Shifts in Perspective: Capitalizing on the Counter-Normative Nature of Service-Learning

Patti H. Clayton and **Sarah L. Ash**
North Carolina State University

Service-learning is a unique pedagogy, and its very differences from traditional teaching and learning strategies make it both appealing and challenging to implement. Students and faculty alike are the products of traditional learning environments and often find service-learning unfamiliar and, as a consequence, experience dissonance, discomfort, and uncertainty. Confronting the difficulties students and faculty at our North Carolina State University have faced in adjusting to these differences has helped the authors to realize the importance of making "shifts in perspective" in how to understand and enact teaching and learning and service. This article shares the authors' emerging understanding of these "shifts" and how students and faculty can be supported in undertaking them effectively. The central conclusion is that reflecting on the differences between service-learning and more traditional pedagogies, and on ways to make the associated shifts in perspective and practice, can help practitioners to implement service-learning successfully and more fully tap its power to nurture the capacity for self-directed learning.

A review of almost any article or text on service-learning generates descriptors such as "collaborative," "reflective," "participatory," "reciprocal," "self-directed," "egalitarian," "engaging," and "connected." It is doubtful, however, that these adjectives would be at the top of most students' lists if they were asked to describe their typical classroom experiences. In fact, some North Carolina State University students recently used such phrases as "lecture-based," "passive," "hierarchical," "highly structured," and "anonymous" when asked to describe their experience in traditional courses. Phrases such as "focused on progress," "interactive," "personal," "student voice," and "conducive to relationships" were offered by students in reference to a service-learning enhanced class. In that difference lie some of the challenges—but also some of the most important opportunities—of service-learning.

It is well known that students face difficulties transitioning from traditional instructor-centered pedagogies to those that require greater learner responsibility (Felder & Brent, 1996). The importance of exploring the factors that help and hinder teaching and learning, when service-learning is the new pedagogy being integrated into a course, has been articulated (Gilchrist, Mundy, Felten, & Shields, 2003). The "real world" messiness and unpredictability, complexities of social change processes, personal and intellectual risks inherent in reflection, and shared control and responsibility implicit in partnerships are among the many unique characteristics of service-learning. Relative unfamiliarity with its defining dynamics often makes service-learning—especially high quality service-learning, which is well-integrated academically, rigorously reflective, and procedurally democratic and communal—difficult for students and faculty alike to undertake effectively (Eyler & Giles, 1999). Its uniqueness can lead to degrees of dissonance, frustration, and uncertainty. This, in turn, can lead to diminished outcomes, especially if the response is to disengage, reduce risk-taking, or try to force-fit this new experience into the modes of teaching and learning with which students and faculty alike are apt to be more comfortable

Intentionally confronting the discomfort is a fruitful, albeit challenging, path. In fact, it is this very dissonance and its associated difficulties that give service-learning much of its potential as a transformative pedagogy, and make it such a vital component of education in the 21st century. Vaill (1996) suggests that the traditional model of "institutionalized learning"—with its emphases on efficiency, answer orientation, assumption of teacher (not learner) responsibility for establishing goals, rule-constrained nature, and competitive mode—does not adequately prepare learners for the rapidly changing, unpredictable, interconnected temporary world. In fact, it "tends to disqualify us for the kinds of learning we need to do throughout our lives," in large part because the traditional model of "institutionalized learning" does not teach us about ourselves as learners or help us view the world as a set of learning opportunities (p. 48). Our world of "permanent white water" requires us to reconcep-

tualize learning as "a way of being," thereby defining the task of educators as helping to empower creative, expressive, reflective, self-directed learners who are capable of tapping the learning potential of all their experiences and thus living more effectively in an uncertain world. Service-learning seems to be extraordinarily well-suited to developing such capacities, but it must often do so within "institutionalized learning" contexts, whose norms are in stark contrast.

Although not speaking of service-learning per se, Vaill (1996) articulates the conviction at the heart of this article: "our common experience with institutional learning suggests that for each of us there will be some common challenges as we develop our mode of learning as a way of being" (p. 44). This article shares the authors' emerging understanding of how to support students and faculty not only in *managing* the challenges associated with this unique experience but also in *utilizing* them intentionally as stimuli to the development of capacities associated with learning as a way of being. We have come to see this transformative process as one in which and through which students and faculty alike "shift our perspective"—and in turn our practice—on almost every facet of teaching and learning. In our experience, service-learning not only *requires* students and faculty to make these shifts, but can also be used to *facilitate* them, such that we all become more effective and self-aware as learners and teachers. Honoring and nurturing these shifts therefore may be a significant mechanism for tapping the full power of the pedagogy.

The Counter-Normative Nature of Service-Learning

Like Vaill, Howard (1998) suggests that moving beyond traditional teaching and learning processes is necessary, but also challenging. Howard refers to service-learning as a "counter-normative" pedagogy, one that "qualitatively changes the norms and relationships of the teaching-learning process" (p. 22). He suggests that because of its incongruence with traditional pedagogies, service-learning surfaces a variety of tensions about the purpose and process of education. And he encourages practitioners to think carefully about how to collaboratively "de-program" classrooms away from the individualism, instructor control, and student passivity characteristic of many traditional pedagogies and "re-socialize" them toward the shared responsibility and active learning characteristic of a service-learning process.

