

# BORDÓN

## Revista de Pedagogía

NÚMERO MONOGRÁFICO / *SPECIAL ISSUE*

Aprendizaje-servicio en la educación superior  
*Service-learning in Higher Education*

Héctor Opazo, Pilar Aramburuzabala y Lorraine McIlrath  
(editores invitados / *guest editors*)



Volumen 71  
Número, 3  
2019

**SOCIEDAD ESPAÑOLA DE PEDAGOGÍA**

# PEDAGOGIES AND CIVIC PROGRAMS TO DEVELOP COMPETENCIES FOR DEMOCRATIC CULTURE AND CIVIC LEARNING OUTCOMES

## *Pedagogías y programas cívicos para el desarrollo de competencias para la cultura democrática y resultados de aprendizaje cívico*

ROBERT G. BRINGLE, LORRIE A. BROWN, THOMAS W. HAHN AND MORGAN STUDER  
Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis (USA)

DOI: 10.13042/Bordon.2019.72003

Fecha de recepción: 08/04/2019 • Fecha de aceptación: 09/10/2019

Autora de contacto / Corresponding author: Robert G. Bringle. E-mail: rbringle@iupui.edu

---

**INTRODUCTION.** Service learning is a pedagogy that can achieve civic competences for learners to participate effectively in culturally diverse democratic societies. **METHOD.** A qualitative analysis of research evidence is examined for why service learning provides the optimal pedagogy for achieving democratic competences and civic learning. Past meta-analyses are consistent in establishing service learning as an effective means for enhancing civic learning outcomes. Civic-mindedness provides a set of common civic learning objectives that can guide both curricular service learning courses and co-curricular civic programs. **RESULTS.** Research on Civic-Minded Graduate and Civic-Minded Professional demonstrates their usefulness to provide an integrative framework for civic learning outcomes that can guide the design, implementation, and assessment of both curricular service learning courses and co-curricular civic programs at multiple levels (course, department, school, campus, multicampus). **DISCUSSION.** Institutions of higher learning can accept the challenge to enhance civic learning through service learning, co-curricular programs focused on civic outcomes, and other effective, high-impact pedagogies to enhance long-term habits of community engagement that contribute to the public good. A key component of developing civic learning, in addition to high quality course design, is providing opportunities for dialogue and collaboration with diverse others.

**Keywords:** *Service learning, Civic learning, Curriculum, Democratic Competences.*

---

Institutions of Higher Education have multiple explicit and implicit missions for teaching, research, and service (or third mission) across the governmental sector, the business sector, and civil society. However, one mission that has historical roots in America is “to develop in students an ethos of civic and social responsibility—an understanding of the engaged role individuals must play if communities and democracies are to flourish” (Zlotkowski, 2007, p. 43). More broadly, the United Nations Special Rapporteur Kishore Singh (2016) reminded academics world-wide about the public purposes of Higher Education:

The 1998 *World Declaration on Higher Education for the Twenty-First Century: Vision and Action* ... called upon Higher Education institutions to give the opportunity to students to fully develop their own abilities with a sense of social responsibility, educating them to become full participants in democratic society and promoters of changes that will foster equity and justice (para 109).

Deliberately designing curricular courses and co-curricular civic educational programs that develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions for civically engaged graduates is currently active around the world and is producing new paradigms for instruction, faculty work, curricular innovation, and partnerships with communities (Aramburuzabala, McIlrath & Opazo, 2019; Bringle, Games & Malloy 1999a; Dolgon, Mitchell & Eatman, 2017; Herrero, 2017; International Christian University, 2009; Ma & Chan, 2013; McIlrath, Lyons & Munck, 2012; McIlrath & MacLabhrainn, 2007; Saltmarsh & Hartley 2011; Xing & Ma, 2010).

Central to these developments is the role that service learning and co-curricular civic programs can play in contributing to civic preparation of graduates, both generally and within specific disciplines and professions (e.g., Sullivan, 1995;

Zlotkowski, 2005). The purpose of this article is to summarize the conceptual and empirical basis for service learning as an effective pedagogy for civic growth of students as well as present some specific examples for how this work informs program design, implementation, and assessment. This analysis will provide a qualitative summary of research that identifies service learning as a means for achieving civic learning and democratic skills in Higher Education. Empirical evidence in America (Kuh, 2009, 2012) has been the basis for identifying the following “high-impact” pedagogical practices: First-year seminars and experiences for entering students to help them adjust to college; themed learning communities, which are clusters of courses that cohorts of students take; common intellectual experience; writing-intensive courses; collaborative assignments and projects; undergraduate research; diversity/global learning, including study abroad; service learning; internships; and capstone courses and projects. The analysis of high-impact practices is based on students’ self-reported gains of deep learning, general learning, personal growth, and practical gains that are attributed to these different educational activities. Kuh assumed that high-impact practices produce these results because they are accompanied by higher expectations for student achievement, result in enhanced time and effort by students, produce greater student engagement with faculty and peers, provide opportunities for more frequent feedback, help students reflect on and integrate their learning, increase students’ interactions with diverse others, result in the transfer of learning to other settings, provide authentic ways for students to demonstrate their competence, and result in enhanced clarity about students’ educational and life goals (Kuh, 2009, 2012). He recommended that campuses have every student participate in at least two high-impact educational activities, preferably one in the first year and one in the student’s major field of study (Kuh, 2009). Service learning is unique among these high-impact pedagogies because of its focus on civic learning (Bringle, 2017). In addition, when

long-term co-curricular programs intentionally focus on developing civic outcomes, they can also contribute to the civic growth of students.

### **Service Learning**

*Service learning* is the intentional integration of teaching and community-engaged activities into courses and it has dual purposes of benefiting the community and fulfilling academic learning goals (Bringle, Games & Malloy, 1999b). Although there are many definitions of service (e.g., Furco & Norvell, 2019), this definition of service learning aligns well with the core elements of those definitions:

Course-based, credit-bearing educational experience in which students (a) participate in mutually identified and organized 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. 222).

