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

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), but by the
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1Brooks (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 na-
tional collaboration of college and university
presidents "pledged to encourage and sup-
port academically based community ser-
dvice..." (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 Com-
pact 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 inter-
est in and institutional support for service
learning, and what in general may be called
community-based learning (CBL)? 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 evi-
denced by many universities may have less
to do with student, societal, or even market
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 inte-
grade 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 commu-
nity 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 synthe-
sis, through practice and through teaching"
(Boyer 1990:24). Boyer's definition of
scholarship thus questions the traditionally
held notion that knowledge is first discov-
ered 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 educa-
tion" (Brooks 1997:3).

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

2Community-based learning refers to any ped-
agogical 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.

3Other institutional pressures include concerns
over the quality of undergraduate teaching, eso-
teric 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
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-
ventured 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. 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBL Options</th>
<th>Out-of-Class Activities</th>
<th>Volunteering</th>
<th>Service Add-ons</th>
<th>Internships</th>
<th>Service Learning</th>
<th>Service Learning Advocacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured Reflection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply/Acquire Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curricular Credit</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Rendered</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Community</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 requirements 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 academic 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 community, but contrary to out-of-class activities, assumes that some service has been provided. 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). Volunteers, 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 volunteering...Many people volunteer in their communities without critically examining their beliefs or the structural causes of the need for such services to exist. Simply “doing” is not sufficient for learning to occur (1998:299).

**Service Add-On**

When student participation results in additional 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 component is added), whether tutoring second graders or participating in a city beautification 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 disadvantages 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 community impact of add-ons is indirect. Students who gain through volunteering experiences 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 limited duration of add-ons also suggests a reduced community impact (Marullo 1998:264) than with either traditional internships, 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, cooperative 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; 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 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

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 journaling, 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.

5Hutchings 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.”
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

7Studies 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**

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

*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 designed 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 orient subsequent rounds of practice upon which CBL practitioners will later reflect. Indeed, we make the road by walking (Horton and Freire 1990).
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