Howard (1998) thus suggests, and we have certainly found in our own experience, that many students have to learn how to learn (and teach and serve) through service-learning and many instructors have to learn how to teach (and learn and serve) through service-learning. Caught up in the initial excitement of this pedagogy, and then often overwhelmed by the time and effort it requires, however, students and instructors alike may fail to take into account how fundamentally different service-learning is from traditional teaching and learning strategies. Consequently, instructors may not appreciate the extent to which students interpret the "new" pedagogy of service-learning through their "old" interpretive lens: viewing out-of-class time requirements as unreasonable, seeing feedback on reflection products as "teachers' games," missing the interconnections between service work and course content, and attributing the messiness of encounters with ambiguous and complex "real world" issues to instructor disorganization or poor course design. Similarly, often unconscious reliance on traditional roles and behaviors may lead instructors to fall short of implementing service-learning as the democratic, collaborative, inquiry-guided process it is at its best; we may resist trading off readings or exams, or making space in the creation of our syllabi for community or student voices. And service-learning instructors may fear giving up control over what and how our students are learning. If we do not acknowledge the extent to which many of us—both students and faculty—are the products of traditional classroom environments, we are apt to be less prepared than we could be to support one another in implementing service-learning successfully, much less to tap its full transformative potential.

The authors have begun to think of the dynamic by which a service-learning enhanced course unfolds as a "wave" of incoming dissonance, which instructors ride with students. The class moves from initial enthusiasm at the prospect of involvement in the community to the uncertainty and confusion that almost inevitably result from immersion in this unfamiliar pedagogy. In our experience, the wave follows a predictable pattern.

Phase 1

Intrigued by the promise of the pedagogy and uniqueness of the experience, students and instructor launch into the semester together, hopeful and confident.

Phase 2

As the semester proceeds, students may begin experiencing difficulties adjusting to such a multifaceted process that requires independence, initiative, and persistence in the face of unanticipated

obstacles. Students may also struggle when they are forced to adopt a self-critical analytical perspective oriented toward continuous improvement. And, aware of it or not, instructors may similarly be experiencing difficulties transitioning to this new pedagogy, which requires more flexibility and less hierarchy in relationships than to which most are accustomed.

Phase 3

Gradually, these collective difficulties may begin to diminish the effectiveness of the experience, not to mention collective enthusiasm for it.

As instructors, we witness our students' insecurities and confusion as we ask them—often for the first time in their college careers—to identify their own most important learnings, think from the perspective of the discipline and from the perspectives of those they are serving, and critique not only their experience (in light of what they read) but also what they read (in light of their experience). We see them taken aback by feedback on reflection products that challenge their assumptions and ask them to support and refine overly simplistic conclusions; especially when that feedback suggests that they need to radically rethink, perhaps even start over entirely. We see their unfamiliarity with the process of rewriting through multiple drafts. We hear their disillusionment that their community partners do not always prioritize their collaboration or that their grand plans to "make a difference" are getting scaled back.

And of course our own dissonance as instructors can be equally pronounced. While we wanted our students to have experiences that push them beyond their comfort zones, we find that we are not entirely confident helping them to process the personal and interpersonal issues that frequently arise. We may devote time to giving students feedback on journal entries and other reflection products, but critique their work in ways that do not help them feel safe in taking risks and sharing vulnerabilities. We find ourselves trying to force-fit experiential learning outcomes into the standard assessment procedures that we and our peers trust, and we fall back into "sage on the stage" mode when we feel the semester slipping away with less-than-hoped-for content coverage.

Several weeks into the semester, then, enthusiasm and confidence may have given way to frustration and uncertainty, even second thoughts. Unfortunately, this phase can last the rest of the semester!

In summary, service-learning instructors invite students into a teaching and learning process that is messier, more self-critical, and more open-ended than most student—or most instructors—have been socialized into, creating an experience of dissonance that is all the more filled with learning potential because of these very differences. Our task is thus to see—and to help our students see—uncertainty, confusion, insecurity, and frustration as normal, acceptable, and even beneficial dimensions of learning—as signs, in fact, that learning and growth are taking place. If we can do this successfully, then Phase 3 might give way to Phase 4, a period of increased effectiveness and creativity, greater openness to challenge and risk, deeper self-awareness, and a stronger sense of personal responsibility and community. While sometimes uncomfortable for everyone involved, we have found that it is through embracing this resocializing process that much of the learning associated with service-learning occurs, for our students and ourselves.

Identifying Shifts in Perspective

In the early years of our program we did not openly acknowledge the counter-normative nature of service-learning or explore what it implied—or should have implied—for our approach. Recently, however, this began to change when a group of students helped us to realize that we need to be much more explicit about this resocializing process—that, in fact, we need to label it as such and determine how to undertake it successfully. They coined the term "shifts in perspective" to describe their struggles to adjust to their first service-learning experience.

Reflection served as one of the early triggers to this emerging awareness on their part. The primary reason reflection is so central to effective service-learning is because of the depth of critical analysis it can facilitate into open-ended and ambiguous questions (Eyler & Giles, 1999). As our students articulate specific learning outcomes through the reflection process, they receive substantial feedback from peers and instructors that is designed to point out their assumptions, push them to adopt multiple perspectives, and challenge the logic and significance of their conclusions. In short, rigorous reflection helps students deepen their learning, moving from superficial, unfocused, or even problematic to well-refined, appropriately generalized, and actionable (Ash & Clayton, in press). The students' initial difficulties with this process stemmed from the misfit between their previous understandings of writing and that required by the reflection process. They had previously seen writing as a representation of learning that had already occurred and thus expected minimal feedback or comment beyond a grade, unless the instructor was dis-

pleased with their work. The service-learning process, however, assumes that writing is critically reflective—is what the students came to call "a vehicle for ongoing learning." In this latter interpretation, feedback is a sign of collaboration in the learning process, not an indication of errors or shortcomings, and revising through multiple drafts is a necessary step toward—even a welcome opportunity to—deepening one's learning.