This definition illustrates key attributes of service learning as a pedagogy: (a) it is distinct from volunteering and episodic co-curricular service because it is integrated into a course; (b) community partners collaborate to design, implement, and evaluate the educational experiences for student learning and the community's benefits; (c) faculty, students, and community partners all must benefit from the course experiences; (d) the community service and the academic content are linked through reflection activities that generate, deepen, and capture learning (Ash & Clayton, 2009a, 2009b); and (e) in addition to academic learning, it also identifies personal growth and civic learning as learning goals (Bringle, 2017; Stokamer & Clayton, 2017). The nature of the community-based activities may be

direct service (e.g., serving clients of a non-profit agency), indirect service (e.g., constructing a web page for a non-profit agency), research (e.g., conducting research with a neighborhood association on citizen participation), and/or advocacy (e.g., working with neighborhood residents to rally support for or against a proposed government policy) (Bringle, Reeb, Brown & Ruiz, 2016).

The definition of service learning identifies the unique contribution that service learning brings to Higher Education and that no other high-impact educational pedagogy can deliver as effectively: civic education (Bringle, 2017). What service learning does well and better than any other pedagogy is not just having students “serve to learn”, which is applied learning, but also “learning to serve”, which is the civic education component that is referred to in the definition by the phrase “personal values and civic responsibility.” What service learning should accomplish is having students think about, consider, and analyze what their role is in society with regard to civic, social, and political issues now and in the future (Hatcher, Bringle & Hahn, 2017). In addition, well-designed service learning courses will immerse students in reciprocal, democratically-based activities with diverse community partners so that they can develop the skills for effective civic activities in the future.

Centro Latinoamericano de Aprendizaje y Servicio Solidario (CLAYSS) understands service learning as:

A pedagogical connection in which the educator and educated learn together from experience and together commit themselves in the transformation of reality. It implies action and reflection on the practice and establishment of ties that allow to act and to learn reciprocally with and from the community (What is “service learning”?, n.d., [http://www.clayss.org/english/servicelearning\\_school.html](http://www.clayss.org/english/servicelearning_school.html), para 1).

CLAYSS makes reference to “solidario” (solidarity) in its discussion of service learning, which “underline[s] that we are not referring to a traditional, paternalistic, occasional or superficial kind of service, but to a more horizontal bond between peoples and communities working together for the common good” (“The concept of service and solidarity,” para 1, n.d.).

### Co-Curricular Civic Programs

Co-curricular civic programs can share some of the attributes of curricular service learning courses because they can encompass attention to intentional design and implementation and incorporate community-engaged activities that occur over a period of time (e.g., several months, an academic year). Jacoby (2015) identifies components of co-curricular civic programs, and these include the following: (a) identifying achievable learning outcomes, which we would insist includes civic learning outcomes; (b) identifying community activities that are aligned with achieving the learning outcomes; (c) preparation of the design and implementation with community partners; (d) preparing students for the experience; (e) embedding critical reflection throughout the experience; and (f) assessing student and community outcomes. Well-designed co-curricular civic programs share with curricular service learning intentionality of design and a focus on student learning and growth. When these two categories of activity supplement each other, they can provide a basis for bridging academic affairs and students affairs staff and programming on a campus. This can occur for a wide variety of domains, such as leadership development, diversity initiatives, career development and professional skills, and faith-based interests.

### Civic Learning

Mathews asks, “Why do we need more than a vocational education?” and provides an answer,

“In part, because we live more than a vocational life: we live a larger civic life and we have to be educated for it” (Mathews 1995, p. 70). All high-impact pedagogical approaches aspire to promote academic learning (e.g., discipline-based content) and cognitive development (e.g., critical thinking). Service learning is intentionally directed at civic learning as an educational objective in addition to and often integrated with academic learning (e.g., how is disciplinary knowledge relevant to social issues; how can critical thinking be applied to social issues; Bringle, 2017). It also allows for, if not encourages, explicit linkages between professional education and civic education (Hatcher, 2008; Sullivan, 1995).

We understand that the civic domain of learning is an American construct that may not be literally transportable to other contexts. We also appreciate that context (e.g., history, culture, politics, values, mores, religion) matters to delineating educational goals within different national and regional contexts around the world. Thus, we agree with Furco and Norvell (2019) that “while there are fundamental definitions, elements, and principles of service learning that apply no matter what the situation or context, the cultural fibre of the societies in which SL is practised will ultimately shape the overall character of the SL experience” (p. 32). However, as we have indicated, the civic domain, by whatever label, is the *sin qua non* of service learning. Therefore, we invite readers to adapt our discussion of “civic” to their context and consider how they can develop aspects of this domain in their own pedagogies and co-curricular civic programs within their national, institutional, and disciplinary context (Hatcher & Bringle, 2012).

In the American context, with which we are most familiar, civic learning is a multifaceted category of learning with multiple perspectives and learning objectives (Battistoni, 2002, 2013; Hemer & Reason, 2017). Battistoni (2002) analyzed different understandings of citizenship,

civic education, and civic skills with reference to various disciplines and professions and he identified the following 12 distinctive conceptual frameworks, each linked to a cluster of disciplines and professions: (a) liberalism, (b) communitarianism, (c) participatory democracy, (d) public work, (e) social capital, (f) civic professionalism, (g) social responsibility, (h) social justice, (i) connected knowing and the ethic of care, (j) public leadership, (k) public intellectual, and (l) engaged or public scholarship.

The Council of Europe (2016) published *Competences for Democratic Culture* that provided a conceptual model for civic competencies for learners if they are to participate effectively in a culture of democracy and live in culturally diverse democratic societies. The framework consists of 20 competencies focused on (a) values, (b) attitudes, (c) skills, and (d) knowledge and critical understanding. Values include human dignity, cultural diversity, democracy, and social justice. Attitudes encompass openness to cultural otherness, respect, civic-mindedness, responsibility, self-efficacy, and tolerance of ambiguity. Civic skills consist of learning, analytical and critical thinking, listening and observing, empathy, flexibility, communication, cooperation, conflict resolution. Civic knowledge and critical understanding can be of self; of language and culture; or of the world's politics, law, human rights, cultures, religions, or history. This framework can provide guidance in designing service learning for democratic citizenship, especially through the explicit incorporation of intercultural dialogue. The Council has published a second monograph on pedagogy; service learning is identified as one of the pedagogies that can develop these competencies (Council of Europe, 2017).

