Using Service-learning Activities for Civic Identity Formation

Maia Chankseliani
National Professional Agency, 52 Uznadze St, Tbilisi, Georgia, 0102

Summary:
This paper prepared for the class Educating for Civic Responsibility, Harvard Graduate School of Education, 2006
This paper argues that mandatory service-learning (SL) activities need to be incorporated in the Georgian national curriculum of citizenship education for senior high school students, grades 10-12. The structure of the paper is as follows. After discussing the possible SL activities that need to be introduced to Georgian students, I pass on to the analysis of the objectives and a four-stage structure of the proposed SL activities. The paper also looks at the teacher's role in SL as well as some of the problems that teachers may encounter.

Keywords:
Service-learning, civic education, curriculum, teaching.

> We aim at no less than a change in the political culture of this country both nationally and locally: for people to think of themselves as active citizens, willing, able and equipped to have an influence in public life. … to make [young people] individually confident in finding new forms of involvement and action among themselves (Crick, 1998).
>
> Our educational work would need to be grounded in a deep mindshift that we are not *consumers* of democracy. We are *makers* of democracy. We are growers of democracy. We are democracy! (Williams, 2002, p. 13).

In a strong democracy[1] citizens should be inclined to do more than watch daily news, vote, and, for the most part, live private lives (Parker, cited in Boyle-Baise et al, 2006). Although there are people who maintain that society should stop associating all its hopes for social change primarily with schools (Camajani, cited in Kahne & Westheimer, 2003), it is also true that democracy will not run on autopilot (Kahne & Westheimer, 2003) and is not selfwinding (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004). Schools in Georgia, I believe, have a huge potential and responsibility of preparing citizens who can build and maintain a democratic society based on the values of social responsibility, compassion, and justice. In new democracies like Georgia, praxis-oriented components in school-based civic learning are absolutely required to facilitate formation of active, empowered citizens with clearly formed civic identity.[2] Arthur & Davison (2000) differentiate between active and passive citizenship, explaining that passive (functional) citizenship results from the education which develops only theoretical knowledge, understandings, and behaviours. Whereas active citizenship not only develops theoretical knowledge, understandings and behaviours but also empowers individuals by stimulating critical thinking in order that they question, debate and take an active role in proposing alternative structures and processes for democracy.

SL needs to be differentiated from community service/volunteerism. The major difference between SL and community service is that the former combines community service with learning and requires teacher supervision (Rhoads, 1997; NSLC, n.d.). While the focus in community service is on service, in SL the focus is on service and learning (Furco, 2006).[3] SL encourages students to

do things with others rather than for others and both parties are supposed to change in this process (Karasik, cited in Jacoby, 1994). In contrast to community service, SL should be political by promoting democracy and emphasis on volunteerism should not be a way of avoiding politics (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004).[4] It is not to convey the idea that community service alone is less important than SL; these two have essentially different objectives. In this paper, I will be specifically interested in the learning component of SL as an effective pedagogical tool for civic identity formation of senior high school students.

Service component of proposed SL activities may include but are not be limited to working/serving at: soup kitchens, homeless shelters, family social services, orphanages, shelters for mentally disadvantaged kids/adults, shelters for disabled people. Any activities associated with helping senior citizens or other socially disadvantaged groups should be welcomed. Activities may also include visiting prisons[5] in order to explore the issues of crime and justice in a democracy. Research (Jacoby, 1994) demonstrates that in the beginning it will be better to start with big group projects (e.g. soup kitchens) rather than psychologically more intense small group activities (e.g. involvement with prisoners or pregnant drug addicts). Since SL activities are designed to be focused on democracy building through the understanding of social justice, activities associated with environmental studies or other sciences will not be appropriate for this framework.

Good SL activities need to be intentionally designed in a way to serve the following objectives: deepen theoretical civics knowledge, develop connections with the community and social responsibility, facilitate identity formation through positioning, stimulate interest in political engagement, instigate moral development and moral activism.