How to conceptualize writing and, relatedly, the meaning and value of feedback, was thus one of the first of many shifts in perspective the students found themselves needing to make as they struggled to emerge from their early-semester frustrations. As they continued to reflect on this particular shift, the students added the clarification that writing's role as a vehicle for learning is dependent less on number of pages produced or hours spent writ-

Figure 1
Excerpts from Original Student Shifts in Perspective Document

The "real world" is after and beyond college➜College is the "real world"
Throughout the college years, students may hear that the university is only preparing us for the "real world" and may therefore think that genuine concern for the rest of society and our own role within a community can only begin after the college years. We have come to see that students are already in the "real world" and can make a real, tangible impact on the university and society while we are still students.

Valuing the product / outcome➜Valuing both the product and the process
Service-learning presents learning opportunities in which students are challenged to focus not only on the product of their learning but also on the process. This shift in perspective can be translated into not worrying so much about a grade in a class or the outcome of a service experience, but rather embracing the challenges and learning that take place throughout the experience. By learning to "trust the process," we realized that "failure" is acceptable—although it does have consequences—and can be a valuable learning opportunity.

Living unreflectively➜Reflecting-in-action
Taking action is important, but learning to become reflective-in-action allows every moment of our lives to become opportunities for growth and thus can be even more valuable. More meaning can be taken from an experience through reflecting on its significance. Becoming reflective means asking ourselves why situations unfold as they do, what changes need to be made in the world around us, how we can be more effective, and who we are and want to become. In order for this deeper reflection to occur, we must also shift toward greater openness and honesty with ourselves and with others.

Viewing writing / speaking as assignments➜Viewing writing /speaking as vehicles for thinking and discovery
Writing and speaking are not merely the end products of a thought process, developed to fulfill an assignment or to demonstrate thinking that has already been done. Rather, they are vehicles for ongoing learning and deeper thinking about who we are and the work we are doing. This shift in perspective includes the realization that understanding includes being able to articulate learning and that quality of thought rather than quantity of writing is key in effectively learning through writing. By approaching assignments in this light, we can see them as meaningful vehicles for important learnings rather than as "busywork" to satisfy a requirement.

Defining success narrowly (immediate, large-scale impact)➜Defining success to include long-term, small-scale impact
Service-learning challenges us to view success differently. "Success" not only includes making a big impact on a lot of people but also touching a few people deeply and sometimes in ways that do not emerge immediately. We can begin gauging when we need to address the smaller or the larger aspects of the service being provided. Rather than diving in and trying to institute large changes immediately, we can focus on making several small changes that combine over time to create the larger change that we envision. Achievement of the "big picture" may seem delayed or discarded as a result of focusing on the smaller, short-term aspects of our service, but this is not necessarily the case. With this shift, making a difference may begin to seem more feasible, and we can begin to see how citizenship can be integrated into our lives.

"Out there"➜"In here"
While engaged in a service-learning enhanced course, it is important for faculty and students to shift their locus of control from external to internal. By viewing problems as "in here" not "out there" only, as recommended by Greenleaf (1991, 1970), we are able to avoid frustrations associated with feeling victimized and can responsibly take action in areas over which we have influence. This "internalist" shift in perspective also relates to our perceptions of service: though service is commonly understood as helping others in need (thus implying inequality), service-learning encourages us to view service as a relationship between equals—one through which the one who serves is equally as healed ("in here") as the recipient of the service ("out there").

ing than on the quality of the thinking that the writing supports. Disciplined focus and eliminating distractions—what a student called "concentrated, dedicated time"—were identified as key to learning effectively through reflective writing. Students observed that "writing is a vehicle for learning, yes, but you have to *think* while you write to learn anything from it."

Over the remaining months of the semester, the students kept a running list of additional such shifts in perspective. In an attempt to better understand their own struggles to adjust to the service-learning process and support students in other classes they believed would benefit from similar reflection, they produced a document summarizing and explaining the most significant shifts they experienced (see Figure 1 for excerpts). They then used this material to facilitate a reflection activity at the conclusion of the public presentations that comprise the end-of-semester, campus-wide "Celebration of Service-Learning." These students taught us the value of—and an approach to—substantive exploration of the counter-normative nature of service-learning. Their own shifts list and summary document are themselves testimony to the potential of service-learning to help students develop metacognitive abilities: to watch themselves learning and acting, and improve their abilities to learn and act accordingly

Expanding On the Shifts In Perspective

Building on this work, the authors have collaborated with additional students as well as faculty at North Carolina State University and other universities to continue examining the specific ways in which service-learning is experienced by participants as differing in important ways from more traditional pedagogies, and the implications of those differences for understanding their tasks as teachers and learners. Although these differences are well-identified in the service-learning literature, much of which explores the unique nature of the pedagogy (Eyler & Giles, 1999; Pompa, 2002; Steinke & Buresh, 2002), we have found value in asking students and faculty to identify, categorize, and consider the implications of such differences *themselves*, through a process of reflection on their own experience with service-learning.