Stokamer and Clayton (2017) offered three examples of civic learning goals that are grounded in democratic purposes and democratic processes both within the service learning project and as an end that builds everyone's capacities:

(a) inclusivity, which has at its core capacities to think beyond the single perspective of one's own worldview and act accordingly; (b) criticality, which has at its core capacities to recognize and challenge enshrined structural inequities that limit social justice; and (c) co-creation, which has at its core capacities to bring an asset-based orientation to collaboration and to integrate the knowledge, perspectives, and resources of all stakeholders in determining questions to be addressed, possibilities to be pursued, and strategies for collaborating effectively and with integrity (p. 48).

Thus, rather than doing *for* others, service learning is focused on activities in the community that work *with* others in ways that address mutually supported inquiry, teaching, and learning and that support respecting diverse points of view as community issues are addressed (Hansen & Clayton, 2014).

The construct civic-mindedness was developed to integrate various conceptualizations of civic learning outcomes and is defined as "a person's inclination or disposition to be knowledgeable of and involved in the community, and to have a commitment to act upon a sense of responsibility as a member of that community" (Steinberg, Hatcher & Bringle, 2011, p. 20). The Civic-Minded Graduate (CMG) construct (Bringle & Steinberg, 2010; Bringle, Studer, Wilson, Clayton & Steinberg, 2011; Steinberg *et al.*, 2011) is defined as:

A person who has completed a course of study (e.g., bachelor's degree), and has the capacity and desire to work with others to achieve the common good. "Civic-Mindedness" refers to a person's inclination or disposition to be knowledgeable of and involved in the community, and to have a commitment to act upon a sense of responsibility as a member of that community" (Bringle & Steinberg, 2010, p. 429).

A CMG is assumed to display integration of three domains: personal identity, civic experiences, and

educational experiences (Bringle & Steinberg, 2010; Bringle & Wall, in press). The CMG construct is composed of ten domains (Steinberg *et al.*, 2011, p. 22): (a) knowledge of volunteer opportunities; (b) academic knowledge and technical skills; (c) knowledge of contemporary social issues; (d) communication and listening skills; (e) appreciation of and sensitivity to diversity; (f) skills to build consensus; (g) valuing community engagement; (h) self-efficacy; (i) social trustee of knowledge; and (j) intentions to be personally involved in community service. These attributes of CMG are viewed as being common across curricular service learning and co-curricular civic programs that have civic learning as a focus (Bringle *et al.*, 2011).

Whereas CMG is focused on what student civic learning objectives are at the completion of their studies, Civic-Minded Professional (CMP) is focused on post-graduation integration of (a) identity, (b) work, career, profession, and (c) civic attitudes, civic action, and public purpose (Hatcher, 2008). A CMP is (a) skillfully trained through formal education, with (b) the ethical disposition as a social trustee of knowledge, and (c) the capacity to work with others in a democratic way (d) to achieve the public good. CMP provides a connection between professional education and civic education, calling attention to the public dimensions and responsibilities of professional practice and positing “that there is finally no separation between the skills of problem solving and those of deliberation and judgment, no viable pursuit of technical excellence without participation in those civic enterprises through which expertise discovers its human meaning” (Sullivan 1995, xix).

Steinberg *et al.* (2011) presented three different methods for measuring CMG: (a) a CMG Scale, which is comprised of 30 self-report items; (b) CMG Narrative prompt, which produces a written narrative that is scored with a rubric; and (c) a CMG Interview protocol, which is scored with a rubric. Generally, these three assessment

strategies demonstrated convergence in measuring CMG (Steinberg *et al.*, 2011). The CMP is measured with a 23-item scale (Hatcher, 2008). Both the CMG and CMP scales have demonstrated sound psychometric properties.

### Meta-Analyses of Civic Outcomes

Meta-analyses have examined the relationship between enrollment in service learning courses and civic outcomes. In most cases, the civic outcomes have been self-report measures of civic learning. Conway, Amel, and Gerwien (2009) found in a meta-analysis of research that citizenship outcomes were stronger for service learning courses with structured reflection than traditional pedagogies. Celio, Durlak, and Dynmicki's (2011) meta-analysis of 62 studies involving 11,837 students at the elementary, secondary, or postsecondary level found that, compared to control groups, service learning students showed significant gains in five outcome areas: attitudes toward self, attitudes toward school and learning, civic engagement, social skills, and academic performance. Additionally, service learning courses that included more of the best practices of linking to curriculum, voice, community involvement, and reflection were associated with higher outcomes.

Service learning inevitably involves students in interactions with individuals who are, in some way, different from the students. Therefore, the role of diverse interactions in promoting civic learning and cognitive growth is important to guiding the design and implementation of service learning. Bowman's (2011) meta-analysis of the relationship between college diversity experiences and civic engagement found that diversity experiences (e.g., face-to-face interactions with diverse groups) were related to increases in civic attitudes, behavioral intentions, and behaviors. In addition, the magnitude of this association was higher for interpersonal interactions with racial diversity than for didactic curricular and co-curricular diversity

experiences. Similarly, Nelson Laird's (2005) research indicated that college students with increased exposure to diversity, especially participation in diversity courses and positive experiences with diverse fellow students, were more likely to have higher scores on social agency, outlook toward critical thinking, and academic self-confidence.

### **Research on Civic-Minded Graduate and Civic-Minded Professional**

Concerning CMG, Morton (1995) contended that how a college student engages in any type of community service can have differing levels of integrity or depth. Higher levels of integrity are assumed to possess deeply held, internally coherent values; match between means and ends; describe a primary way of interpreting and relating to the world; offer a way of defining problems and solutions; and suggest a vision of what a transformed world might look like (p. 28). Morton viewed integrity as the degree to which civic values and civic behaviors are aligned and integrated with the self. CMG correlated with Morton's concept of integrity (Steinberg *et al.*, 2011). Bringle and Wall (in press) found correlations between identity as a student and CMG, civic identity and CMG, CMG and all of the motives for volunteering on the Volunteer Functions Inventory (Clary *et al.*, 1998), and CMG and measures of interest in charity, service programs, and advocacy types of service. Bringle, Hahn, and Hatcher (2019) found that CMG was related to openness to diversity, self-efficacy, both social change and charity orientations to service, and endorsing the principle of care. In addition, they found CMG to be correlated with non-prejudicial attitudes and self-confidence for social behaviors.