Through SL experience students get to know more about particular communities, relevant public policies, historical perspectives, the role of stakeholders (Holland, 2005), i.e. they expand their content knowledge of civics, which they should have acquired at regular civics classes. The basic theory of SL (Dewey, 1916) says that the most important aspect of learning is this very integration of knowledge with experience.[6] According to the definition provided by Haste (2004), praxis-based learning assumes that knowledge is gained through active engagement with relevant tasks; knowledge comes from experience, and it needs to be used if we wish to produce not only knowledgeable people but people who are efficacious.

SL will make students feel that they are closely connected to the community.[7] This is important because citizenship should be identified with belonging to a community and citizenship needs to be "active" because citizens are expected to actively cooperate with others to promote social well-being (Assiter, 1999). Research shows that being connected to the community is vital for a democracy to remain strong (Morgan & Streb, 2001). As explained by Haste (1996), people's interdependence creates social order - people should recognize and perform their community responsibilities in order for the society to function; cooperation is indispensable for the functioning of state and state's effectiveness is necessary for the individuals' survival. SL usually helps young people understand why they need to value social participation and makes them feel the need of creating a different future for themselves and their communities. Billig (2000) argues that students' social competence increases after SL activities; they become more active, positive contributors to the society as their personal efficacy enhances (Putnam, 2000). Yates (1999) also analyzes efficacy and shows that SL helps participants realistically assess the chances of making actual changes in the society (Yates, 1999). Morgan & Streb (2001) make a similar point when they maintain that SL activities allow students to realize that they can cause change by working hard with other people in the community. Finally, research demonstrates (Billig, 2000) that high-school students who participate in SL activities are more likely to be engaged in different types of community organizations than those who did not. And that is because they feel they can make a difference.

Another objective of SL activities should be to enhance students' sense of social responsibility (Battistoni, 1997). Research (Billig, 2000) demonstrates that students who engaged in SL ranked responsibility as a more important value and reported higher sense of responsibility than students from comparison group.

SL is invaluable for identity formation as it allows students to position themselves in different social roles and, thus, understand their identities in different contexts. Rhoads (1997) maintains that positionality which is a reference point for our social, cultural, and economic situatedness, provides a means to reflect on our identities and on our relations with those served. Boyle-Baise et al. (2006) cites student recollections: "the notion of positionality was significant for us. As we considered ourselves in relation to others— and they to us—we questioned easy categorizations of 'server' and 'served.' Several of us had been recipients of charity as children; now we found ourselves situated as 'givers'" (p. 22). Students realize that they are members of multiple communities, each offering to them identity and personal meaning. Since self is tied to the other, encountering others and positioning oneself in different social contexts will help to establish and understand the self (Rhoads, 1997). The example from Yates (1999) shows how working at a soup kitchen helped students position themselves differently – while they saw themselves as simply well-off people before, now they understood that they could be helpful and brave. Also, they learned that those whom they helped had some self-respect and did not want to be positioned as people who could cause only sympathy (Haste, 2004). Hence, SL facilitates construction and explanation of the self in the context of social interaction.

At the same time, SL is the opportunity for students to transcend their identities (social, political, etc.) and connect with people who are unlike them, thus, creating Putnamian (2000) bridging social capital. The challenge of the teacher is to help students understand that although sometimes they cannot ignore identity differences which are brought about by socio-economic position (Rhoads, 1997), they have a lot in common with a particular group of disadvantaged people.

Moral development, brought about by SL, is sometimes considered to be a part of the overall cognitive development. [8] Students engaged in SL confront moral dilemmas when reflecting on their experiences (Jacoby, 1994). Research (Billig, 2000) shows that students with some SL experience were more likely to think about morality in the society. Kohlberg's stage theory of moral thinking can be useful for an educator involved in SL and analyzing/intentionally constructing student learning experience. The "best" possible society, according to this theory, would consist of individuals who not only understand the need for social order (stage 4) but can entertain visions of universal principles, such as justice and liberty (stage 6) (Kohlberg, cited in Crain, 1985).