First we ask students and faculty to list some of the characteristics of service-learning enhanced courses in explicit contrast with the characteristics of their other classes. Students generate such comparisons as "lecture-based vs. interactive discussion," "anonymous vs. personal," "active student role is not encouraged vs. active student role is expected," "hierarchical vs. power is shared," "rigidly structured vs. flexibly structured," and "'do or die' vs. progressive improvement." Faculty generate such comparisons as "learning is factual vs. learning is conceptual," "learning is centered on the self vs. learning is centered on the common good," "learning proceeds without processing vs. learning proceeds through reflection," "material is compartmentalized vs. material is integrated," "goal-oriented vs. process-oriented," and "remaining objective vs. sharing our own judgments and passions."

We then ask them to organize these differences into categories, some of which are presented in the first column of Table 1. These include "the nature of assignments," "the meaning of experience," "the role of the instructor," and "the role of the student." As a third step, we ask students and faculty to determine specific shifts in perspective associated with each category of difference, as indicated in the second column of the table. For example, in the category "Assessment" (not included in the table) students and faculty alike suggest the shift from "instructor responsibility to define learning outcomes, which are common to all students" to "student responsibility to define at least some of their own learning outcomes, some of which may be individualized." And within the category, "Motivation / Accountability" (also not included in the table), they note the shift in perspective from "seeing accountability as externally-imposed" to "seeing accountability as internally-derived."

Finally, we ask students and faculty to identify shifts in practice—in attitude or behavior or skills—associated with each shift in perspective, as suggested in the final column of Table 1. Complementing the shift in perspective regarding shared responsibility to define learning outcomes, for example, is the need for students to transition from "accepting as given the objectives on the syllabus" to "defining our own objectives and holding ourselves accountable for meeting them, even when this involves additional work or asking the instructor to consider making changes to an assignment." Relatedly, faculty see the need to shift their practice from "creating an exam to test that all students have mastered the same concepts" to "structuring reflection processes and products so as to demonstrate individual learning outcomes as well." A corollary shift in practice for faculty related to moving from external to internal accountability involves a shift from "articulating rewards and punishments" to "discussing responsibilities."

The "shifts" project thus has both conceptual and functional dimensions: it involves changing our *understanding* of what we are doing, but it also involves changing what we actually *do*. Each shift in perspective, therefore, also has several associated shifts in practice. While some of the shifts in

Table 1 *Sample Shifts in Perspective and Practice*

Category	Shifts in perspective
Teaching and learning process	Failure as subject to being penalized ➜ Failure as an acceptable source of learning and growth, though with consequences to both classroom and community
	Competitive classroom ➜ Collaborative classroom
	Classroom process is neat/tidy/under control ➜ Classroom and service processes are messy/open-ended/unpredictable
	Content focus ➜ Process focus as well
	Classroom environment is often low risk / high comfort ➜ Classroom and service environments can be high risk / low comfort
Faculty role / identity	"Teaching" / conveying knowledge ➜ "Facilitating" / supporting learning and growth
	A stance of objective detachment ➜ A stance of commitment and involvement
	"Sage on the stage" ➜ Partner in the teaching and learning process
Student role / identity	Passive recipient of knowledge ➜ Active co-generator of knowledge
	Victim mentality ➜ Empowered actor mentality
Range and nature of relationships	Student peers as stimuli primarily for personal growth ➜ Student peers as capable facilitators of intellectual development
	All learning relationships internal to campus ➜ External community as partner in the learning process
	Power in the hands of the instructor ➜ Power shared with the students and the community
Nature of assignments	Course material as isolated and irrelevant to life outside the classroom ➜ Course material as connected on many dimensions, to other material and to our lives
	Assignments as "hoops" to jump through ➜ Assignments as real learning opportunities
Nature of truth (including processes for discovery)	"Truth" is a matter of right and wrong ➜ "Truth" is complex and ambiguous
	Experience as invalid source of information relative to texts ➜ Experience as valid complementary source of information
Time / workload	Time and space management (when and where) as an individual process ➜ Time and space management as a collective process
	Out-of-class time as unreasonable expectation ➜ Out-of-class time as necessary to the learning process