Steinberg *et al.* (2011), Bringle and Wall (in press), and Bringle *et al.* (2019) all found positive correlations between the number of service learning courses taken and CMG scores. Bringle and Wall found that the motive to engage in

community service to enhance Understanding was correlated with CMG scores, which highlights how educationally meaningful community service within the context of a course is compatible with and may contribute to further integrating civic and academic domains with the self. However, those correlational findings fail to differentiate causality.

Research on CMP has included graduate physical therapy students, academic librarians, alumni of a civic engagement scholarship program, and alumni. Academic librarians who volunteered, had interest in service learning, or participated in community activities reported higher levels of civic-mindedness than their colleagues who did not (Barry, Lowe & Twill, 2018). Richard, Keen, Hatcher, and Pease (2017) examined the extent to which service learning experiences during the college years were associated with civic outcomes following graduation, especially in terms of civic-minded orientations, volunteering, and civic action. Their evaluation of various attributes of service learning (e.g., curricular, co-curricular programming, types of reflection, dialogue across difference, interactions with others) found two components to be especially prominent in being correlated with CMP. Dialogue with others across difference was the strongest predictor of demonstrating civic outcomes following graduation from college. Furthermore, both structured and informal reflection contributed to civic outcomes after graduation (i.e., civic-mindedness, voluntary action, civic action). Palombaro *et al.* (2017) reported that CMP scores increased in graduate physical therapy students throughout their course of study in the program. Moreover, students who took part in leadership experiences associated with a student-run pro bono clinic had increases in civic-mindedness that significantly exceeded the changes by students who did not participate.

Administering a short form of the CMP scale, Hahn, Hatcher, and Graunke (2016) found that undergraduate alumni who participated in



multiple service learning courses reported higher levels of civic-mindedness than alumni who did not participate or who participated less often in service learning courses. These results were significant after adjusting for gender, ethnicity, volunteer service in high school, and participation in four other high impact practices: study abroad, research with faculty, practicum, and co-curricular service. Alumni who participated in service learning courses also reported higher levels of effectiveness working with people of different races, ethnicities, and religions.

### Civic Learning in Service Learning Courses and Co-Curricular Civic Programming

Research supports the conclusion that service learning is an effective pedagogy for enhancing civic learning, that CMG and CMP can provide nomological nets detailing democratic civic outcomes, and that service learning is a means for achieving democratic civic outcomes. How can these frameworks be incorporated into the design, implementation, and evaluation of service learning courses and civic programs?

Bringle *et al.* (2011) provided examples for how CMG can serve as a common framework for curricular and co-curricular service programs. In particular, they identified the following functions that CMG provides:

(a) common understanding of and appreciation by the staff of the strengths of individual programs; (b) a delineation of knowledge, skills, and dispositions associated with civically-oriented programs; (c) development of assessment procedures (scale, narrative analysis with rubrics, interviews) to evaluate CMG (Steinberg *et al.*, 2011); (d) the capacity to evaluate CSL (Center for Service and Learning) programs and provide feedback to coordinators for program improvements; (e) a framework for enhancing civic learning in service learning courses by more intentionally designing course activities in

terms of CMG elements; (f) a procedure for obtaining institutional assessment of students' civic outcomes across majors; (g) a way of communicating and discussing civic learning outcomes with various internal and external audiences; (h) a means for conducting research associated with civic growth that can evaluate components of developmental models as programmatic or mediating variables; (i) thinking and planning more intentionally and coherently about civic development; and (j) deepening partnerships with and contributions to the community (Bringle *et al.*, 2011, p. 22).

Thus, CMG provides a basis for assessing civic growth at the level of the individual, course, program, department, school, institution as well as multi-institution research. For example, CMG could assess civic-mindedness of undergraduate and graduate students when they graduate. This could provide an index of civic outcomes for the institution as a whole and of students in different departments or schools. This type of institutional research using CMG could provide data for quality assurance, accreditation, awards, institutional research, and grant proposals.

CMG has been used as a basis for faculty development activities in which CMG frames the nature of civic learning objectives for faculty designing service learning courses. When faculty teaching service learning courses consult with staff at the Center for Service and Learning, they are introduced to the CMG framework as both a tool for course design to achieve civic growth and a tool for assessing student civic learning outcomes. For example, a lecturer in the School of Public Health utilized the CMG scale to explore the extent to which service learning experiences in a Community Health course led to specific civic learning outcomes. Responses on the scale showed that there were significant increases in knowledge related to volunteer opportunities and enhanced attitudes, values, and skills related to building civic identity. A

lecturer in Interior Design used the domain of civic identity in the CMG rubric to document the progression of her students' civic identity as a result of participating in a service learning project working closely with a community partner in a local, urban neighborhood to transform an existing residential structure into a mixed use building. The rubric was used to evaluate critical reflection products and positive gains were found in students' level of civic identity and their understanding of community issues, agencies, and interventions.

CMG has also been used with co-curricular civic programs (Bringle *et al.*, 2011). Our university has a decades-long institutional commitment of supporting student service and civic involvement by awarding financial aid, scholarships, or bursaries to students who are engaged in community service. Beginning in 1994 with one scholarship awarded, the Sam H. Jones Community Service Scholarship (SHJCSS) program has grown to include \$684,000 of financial aid awarded to 177 students in the 2017-18 academic year. There are eight distinct programs focused on activities ranging from staffing a campus food pantry, leading student service trips and campus-wide service events, and supporting faculty-led community engaged teaching and research. The CMG construct has been used to design, implement, and assess a common set of civic learning goals and outcomes across all eight programs, although in some instances only a subset of items from the CMG scale are used that are particularly relevant to a program. For example, CMG is used annually to assess student learning and development through SHJCSS program activities. Seven of the eight SHJCSS programs focus specifically on students' professional and civic development. Program directors complete a proposal that details how dimensions of the CMG are interwoven into trainings and other activities and how those activities will be evaluated. Subsequently, student scholars engage in leadership training and in-class activities with the goal of putting into practice the different attributes of CMG.

