Continuing to Blur the Boundaries, Cross Vectors, and Complicate Positionalities and Power Dynamics of our Field

Alan Bloomgarden
International Journal of Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement

Jessica Mann
International Journal of Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement

Continuing to Blur the Boundaries, Cross Vectors, and Complicate Positionalities and Power Dynamics of our Field

Alan Bloomgarden

Jessica Mann

International Journal of Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement

Introducing Volume 10 of the Journal, Co-Editors Alan Bloomgarden and Jessica Mann set the research presented in 2022 articles in context of dialogue with key current conversations underway on persistent concerns in the field of community engagement, including reciprocity, accountability, global and anticolonial perspectives, and engagement among and between diverse participants. Research on service learning and community engagement included here spans and often crosses the thematic boundaries of the Journal's sections, devoted to Advances in Theory and Methodology, Student Outcomes in Primary, Secondary, and Higher Education, Community Impacts and Outcomes, International Service Learning and Community Engagement Research, and Book Reviews. The Editors call upon our field to continue and further support growth and capacity for developing and publishing scholarship from across the globe, and speak to that work as central to achieving the International Association for Research on Service Learning and Community Engagement's goals for presenting high-quality scholarship and advancing equity and inclusion.

Keywords: theory and methodology, student outcomes, community impacts and outcomes, international service learning and community engagement

Volume 10's **Advances in Theory and Methodology** section encourages our field to deepen its work to unpack and inspect often less visible ironies and tensions accompanying the institutionalization of community-based learning. In *Radical community-based learning: Tapping into students' sense of justice*, Vincent Russell and Spoma Jovanovic draw upon analysis from the field that documents students' gravitation toward engaged pedagogies for the opportunities they offer to support and develop capacities for activism, for enacting democratic principles, for building solidarity, while advancing growth and self-identity. The authors articulate this as a call for building and strengthening pathways toward "radical CBL," developmental opportunities to leverage student passions and aspirations for justice for more intentional and critical interrogation of the nature, types, and expectations of partnerships universities form with community stakeholders.

Focusing on "answerability," this piece deepens the critique that the structural contexts for service learning sometimes reinforce rather than challenge historical power and resource relations between universities and partners. This is an irony, considering the aspirations many have for these collaborations to yield transformative work. The authors define the focus of "radical CBL," which they emphasize involves students in "partnering with grassroots social movements, groups, and/or

organizations to engage in political activism for social justice," as a conceptual frame for more ambitious work toward the field's ideals. Too often, community-engaged learning collaborations are inclined to form upon and maintain cultural and structural affinities found between established, stable, resourced partners, rather than across gradients of resources, access, status, and scale (Bloomgarden, 2017). Instead, Russell and Jovanovic forefront "answerability" as a framework for discourse among students, faculty, and partners, not only to embed communication and exchange about accountability within current engagement but more importantly also to ensure the pursuit of outcomes and meaning is situated within historical trajectories, contexts in which impact and consequences have come to be defined and matter for all parties over time:

> In this way, students and faculty are answerable to community partners to ensure that the students' public work is meaningful and impactful for the community; similarly, students and faculty hold community partners responsible to provide meaningful opportunities for political activism.

Their findings offer as much to improving pedagogy and conceptualization of student learning outcomes as contribute to principles and practices of partnership construction and sustainability.

Several of this Volume's pieces in the **Student Outcomes: Primary, Secondary and Higher Education** section share findings and reflection on research related to student learning that speaks to the wellness and success of participants in dialogic exchange together. Central to the purposes and practices of service learning and community engagement are the sometimes complementary and sometimes conflicting aims to enable, empower and advance student aspirations to affect communities and the lives of others, and to challenge and discomfort students from assumptions and beliefs about their understandings of themselves as prepared, positioned for, and entitled to undertake such work. In their piece, *The VALUE of Community Engaged Teaching and Learning is in the Values: Advancing Students' Learning Outcomes*, Mavis Morton and colleagues Lindsey Thomson and Jeji Varghese, focus examination upon linkages and alignment between community-engaged teaching in their Sociology courses and both course and institutional learning outcomes.