SL should instigate thinking about morality as well as actual moral activism. Heldke & O'Connor (2006) discuss moral activism as a phenomenon with multiple dimensions, requiring that people question their values and beliefs. It includes self-reflection and eagerness to explain why one has definite views and attitudes. Poppendieck (cited in Heldke & O'Connor, 2006) provides an excellent example in the form of a metaphor which can illuminate the phenomenon of moral activism to students: one day a resident of a village on the bank of a river sees a baby floating downstream. She rushes out to save it. The next day two babies are rescued and the day after that several more. Soon babies are arriving in large numbers, and they become a regular feature of life in the village; nearly the whole village becomes involved in rescuing them. Finally, one of the villagers suggests making an expedition upstream, to see how the babies are getting into the water. The caregivers, however, are so busy taking care of babies that they are unable to go and investigate the causes.

This metaphor can help students think of the ways of responding to social injustice. They will see that a moral activist should be somewhere there on the river – he or she can be downstream, helping in the emergency, which has become a way of life; working upstream, thinking of policy issues; at the head of the river, working to change conditions and prevent babies from falling into the river. Students need to understand that each position is indispensable for the society and where one stands depends on the moral beliefs and the perception of moral justice of a person. The main thing is that all the people on the river strive to create socially just world (Heldke & O'Connor, 2006).

However, the central aim of SL is to avoid turning of the absolute majority of students into the caregivers only. The desire of political change, as expressed by standing near the top of the river

and investigating causes to act upon them, is extremely important. Active citizens are moral in the same degree as they are political; political apathy generates moral apathy (Hargreaves, as cited in Haste, 2004). Thus, SL should stimulate the interest in political engagement[9] as it deepens moral understanding of justice and equity. SL activities will have to initiate students into political life by the development of a sensibility for participation in democratic polity (Williams, 2002).

There is a definite correlation between students' voice in community projects and their desire of being politically active –those who had more voice in SL projects, tended to express bigger desire of political participation (Morgan & Streb, 2001). However, if we take the US example, the correlation between just participation in community service and conventional political engagement does not seem to be strong (Keeter, Zukin, Andolina, & Jenkins, 2002; Reich, 2005).[10] This can be interpreted as a clear danger that the majority of students (especially those who did not have significant voice in SL activities) may not position themselves on the top of the river. To avoid such results, SL activities need to be designed with an eye on political engagement (Owen, 2000). In general, the research (Billig, 2000) does demonstrate that since students who participate in SL programs show greater cognitive complexity than those who were in control groups, they also develop more sophisticated understanding of socio-historical contexts and are more likely to think about politics. The teacher's role will be to concentrate on this potential for students' future political engagement. Discussions on the "reflection" stage of the SL should often focus on political agency, as demonstrated by Yates (1999). In such conversations instead of talking about the government as a distant entity, students would need to be encouraged to develop progressive attitudes of making suggestions about possible changes in the existing socio-political situation. This would help them fully visualize their individual role in creating and retaining a strong democracy by active political participation.

Thus, following Westheimer & Kahne's (2004) model, the primary objective of SL is the formation of personally responsible, participatory, and justice-oriented citizens (Figure 1). When participatory citizens will be organizing the food drive, personally responsible citizens will be donating food, justice-oriented citizens will critically analyze the causes of hunger and will be ready to act for the elimination of these causes. While supporting the development of all these three visions and asking students to contemplate about the most appropriate position for themselves, the teacher will have to make it clear to them that any one of these positions does not exclude the possibility of pursuing the other two, and that at different stages of one's life, a person may be interested in different types of citizenship activities. The most important thing for the teacher to consider, however, is that the justice-oriented citizenship model is pursued rarely. This is a citizen who fully understands social justice. He or she can critically assess socio-political and economic situation and act correspondingly to make positive changes for the improvement of the society. Such citizens are absolutely required for the creation of a democratic society and they are required in significant numbers. Therefore, the main responsibility of the teacher will be to instigate maximum interest and efficacy in students so that they choose to pursue the path of being justice-oriented citizens. The ways and methodologies of promoting this type of deep experiential learning could be a topic of further research.