To gauge student development on outcomes during the academic year, a mid-year assessment is administered that requires program directors to evaluate each student scholar on three of the SHJCSS outcomes —Professional Skills, Civic Communication Skills, and Civic Identity— the latter two of which are based on CMG dimensions. These mid-year assessments also ask staff to identify individual student strengths within these outcomes and to articulate a plan to address those areas in which each student needs to develop. The CMG Scale is also administered to scholars at the end of the academic year as part of a culminating survey, and the results are shared with program directors and used to improve future programs.

Unique among the SHJCSS scholarships is the Service Learning Assistant (SLA) scholarship. This scholarship program engages students in faculty-led activities that support community engaged teaching, research, and service. It intentionally involves civic mentoring, student professional development, critical reflection, and community partnership development to contribute to a student's civic development. The SLA scholarship is unique among the seven other SHJCSS in that the financial support is awarded directly to a faculty or staff member and is focused on faculty development as well as student development. Faculty and staff apply for the scholarships in one or more of the following categories: teaching (e.g., a service learning course), research/scholarship (utilizing community-engaged research methods), service (e.g., providing professional expertise in collaboration with a community organization), or capacity building (expanding the capacity of their program to offer service learning courses or curricula). Once funded, the faculty/staff mentor identifies a student as a recipient of the scholarship.

SLA scholarship funds are intended to support faculty and staff work that enables them to manage the increased time commitment, logistics, and relationship building required for

designing and implementing a service learning course as well as other community-engaged/public projects, research, and initiatives conducted in and with communities. This support enhances faculty/staff community-engaged scholarly practice; provides high-quality student mentoring opportunities; builds capacity for sustainable, mutually beneficial community-campus partnerships; improves scholar time/project management skills; and builds civic knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

Mentors and students receive a program orientation on program components, goals, and expectations, including the mentors' role as civic mentor of students. To support their professional development, SLA students complete and reflect upon one professional development activity (determined with their mentor) for each semester. Students then complete an end-of-year final report and narrative detailing their experiences and what they learned as a result of being an SLA. Mentors evaluate the end-of-year narratives utilizing the CMG construct to assess student civic learning and development, specifically looking at these two CMG domains: (a) understanding how social issues are addressed in society, and (b) the role of one's education to address social issues. Results of the assessment provide authentic evidence of student's civic learning.

## Conclusion

The Council of Europe (2016), which published *Competences for Democratic Culture*, provided a framework for delineating (a) values, (b) attitudes, (c) skills, and (d) knowledge and critical understanding as outcomes for educating for democratic citizenship and intercultural dialogue. The framework is very extensive but, perhaps, too general. A strength of the framework is the centrality of intercultural dialogue to develop democratic competencies. Service learning provides a tremendous opportunity to develop research and scholarship in the future

work in Europe and internationally on democratic competencies and various pedagogical approaches to achieve them.

High-quality service learning courses can provide opportunities through the selection of community service activities, key readings, classroom discussions, democratic partnerships, and reflection activities to develop an appreciation for complex learning, allow students to explore multiple perspectives while also developing their personal attributes, develop an appreciation for learning from others, and provide opportunities for dialogue and collaboration with diverse others (Bowman, 2011; Pascarella *et al.*, 2014; Stokamer & Clayton, 2017). Service learning has students involved with and collaborating with diverse others. Brandenberger and Bowman (2015) found across multiple institutions that active learning practices and diversity experiences contributed to prosocial growth from college entry to junior year. Pascarella *et al.* (2014) found that diversity experiences resulted in cognitive growth and more complex modes of thinking across four years of college, even when they controlled for pre-college experiences and other college experiences. They also found that the growth in critical thinking due to interactional diversity experiences was greater for students who entered with lower standardized entrance examination scores.

How these interactions are structured and how reflection activities are structured are critical to developing democratic skills (Stokamer & Clayton, 2017). Bringle, Clayton, and Bringle (2015) concluded that "no amount of learning and thinking about democracy and no amount of activity (e.g., community service) in communities will result in the development of democratic civic skills and civic identity without democratic partnerships" (p. 14). Furthermore, as Boyle-Baise (2002) pointed out, "A charitable task probably will not generate insights for social change" (p. 33). Levine (2013) concluded that mere community service activities are insufficient for the development of civic

learning; students must also be involved in collaborative relationships that involve deliberation in the civic realm. Partnerships between students and community members that contain democratic qualities (e.g., just, inclusive, participatory, equitable, reciprocal) are critical and necessary to allowing civic lessons about democratic processes to be fully developed and cognitive learning to be clarified (Bringle *et al.*, 2015).

Furthermore, research around the world demonstrates that employers are not primarily concerned with how well students have learned the

content of their major (e.g., Hart Research Associates, 2013). What employers want transcends the major. What they want is interdisciplinary, and it puts an emphasis on critical thinking, communication, and the ability to work with diverse others. These are all skills that can be built through service learning experiences. CMG and CMP illustrate the importance of understanding how scaffolding of curricular and co-curricular civic experiences can be studied longitudinally after graduation (Hill, Pasquesi, Bowman & Brandenberger 2017) to produce these desirable outcomes.