Moving beyond questions of efficacy and success, authors Vanessa Sperduti and Sandra Smeltzer note, service learning can often serve as the venue in which the dissonance between student aspirations and the discomfiting dimensions of engaged, experiential learning first or most clearly come to light. Applying a mental health lens to student reflections on their encounters with these tensions, their study *Mental Health and Service-Learning in the Canadian Context*, identifies practices for amplifying constructive learning while offering strategies for bolstering student readiness and reflective growth. Analyzing the nature of stresses and tolls upon participants and charting the trajectories of growth and learning in interpersonal care-centered service learning were similarly a focus for both Raul Machuca and Elissa Martinez's piece, *Service-Learning in Multicultural Counselor Education after Disaster Situations: A Case Study*, and Tammy Barron, Kelly Kelley, and Alexandra Mathis in their study, *The Impact of Service-Learning: Perspectives of Natural Supports of Students with Intellectual Disability on a College Campus*. This latter piece explores reflection and learning among special education program students working in support relationships with peers on campus with identified intellectual disabilities (ID) and other exceptionalities. Beyond offering a contribution to our field's efforts to push the boundaries of thinking about where service happens and about who is "served", this piece prompts readers to think about pedagogical strategies and reflection on inclusivity, mutuality in learning, and ultimately the potential for service learning to support and benefit from commitments to educational access and success on college campuses.

Inquiry in our field examining the state of reciprocity, equity, and sustainability among campus and community partners in academic service learning and community engagement collaborations has appropriately gravitated toward questions of power. Who brings and exercises control in

engagement projects and partnerships? In what circumstances, to what degrees, when, where, and why do power differentials affect whether and how justice is or can be achieved among partners? How are power gradients structured or expressed in campus-community partnerships, how are they perceived among collaborators, and why and how does it matter to learning and/or service? It is striking how much more prevalent such questions to our practice have become, for example, in the more than 20 years since an otherwise exhaustive summary review of one of the largest-scale and best-funded US campus-community collaboration initiatives, the US Department of Housing and Urban Development's *Community Outreach Partnerships Center Program*, only barely and indirectly made mention of power and its dynamics in such relations (Vidal, A. et al, 2002). These and other related questions have been on a trajectory toward becoming as pervasive and significant for designers and participants in community-engagement collaborations as for scholars reflecting upon them. Increasingly this topic is considered in the literature of our field. Understanding relations and perceptions of power is essential to, and rarely far from, consideration of both design and implementation, and of strategizing for reflective learning, because just, ethical, sustainable, and responsible engagement so critically depends upon recognizing and understanding power and its consequences.

This year's section on **Community Impacts and Outcomes** offers two contributions to inquiry on these topics. David A. Delaine and his colleagues Damon Nabrit, Nathan L.R. Harris, Charles Nabrit, Chris Ratcliff, and Paula J. Penn-Nabrit, in *Factors That Promote Reciprocity within Community-Academic Partnership Initiation*, undertook collaborative inquiry (CI) as a framework for examining themes of power through the evolution of a university collaboration with a faith community on food justice and urban agriculture. As a project and writing team that sought to give voice to campus and community positionalities in balance, their thoughtful reflections come from a team made up of predominantly people of color, working within a collaborative context, engaging a historically white institution in a predominantly Black neighborhood. They offer complex and highly textured insights into the power dynamics of race and class among other critical vectors as they speak directly to aspirations for equity and reciprocity. Like Delaine, et. al., Adrienne L. Cohen, Dina Walker-Devose, and Urkovia Andrews thoughtfully disarrange readers' expectations of predicted power gradients and complicate our understandings about who holds power, to what extent, where and why in their article, *The Role of Power in the Experiences of Service-Learning Community Partners*. Their analysis of partner perceptions within a framework differentiating forms of relational from structural power provides insights into both multi-directional trajectories for the exertion and effects of power differentials and suggests such expressions are not entirely perceived as having uniformly negative deleterious consequences.

The recent and exciting move to take the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification Australia from pilot to full implementation in 2022 helps to draw our attention as a field to the recognition and assessment of this work globally. As work that fundamentally focuses upon trajectories of organizational and cultural change, preparation and self-study of practices, infrastructures, outcomes, and impacts using the Carnegie frameworks have the potential to support movement-building efforts to align institutional mission statements with productive community-engaged practices (Saltmarsh and Johnson, 2020. Such is the context for this year's **International Service Learning and Community Engagement Research** section. Rosanna Snijder and colleagues Aukelien Scheffelaar, Eduardo Urias, Femke Hilverda, Suzan el Safti, Nadine Blignaut-van Westrhenen, and Marjolein Zweekhorst at The Netherlands" Vrije Universiteit of Amsterdam, presented in their piece, *Implementation of Public Engagement Pedagogies in a Dutch University: From Individual Lecturers Towards an Institutional Approach* further opportunity for extending the classification framework's organizational change work. Beyond serving for Snijder and Universiteit colleagues as an ersatz action research institutional resource, this piece situates the perspectives of Dutch community-engaged faculty in dialogue with the wider field's discourse about faculty roles in mobilizing institutional civic commitments.