Figure 1. Kinds of Citizens[11]

		Personally Responsible Citizen	Participatory Citizen	Justice-oriented Citizen
DESCRIPTION		Acts responsibly in his/her community Works and pays taxes Obeys laws Recycles, gives blood Volunteers to lend a hand in times of crisis	Active member of community organizations and/or improvement efforts Organizes community efforts to care for those in need, promote economic development, or clean up environment Knows how government agencies work Knows strategies for accomplishing collective tasks	Critically assesses social, political, and economic structures to see beyond surface causes Seeks out and addresses areas of injustice Knows about social movements and how to effect systemic change
SAMPLE	ACTION	Contributes food to a food drive	Helps to organize a food drive	Explores why people are hungry and acts to solve root causes
CORE	ASSUMPTIONS	To solve social problems and improve society, citizens must have good character; they must be honest, responsible, and law-abiding members of the community	To solve social problems and improve society, citizens must actively participate and take leadership positions within established systems and community structures	To solve social problems and improve society, citizens must question and change established systems and structures when they reproduce patterns of injustice over time

SL activities will be conducted by the teacher of the citizenship education class. The existing citizenship education curriculum for Georgian high schools is very broad and gives plenty of opportunities to the teacher. Therefore, it is recommended that teachers incorporate the readings about social justice into the required readings list from the second semester of the 9th grade,[12] in order to help students understand the framework of social justice and instigate their interest.

The teacher should be prepared for the fact that he/she will have to be a manager of dilemma (Lampert cited in Colbey, 2003) because SL is usually harder to do well than regular classes. The teacher is not usually "in control" of many of the student experiences. At the same time, the teacher is supposed to play a very active role in guiding and facilitating students' learning, even though it is a student-centred form of teaching (Colby, 2003, 141). Strict organization of the SL activity can help to make teachers' function more obvious. I propose a four-stage model of the SL activity implementation. It includes planning, implementation, reflection, and evaluation. Every activity will need to include all these stages. Therefore, I suggest that no more that two full SL activities are conducted during a semester.[13]

Students should be given full voice in the planning process. By doing so they will increase their personal contribution to the work (Colbey, 2003). Research (Morgan & Streb, 2001) demonstrates that each one-unit increase in the level of student voice is associated with 0.34 points increase on the 5-point scale in the students' efficacy and almost one half of a point increase in students' personal competence. In effective SL programs student voice is maximized in selecting, implementing, and evaluating the project (Billig, 2000). Thus, it should not be the teacher only who selects projects, plans logistics, and involves students only in the actual service performance. Students should have the opportunity of doing a kind of needs assessment and selecting a project based on their group decision. They will be supposed to do most of the planning as well (Morgan & Streb, 2001). Besides, scholars suggests (Fletcher & Vavrus, 2006) that young people need to be engaged as partners and not only as students, as too much control from teachers sometimes causes disengagement of the young people. This partner-approach, however, does not assume that there should not be enough guidance from the teacher whose wisdom, experience, or reflections can be invaluable (Fletcher & Vavrus, 2006).

At this stage teachers will be supposed to prepare students for all aspects of service work, so that they have clear understanding of tasks and roles, as well as information or skills required to perform these tasks (Billig, 2000). Students should also be made aware of any safety precautions, as well as the sensitivity of people with whom they will have to cooperate.

By implementation I mean actual on-site performance of a SL task. Teachers need to understand, however, that only participation in a community service activity does not make the experience SL because "experience is not what happens to a man; it is what a man does with what happened to him" (Aldous Huxley). Thus, the next stage – reflection – is perceived to be the key part of SL (Jacoby, 1994; Colbey, 2003; Johnson, 2006).

Reflection promotes critical analysis and democracy by making students contemplate upon the ways of achieving social justice. Reflection activities should be used to discuss the dissonance caused by the activity in students' thinking and the options of dealing with it. The word reflection is derived from Latin *reflectere* "to bend back", like mirror bending back light and making apparent things that seemed invisible or unknown, refection helps students see themselves in others and others in themselves (Johnson, 2006). It can be organized as an individual or group exercise, written (journals) or oral (discussions, dialogues). I would underline the importance of the latter because interaction among students usually proves to be decisive for the generation of meaning.