Students: Fearing critical perspective / challenge ➜ Valuing critical perspective / challenge	**Faculty:** Penalizing shortcomings with low grades ➜ Providing feedback and opportunities for revision / reflection on shortcomings before assigning grades
Students: Doing all work individually to ensure a good grade ➜ Sharing responsibility for work so that all group members learn and contribute	**Faculty:** Creating individual assignments only ➜ Creating group assignments too
Students: Expecting the schedule for the entire semester to be established in advance and held to ➜ "Going with the flow" as the evolving process dictates	**Faculty:** Setting hard and fast deadlines ➜ Setting flexible deadlines; making changes as needed in response to unanticipated obstacles and opportunities
Students:: Focusing only on learning the material ➜ Focusing also on learning how to learn	**Faculty:** Being committed to "coverage" of content ➜ Being willing to trade-off some content for time spent on critical thinking, etc.
Students: Feeling offended when a peer or instructor disagrees with them ➜ Being receptive to peer and instructor disagreement as insight into other perspectives	**Faculty:** Responding to students to make them feel that their answers are in some way "correct" ➜ Establishing and enforcing norms of inquiry that make intellectual and interpersonal interactions critical yet also safe
Students: Asking instructors to "just give us the answer" ➜ Asking instructors to help them determine the best questions and the best problem-solving processes	**Faculty:** Preparing for class by reviewing lecture notes and developing presentations ➜ Preparing for class by meeting with students who will lead discussion and helping them learn this role
Students: Believing that instructors have little conviction because they encourage multiple perspectives and resist sharing their own ➜ Expressing interest in instructors' perspectives without being inappropriately swayed by them	**Faculty:** Setting firm boundaries between personal and professional lives and maintaining a public face of neutrality ➜ Sharing with students their passion for the discipline and their own interpretations / convictions on issues related to course content, as appropriate
Students: Expecting instructors to have all the answers ➜ Expecting instructors to have both questions and answers; valuing students' role in helping instructors learn	**Faculty:** Expecting confidence derived from control and expertise ➜ Accepting vulnerability and uncertainty as a result of sharing responsibility, dealing with unfamiliar issues, and being in the role of both student and instructor
Students: Valuing the instructor's interpretation of material ➜ Valuing their own interpretation of material, based on reflection on their experience, as well	**Faculty:** Designing assignments for regurgitation ➜ Designing assignments for independent inquiry and helping students develop the skills of problem-definition and problem-solving **Both:** Taking time to learn about learning theory (e.g., Bloom's Taxonomy)
Students: Expecting infrastructure / support to be provided by others ➜ Creating needed support, in collaboration with others **Students:** Assuming that resources / expertise / time / are insufficient ➜ Realizing much can be done with limited resources / expertise / time and that "we are sufficient to the task"	**Faculty:** Spending no time discussing students' roles in their own learning ➜ Creating activities through which students learn to take responsibility for their own learning
Students: Discounting time spent with peer Reflection Leaders as tangential to academic assignments ➜ Valuing peer Reflection Leaders' mastery of course content and learning processes and soliciting their advice	**Faculty:** Limiting peer review of theory-based assignments ➜ Frequently using peer review and teaching students to use rubrics and to assess standards of critical thinking, etc.
Students: Taking time to get to know fellow students and instructors as an aid to learning and collaboration ➜ Taking time to get to know community members as well, including both community organizations' staff and clientele	**Faculty:** Seeking input on syllabus design only from colleagues ➜ Seeking input on syllabus design from students and from community members as well
Students: Relying on the instructor's knowledge and preparation to make something of value happen in class ➜ Assuming responsibility to make something of value happen in class, including coming prepared with summaries / questions / critiques of readings	**Faculty:** Filling the silence with answers when responses are not forthcoming ➜ Allowing silence to become uncomfortable and reflecting on the requirements of a "power-shifted" classroom with students **Both:** Telling community partners what our learning objectives are and therefore what activities we need to undertake ➜ Inviting community partners into the process of determining learning objectives and associated service-learning activities
Students: Developing the skills associated with memorizing facts ➜ Developing the skills associated with making and sharing connections	**Faculty:** Presenting material in the abstract ➜ Presenting material in the context of previous material, other courses, out-of-class experiences, popular culture, and / or personal and professional encounters with it
Students: Figuring out what the instructor wants and giving it to her in order to get a good grade ➜ Figuring out what the objectives are so as to learn from doing the assignment	**Faculty:** Including objectives on the syllabus only because doing so is required ➜ Crafting objectives that are real drivers of assignments and explaining to students why they are of value to the discipline / profession / etc.
Students: Thinking: "Just tell me what the answer is." ➜ Thinking: "Easy answers are rarely the only or the best answers."	**Faculty:** Giving feedback in the form of correcting answers ➜ Giving feedback in the form of challenging assumptions, suggesting alternative perspectives, etc. and providing multiple opportunities for revision
Students: Accepting what is read as true because it is in the book ➜ Questioning what is in the book based on what is experienced	**Faculty:** Valuing experience in the community as at best an opportunity to apply course material ➜ Valuing experience in the community as an opportunity to evaluate course material
Students: Spending out-of-class time in familiar settings such as libraries and in accordance with one's own schedule ➜ Spending out-of-class time in unfamiliar settings such as the community as well and on a schedule co-determined by one's partners	**Faculty:** Determining independently when time is spent on which topics ➜ Designing a syllabus around timing of community partner needs and interactions
Students: Setting aside little out-of-class time and using it only for cramming, required homework, and minimal reading ➜ Scheduling at least two or three blocks of time per week to spend on in-depth engagement with the course	**Faculty:** Requiring out-of-class time but not explaining its value or rationale ➜ Making visible the links between in- and out-of-class learning experiences and trade-offs made to integrate service and reflection while maintaining a reasonable workload

perspective and practice may be unique to students or faculty, many—perhaps not surprisingly given the interdependence characteristic of service-learning—involve issues of dissonance facing both.

Supporting Students and Faculty in Making Shifts

The process associated with better understanding these shifts, as described so far, has four steps:

1. Identifying the characteristics of service-learning that make it counter-normative to our prior and predominant experience.
2. Categorizing those differences
3. Defining specific shifts in perspective within each category
4. Identifying the ways in which shifted perspectives imply shifted practices: challenging us to adopt new attitudes, develop new skills, and enact new behaviors.