## References

---

- Aramburuzabala, P., McIlrath, L. & Opazo, H. (2019). *Embedding service learning in European higher education*. New York, NY, USA: Routledge.
- Ash, S. L. & Clayton, P. H. (2009a). Generating, deepening, and documenting learning: The power of critical reflection for applied learning. *Journal of Applied Learning in Higher Education*, 1, 25-48.
- Ash, S. L. & Clayton, P. H. (2009b). *Learning through critical reflection: A tutorial for students in service-learning* (instructor version). Raleigh, NC, USA: Authors.
- Barry, M., Lowe, L. A. & Twill, S., (2018). Academic librarians' attitudes about civic-mindedness and service learning. *The Library Quarterly*, 87(1), 1-16.
- Battistoni, R. M. (2002). *Civic engagement across the curriculum: A resource book for faculty in all disciplines*. Providence, RI, USA: Campus Compact.
- Battistoni, R. M. (2013). Civic learning through service learning: Conceptual frameworks and research. In P. Clayton, R. Bringle & J. Hatcher (eds.), *Research on service learning: Conceptual frameworks and assessment*, vol. 2A (pp. 111-132). Sterling, VA, USA: Stylus Publishing.
- Bowman, N. A. (2011). Promoting participation in a diverse democracy: A meta-analysis of college diversity experiences and civic engagement. *Review of Educational Research* 81(1), 29-68.
- Boyle-Baise, M. (2002). *Multicultural service learning: Educating teachers in diverse communities*. New York, NY, USA: Teachers College Press.
- Brandenberger, J. W. & Bowman, N. A. (2015). Prosocial growth during college: Results of a national study. *Journal of Moral Education*, 44(3), 328-345.
- Bringle, R. G. (2017). Hybrid high-impact pedagogies: Integrating service-learning with three other high-impact pedagogies. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 24(1), 49-63.
- Bringle, R. G. & Clayton, P. H. (2012). Civic education through service-learning: What, how, and why? In L. McIlrath, A. Lyons & R. Munck (eds.), *Higher education and civic engagement: Comparative perspectives* (pp. 101-124). New York, NY, USA: Palgrave.
- Bringle, R. G., Clayton, P. H. & Bringle, K. E. (2015). Teaching democratic thinking is not enough: The case for democratic action. *Partnerships: A Journal of Service Learning & Civic Engagement*, 6(1), 1-26.
- Bringle, R. G., Games, R. & Malloy, E. A. (eds.) (1999a). *Colleges and universities as citizens*. Needham Heights, MA, USA: Allyn & Bacon.

- Bringle, R. G., Games, R. & Malloy, E. A. (1999b). Colleges and universities as citizens: Issues and perspectives. In R. Bringle, R. Games & E. Malloy (eds.), *Colleges and universities as citizens* (pp. 1-16). Needham Heights, MA, USA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Bringle, R. G., Hahn, T. W. & Hatcher, J. A. (2019). *Civic-minded graduate: Additional evidence II* (unpublished manuscript). Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis, Indianapolis, IN, USA.
- Bringle, R. G. & Hatcher, J. A. (1996). Implementing service learning in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 67, 221-239.
- Bringle, R. G., Reeb, R., Brown, M. A. & Ruiz, A. (2016). *Service learning in psychology: Enhancing undergraduate education for the public good*. Washington, DC, USA: American Psychological Association.
- Bringle, R. G. & Steinberg, K. S. (2010). Educating for informed community involvement. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 46, 428-441.
- Bringle, R. G., Studer, M. H., Wilson, J., Clayton, P. H. & Steinberg, K. (2011). Designing programs with a purpose: To promote civic engagement for life. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 9(2), 149-164.
- Bringle, R. G. & Wall, E. (in press). Civic-minded graduate: Additional evidence. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*.
- Celio, C. I., Durlak, J. & Dymnicki, A. (2011). A meta-analysis of the impact of service-learning on students. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 34, 164-181.
- Centro Latinoamericano de Aprendizaje y Servicio Solidario (CLAYSS) (n.d.). What is “service learning”? Retrieved from [http://www.clayss.org/english/servicelearning\\_school.html](http://www.clayss.org/english/servicelearning_school.html)
- Centro Latinoamericano de Aprendizaje y Servicio Solidario (CLAYSS) (n.d.). *The concept of service and solidarity*. Retrieved from [http://www.clayss.org/english/servicelearning\\_solidarity.html](http://www.clayss.org/english/servicelearning_solidarity.html)
- Clary, E. G., Snyder, M., Ridge, R. D., Copeland, J., Stukas, A. A., Haugen, J. & Miene, P. (1998). Understanding and assessing the motivations of volunteers: A functional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 516-530.
- Conway, J. M., Amel, E. L. & Gerwien, D. P. (2009). Teaching and learning in the social context: A meta-analysis of service learning's effects on academic, personal, social, and citizenship outcomes. *Teaching of Psychology*, 36, 233-245.
- Council of Europe. (2016). *Competences for democratic culture: Living together as equals in culturally diverse democratic societies*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.
- Council of Europe (2017). *Council of Europe reference framework of competences for democratic culture (CDC). Volume 3 – Guidance for implementation. 2. CDC and pedagogy*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.
- Dolgon, C., Mitchell, T. D. & Eatman, T. K. (2017). *The Cambridge handbook of service learning and community engagement*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Furco, A. & Norvell, K. (2019). What is service learning? Making sense of the pedagogy and practice. In P. Aramburuzabala, L. McIlrath & H. Opazo (eds.), *Embedding service learning in European higher education: Developing a culture of civic engagement* (pp. 13-35). Oxford, UK: Routledge.
- Hahn, T. W., Hatcher, J. A. & Graunke, S. S. (2016). *Service scholarships, persistence and retention. Research brief*. Indianapolis, IN, USA: Center for Service and Learning.
- Hansen, F. B. & Clayton, P. H. (2014). From for to of: Online service-learning as both disruption and doorway to democratic partnerships. In S. Crabill & D. Butin (eds.), *Community engagement 2.0: Dialogues on the future of the civic in the disrupted university* (pp. 12-25). New York, NY, USA: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Hart Research Associates (2013). *It takes more than a major: Employer priorities for college learning and student success*. Washington, DC, USA: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Hatcher, J. A. (2008). *The public role of professionals: Developing and evaluating the Civic-Minded Professional scale* (doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Pro Quest Dissertation and Theses, AAT 3331248.
- Hatcher, J. A. & Bringle, R. G. (2012). Exploring similarities and differences through cross-cultural comparative research. In J. Hatcher and R. Bringle (eds.), *Understanding service-learning and community engagement: Crossing boundaries through research* (pp. ix-xxii). Charlotte, NC, USA: Information Age.
- Hatcher, J. A., Bringle, R. G. & Hahn, T. W. (eds.). (2017). *Research on service learning and student civic outcomes: Conceptual frameworks and methods*. Sterling, VA, USA: Stylus Publishing.
- Hemer, K. M. & Reason, R. D. (2017). Student civic outcomes in higher education. In J. Hatcher, R. Bringle & T. Hahn (eds.), *Research on service learning and student civic outcomes* (pp. 25-43). Sterling, VA, USA: Stylus Publishing.
- Herrero, M. A. (2017). *Jornada de investigadores sobre aprendizaje-servicio*. Buenos Aires: CLAYSS.
- Hill, P. L., Pasquesi, K., Bowman, N. A. & Brandenberger, J. W. (2017). Longitudinal research and student civic outcomes. In J. Hatcher, R. Bringle & T. Hahn (eds.), *Research on service learning and student civic outcomes* (pp. 283-302). Sterling, VA, USA: Stylus Publishing.
- International Christian University (2009). *Lessons from service-learning in Asia: Results of collaborative research in higher education*. Tokyo, Japan: Service-Learning Center, International Christian University.
- Jacoby, B. (2015). *Service-learning essentials: Questions, answers, and lessons learned*. San Francisco, CA, USA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kuh, G. D. (2009). *High-impact educational practices*. Washington, DC, USA: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Kuh, G. D. (2012, April). *A closer look at selected high-impact practices*. Paper presentation at the Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education, Louisville, KY, USA.
- Levine, P. (2013, February). *A defense of higher education and its civic mission*. Plenary address given at the Pathways to Achieving Civic Engagement Conference, Elon, NC, USA.
- Ma, C. H. K. & Chan, A. C. M. (2013). A Hong Kong university first: Establishing service-learning as an academic credit-bearing subject. *Gateways: International Journal of Community Research and Engagement*, 6, 178-198.
- Mathews, D. (1995). The politics of diversity and the politics of difference: Are academics and the public out of sync? *Higher Education Exchange*, 66-71.
- McIlrath, L., Lyons, A. & Munck, R. (eds.). (2012). *Higher education and civic engagement: Comparative perspectives*. New York, NY, USA: Palgrave.
- McIlrath, L. & MacLabhrainn, I. (eds.) (2007). *Higher education and civic engagement—international perspectives*. Ashgate, England: Aldershot.
- Morton, K. (1995). The irony of service: Charity, project and social change in service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 2, 19-32.
- Nelson Laird, T. F. (2005). College students' experiences with diversity and their effects on academic self-confidence, social agency, and disposition toward critical thinking. *Research in Higher Education*, 46, 365-387.
- Palombaro, K. M., Black, J. D., Dole, R. L., Pierce, J. L., Santiago, M. R. & Sabara, E. J. (2017). Assessing the development of civic mindedness in a cohort of physical therapy students. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 17(4), 31-43.