Authors Akhila Narayanan, Justin R. Nayagam, and Malini R present an approach to the challenges facing student selection and admission to a highly popular international service learning program at India's Union Christian College but operated in settings abroad. In *International Service-Learning: Proposal for A Multi-Dimensional Model for Student Selection*, the authors offer a model of systematic, inclusive evaluation of applicant readiness and student focus. But further, their piece suggests ways that developmentally-focused programming for the wider applicant pools they are seeing for a desirable offering can potentially advance preparedness and personal growth among students whom their program cannot yet accommodate. These approaches suggest ancillary or extra-programmatic developmental pathways from which other community-based learning course and program partnerships, and institutions more generally might benefit. Exploring pathways for advancing student growth as gauged against widely adopted high-impact practices (HIP) (Kuh, 2008) is the focus of Risto Marttinen, Brianna Meza, John Gleaves, Debra Patterson, Maria Beitzel, and Joao Barros in their article, *High Impact Practices in Domestic and Study Abroad Service Learning Kinesiology and Physical Education Courses*. Like many submissions for this journal, this piece could as easily have been placed in the student outcomes section, but their approach interestingly juxtaposes domestic and international service learning with study abroad as a multi-dimensional context for examining student growth metrics within the HIP framework.

In *The Transformative Potential of Service-Learning in an African Religious Context,* Sarah C. DeMarais, Steven W. Mumford, and Thomas F. Ryan extend a long and rich tradition of reflective service and discernment emerging from work grounded in Catholic Social Teaching. Of particular currency to readers will be the authors' examination of practices of critical reflection at the intersecting contexts of online, asynchronous learning module delivery, global service learning in a non-Western setting, and Loyola Institute for Ministry's mission to advance transformative and reflective learning in the context of faith exploration.

As the International Association for Research on Service Learning and Community Engagement aspires to continue efforts to de-center its focus from largely North American historical and cultural contexts, so do we as the *Journal's* editorial team seek to expand and enhance our capacity to elicit and support scholarly work from global contexts. To these ends, we aspire to explore strategies for inviting and developing scholarly work originating not only beyond Anglophone countries geographically but prepared outside the English language. We welcome the community of editorial and association board members, Journal section editors and peer reviewers, and the community engagement field to guide and assist us with this.

We have been pleased to enlist the IARSLCE's Graduate Student Network as a way to engage emerging scholars by inviting them to help identify and review works for the *Journal's* **Book Review** section. This Volume's contribution, *A Path Forward: A Review of Grassroots Engagement and Social Justice Through Cooperative Extension*, comes from now Dr. Emily Phaup at Whitman College, who reviews *Grassroots Engagement and Social Justice through Cooperative Extension*, edited by Nia Imani Fields and Timothy J. Shaffer (Michigan State University Press, 2022). Dr. Phaup examines the ways in which this project undertakes bold work to unpack some less-noted ironies and challenges built into the positionality of Cooperative Extension units. She highlights the fact that these arms of public institutions are at once deeply engaged in their communities, and also often problematically positioned and not well-oriented for enacting justice work, saddled with as they sometimes are, and perpetuating as they sometimes do the colonial, patrimonial and inequitable campus-community relationships they inherit from institutional histories and cultures. This reviewer and the book's authors alike share great appreciation for Extension's important community resources, for their potential to point the way toward realizing more inclusive, equitable and ultimately community responsive engagement strategies and impacts. Phaup's review encourage IJRSLCE readers to consider the thoughtful

advice Fields and Shaffer offer on directions to take.

References

Bloomgarden, A. (2017). Introduction to Part II. In C. Dolgon, T. Mitchell, & T. Eatman (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Service Learning and Community Engagement* (Cambridge Handbooks in Psychology, pp. 127-131). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kuh, G. D. (2008). Excerpt from high-impact educational practices: What they are, who has access to them, and why they matter. *Association of American Colleges and Universities, 14*(3), 28-29.

Saltmarsh, J., & Johnson, M. (2020). Campus classification, identity, and change: The elective Carnegie classification for community engagement. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement, 24*(3), 105-114. https://openjournals.libs.uga.edu/jheoe/article/view/2513

Vidal, A., Nye, N., Walker, C., Manjarrez, C., Romanik, C., Corvington, P., ... & Kim, D. (2002). *Lessons from the community outreach partnership center program*. Washington: The Urban Institute. Accessed January 18, 2023 at https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Clare-Romanik/publication/200031270_Lessons_from_the_Community_Outreach_Partnership_Center_Program/links/5dfa9480a6fdcc28372bb131/Lessons-from-the-Community-Outreach-Partnership-Center-Program.pdf

---

About the Authors

Alan Bloomgarden is Director of Foundation and Government Grants at Holyoke Community College. He currently serves as co-editor for the IJRSLCE and will be the senior co-editor for Volume 11 in 2023.

Jessica Mann is assistant vice president of community engagement at Duquesne University and senior co-editor of the *International Journal of Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement*.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Alan Bloomgarden at abloomgarden@hcc.edu and Jessica Mann at mannj@duq.edu.