The fifth and final step involves supporting students and faculty in actually making these shifts in both perspective and practice, which includes honoring the attendant difficulties and making it safe for one another to take associated risks. Because we have found that reflection on the unique nature of service-learning can help students and faculty learn their way into this often unfamiliar and challenging process, we are beginning to develop a range of mechanisms to support such reflection and to consider at what points in the process it is most useful.

With Faculty

Participants in our service-learning faculty development process engage in a service-learning immersion experience and then, having begun to rework their syllabi and having read Howard's (1998) article on service-learning as counter-normative pedagogy, are asked to identify several very specific ways in which the service-learning enhanced courses they are developing will be distinctly different from the way they have taught before. We help them analyze these differences in terms of the shifts in perspective and practice they imply: the faculty generate their own lists and compare them to those produced by students and other instructors. In the future, we plan to have a student panel share their experiences, specifically in terms of the shifts in perspective and practice they did, or did not, make during the course of their service-learning classes, and the factors that assisted or hindered them in the re-norming process.

Our training and support for service-learning instructors, then, increasingly includes helping them to think of their teaching with this pedagogy in light of its counter-normative nature, so that they can design their syllabi and prepare themselves and their students accordingly. While this process does require that we look critically at traditional teaching and learning processes, it does not necessarily involve leaving these processses behind entirely. Our work with faculty also includes helping them explore the value and limitations of traditional pedagogies and service-learning so that they can incorporate a mix that is appropriate to their objectives.

We believe that this reflection on their pedagogical choices should also translate into greater understanding of themselves as educators, greater confidence in themselves as facilitators of their students' learning, enhanced fluency in articulating their own objectives, and ultimately a gratifying awareness of their own professional and personal development.

With Students

It is our intention that faculty sensitized to the counter-normative nature of service-learning will in turn be intentional and creative in supporting their students through the wave of dissonance and, moreover, will use the service-learning experience as an opportunity to nurture the perspectives, skills, attitudes, and behaviors at the heart of "learning as a way of being." This process of reflecting on learning to learn in a counter-normative context takes time. Howard (1998), however, suggests that we when we struggle with such time trade-offs we might ask ourselves "what is the task at hand in an academic course?" and thus realize that time devoted to helping students learn how to learn need not, in fact, be viewed as time "away" from our primary task (pp. 27 - 28).

Managing time for maximal learning is a key example of an issue faculty might raise with their students early in the semester as part of exploring with them how service-learning may require them to adapt their approach as students. While students may be able to get by with discontinuous, deadline-driven engagement with their other courses (prioritizing the course only when an assignment is due or an exam approaches), the collaborative and cumulative service and reflection activities characteristic of many service-learning enhanced courses—combined with the shared responsibility for what happens in the classroom—require a more evenly distributed, continuous engagement (with almost daily time devoted to one or more elements of the service-learning process). Of course, continuous engagement with the learning process is not only important in service-learning but is apt to enhance outcomes in almost any learning environment; Vaill (1996) points out the irony in the fact

that "institutional learning works best when a learner practices learning as a way of being" (p. 48). In this as in so many other examples, the associated conceptual, attitudinal, and behavioral shifts are necessary elements of self-directed, independent, lifelong learning.

If we are to prepare students for success in service-learning and, more fundamentally, to use this process to nurture their development as self-directed learners, it is important to create space in our courses for reflection on the learning process itself, focusing on the issues surfaced by the counter-normative nature of the course. When and how such reflection might best occur will depend on the students and the course, but we have found a mix of activities such as the following to be helpful:

- Introducing students to service-learning during the first week of class with a reflection activity designed to surface their expectations about the service-learning process, in explicit comparison with their other courses
- A journal entry for student reflection on their struggles with the service-learning process, and the ways they are finding themselves changing as learners because of it;
- An in-class discussion of shifts in perspective once the students have begun to express frustrations or uncertainties with the service-learning process;
- A similar exercise at mid-semester, as a sort of progress check or mid-course correction, and/or at the end of the semester, as part of a wrap-up evaluation of the course and its most important outcomes;
- Bringing a former student to the classroom, to share her own experience with service-learning and the value the associated shifts in perspective had and still have in her life and work;
- Sharing with our students some of the shifts we are experiencing in facilitating the course;
- Asking students to read and respond to material such as Howard's (1998) article, or an excerpt from Vaill (1996), or a list of shifts in perspective produced by former students.

An important dimension of any such mechanism for student reflection is self-evaluation and, relatedly, personal goal-setting; establishing a safe but critical space for such reflection is therefore crucial. Students should be challenged to honestly confront their own successes and failures in learning to learn through service-learning, to identify specific examples of the shifts they are or are not making, to consider why they are or are not making them (what forces are helping and hindering them), and to set actionable goals for improvement. One of the opportunities provided by periodic and cumulative reflection on their experience as learners in the service-learning process is that the students may be able to make substantial changes in their approach during the semester, rather than waiting for the end of the semester to consider what they might have done differently.