- Pascarella, E. T., Martin, G. L., Hanson, J. M., Trolian, T. L., Gillig, B. & Blaich, C. (2014). Effects of diversity experiences on critical thinking skills over 4 years of college. *Journal of College Student Development*, 95(1), 86-92.
- Richard, D., Keen, C., Hatcher, J. A. & Pease, H. A. (2017). Pathways to adult civic engagement: Benefits of reflection and dialogue across difference in higher education service-learning programs. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 23(1), 60-75.
- Saltmarsh, J. & Hartley, M. (eds.) (2012). *To serve a larger purpose*. Philadelphia, PA, USA: Temple University Press.
- Singh, K. (2016). *Report of the Special Rapporteur on the right to education*. New York, UN, USA: United Nations Human Rights Council.
- Steinberg, K., Hatcher, J. A. & Bringle, R. G. (2011). A north star: Civic-minded graduate. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 18(1), 19-33.
- Stokamer, S. T. & Clayton, P. H. (2017). Students civic learning through service learning. In J. Hatcher, R. Bringle & T. Hahn (eds.), *Research on service learning and student civic outcomes* (pp. 45-65). Sterling, VA, USA: Stylus Publishing.
- Sullivan, W. (1995). *Work and integrity: The crisis and promise of professionalism in America*. New York, NY, USA: Harper Collins.
- Xing, J. & Ma, K. H. K. (eds.). (2010). *Service-learning in Asia: Curricular models and practices*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Zlotkowski, E. (2005). The disciplines and the public good. In T. Chambers, A. Kezar & J. Burkhardt (eds.), *Higher education for the public good: Emerging voices from a national movement* (pp. 166-186). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Zlotkowski, E. (2007). The case for service learning. In L. McIlrath & I. MacLabhrainn (eds.), *Higher education and civic engagement: International perspectives* (37-55). Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.

## Resumen

---

### *Pedagogías y programas cívicos para el desarrollo de competencias para la cultura democrática y resultados de aprendizaje cívico*

**INTRODUCCIÓN.** El aprendizaje-servicio es una pedagogía que puede contribuir a desarrollar competencias cívicas para que los alumnos puedan participar de forma efectiva en sociedades democráticas culturalmente diversas. **MÉTODO.** Se realizó un análisis cualitativo de evidencias obtenidas a través de la investigación para determinar por qué el aprendizaje servicio es una pedagogía óptima para lograr competencias democráticas y aprendizaje cívico. Metanálisis anteriores son consistentes a la hora de definir el aprendizaje-servicio como un medio efectivo para mejorar los resultados del aprendizaje cívico. La mentalidad cívica proporciona un conjunto de objetivos comunes de aprendizaje cívico que pueden guiar tanto los cursos de aprendizaje servicio curricular como los programas cívicos extracurriculares. **RESULTADOS.** La investigación con estudiantes de Grado y profesionales con mentalidad cívica demuestra su utilidad para proporcionar un marco integrador de los resultados del aprendizaje cívico que puede guiar el diseño, implementación y evaluación de cursos de aprendizaje de servicio curricular y de programas cívicos extracurriculares en varios niveles (curso, departamento, facultad, campus, multicampus). **DISCUSIÓN.** Las instituciones de educación superior pueden aceptar el desafío de mejorar el aprendizaje cívico a través del aprendizaje-servicio, programas extracurriculares centrados en resultados cívicos y otras pedagogías efectivas y de alto impacto para mejorar a largo plazo hábitos de participación

comunitaria que contribuyan al bien público. Un componente clave para desarrollar el aprendizaje cívico, además del diseño de cursos de alta calidad, es brindar oportunidades para el diálogo y la colaboración con otros.

