws) requires critical thought as discussed in Chapter 2.6. Teaching students about volunteering as mentioned in Chapter 2.4 can help students recognize the difference between acting as “white knights” or as “contributing community members” (e.g., serving food “to” the hungry or “participating in” community meals). As an instructor, I created dissonance for my students with a balance of challenge and support as discussed in Chapter 2.3, creating opportunities for them to exercise leadership when they were faced with ambiguity without authority to give direction (e.g., providing limited direction on group work related to our food security leadership activity). Creating experiences that integrate service and learning in spaces between community and university can create unique learning opportunities as presented in Chapter 2.7 (e.g., serving as facilitators at a community-campus symposium on food security).

There is value in the process of weaving together theoretical frameworks from multiple disciplines when trying to advance community priorities. The connectivity of civic leadership to service-learning and student civic outcomes suggests a possible comprehensive, integrated research agenda related to civic outcomes. This research agenda could help draw connections among several disciplines as well as problematize the boundaries of disciplines and sectors in community-engaged work. Within each of our own areas of study and practice, we might find ways to weave the theoretical frameworks that inform our approaches to service-learning practice and inquiry related to civic outcomes. Such connections could support students, faculty, staff, and community partners to imagine a future in which the line between disciplines and sectors is faded – leveraging the strengths of many to address our world’s most complex issues.

Note

Various terms are used in this volume to describe bodies of work. I use the term “disciplines” to represent what the authors refer to as “cognate areas” and “cognate domains.” The authors use both “cognate theories” and “theoretical frameworks” to describe theories drawn from cognate areas. I use the term “theoretical frameworks.”

References

Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters in college? Four critical years revisited*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Berger, B. (2011). Attention deficit democracy: The paradox of civic engagement. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Bollen, K. A., & Curran, P. J. (2004). Autoregressive latent trajectory (ALT) models a synthesis of two traditions. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 32(3), 336-383.
- Crabtree, R. D. (2011). Progress and promise for international service-learning. [Review of the book *International Service Learning: Conceptual Frameworks and Research Volume 1*]. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 17(2), 78-82.
- Ganz, M. (2010). Leading change: Leadership, organization, and social movements. In N. Nohria & R. Khurana (Eds.), *Handbook of leadership theory and practice* (pp. 527-561). Boston: Harvard Business Press.
- Giles, D. E., & Eyler, J. (2013). The endless quest for scholarly respectability in service-learning research. [Review of the book *Research on Service Learning: Conceptual Frameworks and Assessment Volumes 2A and 2B*]. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 20(1), 53-64.
- Jones, S. R., & Abes, E. S. (2004). Enduring influences of service-learning on college students' identity development. *Journal of College Student Development*, 45(2), 149-166.
- Keen, C., & Hall, K. (2009). Engaging with difference matters: Longitudinal student outcomes of co-curricular service-learning programs. *Journal of Higher Education*, 80(1), 59-79.
- Kliwer, B. W., & Priest, K. L. (2017). Why civic leadership for social justice? *eJournal of Public Affairs*, 6(1). ISSN (Online) 2162-9161.
- Mondloch, A. S. (2009). One director's voice. In R. Stoecker & E. A. Tryon (Eds.), *The unheard voices: Community organizations and service learning* (pp. 136-146). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Mortensen, C. R., & Cialdini, R. B. (2010). Full-cycle social psychology for theory and application. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 4, 53-63.
- Musick, M. A., & Wilson, J. (2008). *Volunteers: A social profile*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- National Task Force on Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement. (2012). *A crucible moment: College learning & democracy's future*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges & Universities.
- Newman, I., & Benz, C. R. (1998). *Qualitative-quantitative research methodology: Exploring the interactive continuum*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Post, M. A., Ward, E., Longo, N. V., & Saltmarsh, J. (Eds.). (2016). *Publicly engaged scholars: Next generation engagement and the future of higher education*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Prilleltensky, I. (2012). Wellness as fairness. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 49, 1-21.
- Saltmarsh, J., Hartley, M., & Clayton, P. H. (2009). *Democratic engagement white paper*. Boston: New England Resource Center for Higher Education.
- Snyder, M., & Omoto, A. (1992). Who helps and why? The psychology of AIDS volunteerism. In S. Spacapan & S. Oskamp (Eds.), *Helping and being helped* (pp. 213-239). Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.
- Sperling, R. (2007). Service-learning as a method of teaching multiculturalism to White college students. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 6, 309-322.
- Wilson, J. (2012). Volunteerism research: A review essay. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 41, 176-212.

Author

LORI E. KNIFFIN (lekniffi@uncg.edu) is a doctoral student in Cultural Foundations of Education and the assistant director of the Institute for Community and Economic Engagement at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. Her scholarly interests include civic leadership, community dialogue, and democratic classrooms. She is a past member of the SLCE Future Directions Project leadership team and the immediate past chair of the International Association for Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement (IARSLCE) Graduate Student Network.