Additional Potential Benefits of Shifts In Perspective

Such a process of reflection on learning to learn through service-learning might also generate additional benefits:

- As students come to see the service-learning process as including opportunities to *deepen* rather than merely *prove* their learning and to have an influence in the classroom and the broader community, a consequence should be reduced "game playing" on assignments: any tendencies to "plug and chug" their way through course-related work or to do just enough to "get by" may be minimized.
- Similarly, a shifted perspective may reduce problems with student accountability for service. Students who understand their service as more than an "assignment," as both a data source for their learning (and that of their peers) and a mature commitment to collaborate in a process of social change, ought to be less apt to falsify reports of their service hours and more likely to exceed expectations regarding the amount and quality of their service.
- Shifts in student perspectives might help to counter the common pattern of negative student evaluations of a new pedagogy (Franklin, as cited in Gilchrist, Mundy, Felten, & Shields, 2003). If students become increasingly aware, and perhaps even appreciative, of the reasons for the nontraditional course design, and as they better understand teaching and learning as a "messy" process, they may engage in course evaluation using more mature, reasoned judgment. The results may include both more positive evaluations—in turn making the pedagogy less risky for faculty to undertake—and more helpful feedback for course revision.

Sometimes such reflection does not generate the timely changes in perspective and practice that we hope for; the time invested in such reflection, however, may yet produce long-term, albeit delayed, results. One of the students in the group that gener-

ated the "shifts" project, for example, often felt left behind as her peers identified the changes they needed to make and, for the most part, proceeded to make them successfully. Her look back at the course from one year later suggests some of the differences in how students experience the shifts in perspective. In her case, much of the progress her classmates made toward new understandings of learning did not "take" until later; but this very delay has allowed her to identify additional shifts that are proving useful in other courses and the rest of her life:

> Previously, I assumed that everyone taking a class would have the same learning and thus tended to judge my own outcomes against other students. In our service-learning class, I felt like I was seeing other students experience tremendous changes, but I was not feeling the same. Was I simply a "bad" service-learner? With service-learning, there is no such thing as a "uniform experience" or "uniform learning," however. You work with different people at different sites and bring different backgrounds, values, and prior experiences to a project. Everyone brings something different, experiences something different, and gains something unique (though everyone can certainly relate to others and what they get out of it). I have realized that this is true of most learning situations, and I now try to look for and value those individualized outcomes and not compare my learning against others'. A late shift in perspective for me, therefore, was from seeing learning as following a production-line model to seeing learning as following a dynamic and individualized model.
>
> Another, related, shift is the realization that engagement with ideas and experiences not only carries over into other avenues of life than courses but also carries forward through time as well: the end of a semester does not indicate the conclusion of learning from that semester, and getting the grade does not mean that 'you've gotten out of this all you're gonna get.' Today, I have internalized much more of my service-learning experience than I had when I received my final grade for the course. The end of the service-learning course did not mean the end of the service-learning experience, which is dependent on living a reflective life rather than enrollment in any course.

This student's experience serves as a useful reminder: while the shifts in perspective may not happen as fully as we would like during any given semester, the service-learning process has the potential to cultivate the ground in which they may later grow. In fact, there could be much value in including issues related to these changes in perspective in longitudinal studies undertaken on service-learning students, exploring the extent to which their enhanced understanding of themselves as learners affects their later learning experiences and shapes their understanding of themselves as independent learners after graduation.

The perspective of service-learning veterans is one of several that might be brought into investigating shifts in perspective and developing support mechanisms for making them. Community partners, for example, might articulate differences between their experiences with "volunteers" and with "service-learners." Among many issues that might surface here are the counter-normative (to our partners) semester schedule—with its implications for long-term project planning and implementation—and the need many site supervisors may feel for training and support as they take on what may be unfamiliar roles as mentors and assessors of student learning. Similarly, since the shifts we and our students (and perhaps our community partners) need to make as individuals engaged in service-learning are closely linked to the institutional context (e.g., assessment, faculty roles and rewards, vertically-integrated curriculum), there may be value in including administrators in this "shifts" project. Such broadening of scope might promote better understanding of how service-learning has the potential to stimulate reconsideration of: institutional structures and policies, the reasons why it is often at the periphery rather than the core of academic activity, and specific mechanisms for creating institutional cultures more conducive to service-learning in particular and to nontraditional teaching and learning more generally.

Additional Questions for Future Research

Even though innovative, inquiry-based, interactive classroom practices are clearly on the rise in higher education, at many large institutions such as our own the predominant experience remains fairly traditional: classes in which students are anonymous and passive recipients of packaged information, and completing assignments is merely the means for success in the competition for grades. While this suggests that service-learning is particularly important as a rare stimulus to the shifts in perspective and practice that are necessary for "learning as a way of being," it also means that successfully making these shifts may be particularly difficult. Individual students may vary in the extent to which they make progress toward self-directed learning-as was the case with the student quoted above whose shifts in perspective were somewhat delayed. Litke (2002) suggests that students derive common benefits from service-learning, albeit to varying degrees, and we are similarly finding that the process of shifting perspectives is both shared and individualized. There might be value, therefore, in investigating with different categories of students and faculty their perceptions of, and experience with, such shifts:

- Are students and faculty from particular disciplines more resistant to, or more intrigued by, particular shifts?
- Are there predictable differences between first year students, upper-class students, and graduate students in their ability to identify and make such shifts, and how do these differences contribute to our understanding of the developmental processes characteristic of young adulthood?
- Are there increases in students' ability to examine their own learning processes and make the required shifts in perspective and practice as they gain more experience with service-learning and other nontraditional pedagogies?
- Are there similar differences between new and veteran faculty, or between faculty experienced with other forms of inquiry-guided learning and those whose teaching is almost exclusively in traditional modes?