Facilitation/guidance from the teacher throughout the process is absolutely required for successful reflection.[14] The guidance is all about focused questions and thought-prompts, which help students find connections and explore them (Johnson, 2006). The list of possible questions is provided in Figure 2. Questioning is the path to enlightenment. However, it requires a great deal of skill and tact to pose the question that will stimulate students to think, engage morally, and express thought. Yates (1999) brings a good example of reflection process after a soup kitchen activity. Having started with the question "In what ways was your experience at the soup kitchen different from what you expected?" (p. 22), the discussion continued as students responded to one another's answers. They tended to compare recent visits to earlier ones and sometimes their conversation went beyond the actual experiences in soup kitchens, encompassing welfare reform, responsibilities of public servants, etc. Thus, the conversations dealt with the society and the relationship of self to the society. Analysis of the results showed that service experience made young people think about homeless people, comparing the life of the homeless to their own and reassessing their attitudes to the homeless (Yates, 1999).

Figure 2. List of Possible Thought Provoking Questions

- What do you really care about, and what does your life stand for?
- What have you learned about yourself through this experience?
- Will these experiences change the way you act or think in the future?
- Have you given enough, opened up enough, cared enough?
- How have you challenged yourself, your ideals, your philosophies, your concept of life or of the way you live?
- What would you change about this situation if you were in charge?
- What have you learned about these people or the community?
- Do you feel your actions had any impact?
- Who are you?
- Why are you here?
- What does it mean to be human, and how should you live?
- What's your place in the world?
- How can you make a difference?
- Do you have more/less understanding or empathy than you did before SL?
- In what ways, if any, has your sense of self, your values, your sense of community, your willingness to serve others, and your self-confidence have been impacted or altered through this experience?
- Have your motivations for community service changed? In what ways?
- How has this experience challenged stereotypes or prejudices you have/had?
- Any especially strong lessons learned or half-glimpsed?
- What more needs to be done?
- Does this experience compliment or contrast with what you're learning in class? How?
- Has learning through experience taught you more, less, or the same as the class? In what ways?
- What could be done to change the situation?
- How will this alter your future behaviours/attitudes/and career?
- How is the issue/agency you're serving impacted by what is going on in the larger political/social sphere?
- What does the future hold? What can be done?
- Why are there homeless people?
- What state policies affect homelessness?
- Why do we create homeless shelters rather than identify and solve the causes of the problem?
- How do other countries deal with homelessness?
- What is oppressive? How is oppression manifested in society? In me?
- What is good service?

Reflection will often encompass futuristic perspective by seeking to find answers to the questions: "what can or could be (the possible), what is likely to be (the probable), and what ought to be (the preferable)" (Bell, cited in Hicks, 2001, p. 231). Although the future cannot be predicted, this future-oriented perspective will help students envision possible alternatives and generate ideas about the future that can serve as the foundation for present actions (Dator, cited in Hicks, 2001). Hicks (2001) provides insightful arguments for the concentration on future. He maintains that students need to reflect upon future because we live in a rapidly changing world and the ability to think ahead is becoming increasingly important. We have to constantly analyse possible, probable,

Figure 3. Holland Matrix and Examples[1]

- Activity goals – What do we want to know?
- Core Concepts – What will we look for?
- Indicators – What will be measured?
- Methods – How will we measure?

This is followed by:

- Analysis
- Improvement actions
- Dissemination of information

EXAMPLE 1:

- Goal: Service-learning helps students discover their potential role in community life.
- Concept: Career exploration
- Indicators: Expressed career interest; Demonstrated career skills and attributes; Knowledge of career requirements
- Methods: Survey, interviews, journals

EXAMPLE 2:

- Goal: Prepare students to be effective and active citizens in their communities
- Concept: Awareness of community
- Indicators: Knowledge of issues, ability to identify assets/needs, understanding of problems and policies
- Methods: survey, interviews, observation

and preferable alternatives and think about choices. Wise choices will guarantee responsible citizenship.