**Palabras clave:** *Aprendizaje-servicio, Aprendizaje cívico, Curriculum, Competencias democráticas.*

## **Résumé**

---

*Pedagogies et programmes civiques pour développer les compétences nécessaires pour une culture démocratique et pour attendre les objectifs d'apprentissage*

**INTRODUCTION.** L'apprentissage-service est une pédagogie qui permet aux étudiants universitaires d'acquérir des compétences civiques leur permettant de participer efficacement aux sociétés démocratiques culturellement diverses. **MÉTHODE.** Une analyse qualitative des données de recherche a été effectuée afin de déterminer pourquoi l'apprentissage par le service offrent une pédagogie optimale pour atteindre les compétences démocratiques et l'apprentissage civique. L'esprit civique fournit un ensemble d'objectifs d'apprentissage civique communs qui peuvent orienter à la fois les programmes d'apprentissage-service et les programmes civiques périscolaires à plusieurs niveaux (cours, département, école, campus, multicampus). **RÉSULTATS.** Des méta-analyses précédentes ont permis de conclure que l'apprentissage-service constitue un moyen efficace pour améliorer les résultats de l'apprentissage civique. La recherche qui a eu pour objet les étudiants diplômés à vocation civique et les professionnels à l'esprit civique démontre leur utilité pour fournir un cadre d'intégration des résultats de l'apprentissage civique qui peut guider la conception, la mise en œuvre et l'évaluation des programmes d'apprentissage-service et des programmes civiques co-curriculaires à plusieurs niveaux (cours, département, école, campus, multicampus). **DISCUSSION.** Les établissements d'enseignement supérieur peuvent accepter le défi d'améliorer l'apprentissage civique par le biais de l'apprentissage-service, de programmes périscolaires axés sur les résultats civiques et d'autres méthodes pédagogiques efficaces à fort impact pour améliorer les habitudes de participation à la communauté contribuant au bien public au long terme. En outre de la conception de cours de haute qualité, un des éléments clés du développement de l'apprentissage civique c'est la possibilité de dialoguer et de collaborer avec de personnes très différentes.

**Mots-clés:** *Aprendizaje-servicio, Aprendizaje cívico, Programme, Compétences démocratiques.*

## **Author profiles**

---

### **Robert G. Bringle (corresponding author)**

Chancellor's Professor Emeritus of Psychology and Philanthropic Studies, Senior Scholar at IUPUI Center for Service and Learning in the Department of Psychology at Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis. International Association for Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement.



Dr. Robert G. Bringle has been involved in the development, implementation, and evaluation of educational programs directed at talented undergraduate psychology majors, high school psychology teachers, first-year students, and the introductory psychology course. As a social psychologist, he is widely known for his research on jealousy in close relationships. In his previous position as Executive Director of the IUPUI Center for Service and Learning (1994-2012), his work resulted in an expansion of the number of service learning courses, a curriculum for faculty development, a Community Service Scholars program, an America Reads tutoring program, and a HUD Community Outreach Partnership Center. Dr. Bringle was awarded the Thomas Ehrlich Faculty Award for Service Learning in 1998, the IUPUI Chancellor's Award for Excellence in Teaching in 2011, and the Legacy of Service Award from Indiana Campus Compact in 2012. In 2004, he was recognized at the 4<sup>th</sup> Annual International Service-Learning Research Conference for his outstanding contributions to the service-learning research field. He consults with other campuses, on national initiatives, and internationally (South Africa, Macedonia, Mexico, Egypt, Ireland, Malaysia, Japan, Hong Kong, Singapore, Spain, The Netherlands) on issues related to community service and civic engagement. The University of the Free State, South Africa, awarded him an honorary doctorate in 2004 for his scholarly work on civic engagement and service learning.

E-mail: [rbringle@iupui.edu](mailto:rbringle@iupui.edu)

Correspondence address: 32 Clear Vista Dr., Asheville, NC, USA, 28805.

### **Thomas W. Hahn**

Director of Research and Program Evaluation, Center for Service and Learning at Indiana University Purdue University, Indianapolis. International Association for Research on Service Learning and Community Engagement. Coalition of Urban and Metropolitan Universities. Association for Institutional Research. Thomas W. Hahn is responsible for assessment, evaluation, and research in the areas of student civic learning, experiential learning, and success. Tom has over 20 years of experience in assessment and program improvement in Higher Education. He oversees the annual IUPUI Research Academy on Community Engagement and Engaged Learning and chairs the campus subcommittee for the student Experiential and Applied Learning Record. He received his undergraduate and graduate degrees from Old Dominion University in Norfolk, VA.

E-mail: [tomhahn@iupui.edu](mailto:tomhahn@iupui.edu)

### **Morgan Studer**

Director of Faculty and Community Resources, Center for Service and Learning at Indiana University Purdue University, Indianapolis.

Morgan Studer is responsible for managing the Service Learning Assistant scholarship program, administered through the Sam H. Jones Community Service Scholarship program. In her 12+ year tenure with CSL, Morgan has directed the America Reads\*America Counts tutoring program, managed the Community Work-Study program, and currently consults with faculty on service learning course design, particularly focused on community partnership development and critical reflection design and implementation. She serves on multiple campus committees including the First Year Experience Advisory Board, Division of Undergraduate Education Advisory Board, Engaged Students Working Group, and Equity-Mindedness Working Group. She received her undergraduate degree from Mercer University in Macon, GA and her graduate degree from IUPUI in Indianapolis, IN.

E-mail: [mohughes@iupui.edu](mailto:mohughes@iupui.edu)

**Lorrie A. Brown**

Director of Student and Staff Engagement, Center for Service and Learning at Indiana University Purdue University, Indianapolis.

Lorrie A. Brown is responsible for the oversight of major co-curricular community service initiatives at IUPUI, including the administration of the Sam H. Jones Community Service Scholarship program. For the past 20 years, Lorrie has worked to create responsive and well-structured community engagement experiences for students on campus while also actively sharing best practices on a local and national level. She collaborates with numerous IUPUI campus partners in both academic and non-academic units to support the inclusion of all students in educationally meaningful civic activities. Lorrie received her undergraduate degree from Baldwin Wallace University and her graduate degree from Bowling Green State University, both located in Ohio.

E-mail: [lorrbrow@iupui.edu](mailto:lorbrow@iupui.edu)