Another particularly intriguing line of research we are following emerges from the recognition that there is a wide range of "engaged" pedagogies, all of which are in some ways counter-normative to traditional, instructor-centered approaches to teaching and learning. The teaching and learning strategies that fall under the heading of "inquiry-guided learning"—all sharing a commitment to the general learning outcomes of critical thinking, independent inquiry, responsibility for one's own learning, and intellectual growth and development (Lee, Greene, Odom, Schechter, & Slatta, 2004)—similarly challenge students to adopt less passive roles and instructors to become facilitators, confront both students and instructors with complexity and ambiguity in problem-solving, and yield individualized and developmentally-sensitive learning outcomes. Distance learning also places more emphasis on student interactions as sources of learning than is typical in traditional classrooms and requires greater initiative and self-direction. Palloff and Pratt (1999) note that "this is a new medium in which participants interact differently and in which students are expected to engage with material, each other, and the instructor in completely different ways" (p. 131), and strongly suggest that students be supported in reflecting on the differences and difficulties associated with online learning processes (p. 136). Working with inquiry-guided learning and distance-learning instructors, we are applying the conceptual framework under discussion here beyond service-learning, looking for similarities and differences across pedagogies and using this reflection to support students and faculty in the transition from "traditional" to "engaged" pedagogies.

Conclusion

Howard (1998) makes clear that, because of its counter-normative nature, service-learning is "not for the meek" and that "reformatting classroom norms, roles, and outcomes so that both academic and experiential learning can be joined requires a very deliberate effort around a rather formidable challenge" (p. 28). The authors offer our "shifts in perspective" project as one vehicle for such intentional rethinking and reworking. Our core realization has been that reflecting carefully on the differences between service-learning and more traditional pedagogies, and ways to make the necessary shifts in perspective and practice, helps students and faculty alike to engage more successfully with the service-learning process. And, even more importantly, doing so allows us to more fully tap the transformative power of the pedagogy: helping us all to see teaching and learning and serving as processes that we can grow to understand, assume responsibility for, and trust.

Note

The authors would like to acknowledge the students enrolled in MDS 302H during the spring semester of 2003, who initiated the "shifts" project, produced the summary document excerpted in Figure 1 and the excerpted reflection from one year later, facilitated related reflection with students and faculty on two occasions, and responded to drafts of this article. Other groups of students, faculty, and staff participated in field-tests of the reflection activities discussed here, generated some of the sample shifts, and helped to deepen our understanding of this project: students enrolled in MDS 302H during the spring of 2004, workshop participants at the University of Vermont and at the North Carolina (NC) Campus Compact 2004 Conference on Service-Learning for Faculty, and participants in the summer 2003 NC State Service-Learning Faculty Associates faculty development retreat.

References

Ash, S.L., & Clayton, P.H. (in press), The articulated learning: An approach to reflection and assessment. *Innovative Higher Education, 29*(2).

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

Felder, R. M., & Brent, R. (1996). Navigating the bumpy road to student-centered instruction. *College Teaching, 44*(2), 43-47.

Gilchrist, L.Z., Mundy, M. E., Felten, P, & Shields, S. L. (2003). Course transitions, midsemester assessment, and program design characteristics: A case study. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, Fall, 51-58.

Greenleaf, R. (1991, 1970). *The servant as leader*. Indianapolis, IN: The Robert K. Greenleaf Center.

Howard, J. (1998). Academic service learning: A counter-normative pedagogy, In R. Rhoads & J. Howard, *Academic service learning: A pedagogy of action and reflection* (pp. 21-29). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lee, V.S., Greene, D., Odom, J., Schechter, E., & Slatta, R.W. What is inquiry-guided learning? In V.S. Lee(Ed.) (2004) *Teaching and learning through inquiry: A guidebook for institutions and instructors*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Litke, R.A. (2002). Do all students "get it?": Comparing students' reflections to course performance. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, Spring, 27-34.

Palloff, R.M. & Pratt, K. (1999). *Building learning communities in cyberspace*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pompa, L. (2002). Service-learning as crucible: Reflections on immersion, context, power, and transformation. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *9*(1), 67-76.

Steinke, P. & Buresh, S. (2002). Cognitive outcomes of service-learning: Reviewing the past and glimpsing the future. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *8*(2), 5-14.

Vaill, P. (1996). *Learning as a way of being: Strategies for survival in a world of permanent white water*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Authors

PATTI H. CLAYTON received her interdisciplinary doctorate from the University of North Carolina - Chapel Hill. She is coordinator of the NC State Service-Learning Program and has taught with service-learning in all of her courses in the College of Humanities and Social Sciences over the past five years. Co-developer of the Program's reflection framework, student leadership roles, and faculty development and support processes, she also consults with other universities, and middle and high school teachers. She mentors undergraduates in intensive leadership and personal growth experiences and is particularly interested in leadership development through reflection and civic engagement.

SARAH L. ASH received her doctorate in nutrition from Tufts University and is an Associate Professor in the Departments of Animal Science and Family and Consumer Sciences at NC State University. She has been active in the inquiry-guided learning and general education reform initiatives at NC State, and she serves as the senior faculty fellow with the Service-Learning Program, directing research and scholarship on reflection and assessment and co-facilitating faculty development. Her special interests include the use of critical thinking standards and reflection to improve student learning.