Thus, if we agree that real, deep learning assumes change of the person who is learning, reflection is the most useful part of SL that changes students by opening new ways of thinking, believing, feeling and acting (Johnson, 2006).

Evaluation, which is the feedback on the SL activity prepared by the teacher, will include assessment of student learning as the central part.[15] Systematic evaluation of SL should include formative as well as summative evaluations (Billig, 2000). The purpose of formative evaluation is to ensure that the objectives of the activities are being consistently achieved and to improve the instruction, if necessary, by means of detection and remediation of problematic aspects (Weston et al., 1995). The purpose of summative evaluation is to show if the learners learned what they were supposed to learn. It lets the learner know how they performed but more importantly, by looking at how learners did, it helps the teacher to know whether the utilized methodologies worked.[16]

Teachers may be interested to use Holland (2005) matrix for student assessment during formative as well as summative evaluation (Figure 3).

Project goals, core concepts, indicators, and methods of assessment need to be worked out by the (group of) teacher(s) beforehand. When gathering information, however, teachers need to

consider positive sides and drawbacks of each of the proposed measures. According to Holland (2005), interviews are time intensive, but they provide deeper views of individual experiences. Surveys are time efficient, objective, and anonymous. However, they can be superficial. Journals are in general very useful but require more time to read.[17]

Success of the SL component will be measured by how much students learned/developed as well as how active/engaged they were during SL activities. Since SL activities cover a wide range of cognitive and affective outcomes and encompass students' personal, civic, moral, social development, assessment needs to be complex and the teacher will have to assess primarily his/her own performance according to the student progress in each of the above-analyzed SL objectives. Colbey (2003) suggests that teachers should assess their own performance and the impact of their courses by writing informal reflection journals whenever possible, during and/or after the activities. Sharing these with colleges can be really useful and will help teachers learn from one another.

There can be a number of challenges for teachers who will be responsible for SL activities. I selected two of them - logistical and psychological ones. The major logistical problem may be the provision of information about existing options for SL activities. As explained above, the teacher and students will be responsible for selecting SL activities. However, they may not have enough time to study available options every time they need a new activity. Therefore, I propose that an intermediary organization[18] needs to be established which will be a resource center for SL/community service/volunteerism opportunities. It will keep the database of such opportunities. The database will be accessible for school teachers and students through internet.[19] Besides, the center will work on the promotion of youth engagement and mainstreaming the issue through public awareness campaigns, as well as organizing youth service days. An intermediary organization will be required to gather country-wide information and ensure the maintenance of the web-portal. The web-portal can be an excellent way of communication for those schools which would like to share their experiences with others. On the web-portal schools will post and find information on volunteer opportunities, service news, events, best practices, teacher summative reports, and other resources.[20]

Another problem that teachers will probably face is psychological in nature. Students may feel overwhelmed and frustrated at some point during the SL experience. When describing his personal experiences, Rhoads (1997) maintained that many students considered giving up because they felt helpless to fight against social problems which were beyond their control. Colbey (2003) also discusses the possibility of frustration when students see that their actions do not seem to have much effect. While looking for the solution, both Colbey and Rhoads talk about the teacher's role who can help students realize inevitable obstacles and failures in a way that will support rather than weaken their stamina (Colbey, 2003). By challenging students to think beyond short-term effects to social change (Rhoads, 1997), the teacher will have to make them understand that "bandages will be needed until the larger flow of blood and poverty can be slowed and social transformation brought about" (Rhoads, 1997, p. 89). Students should realize that the depth of socio-political problems cannot make us stop caring for fellow-citizens. We need to continue assisting them while working on wider societal changes.

In conclusion, one needs to become conscious of the fact that by incorporating SL activities in the curriculum and encouraging community participation we do not guarantee that government policies and practices will necessarily become more effective or will reflect public opinion (Kahne & Westheimer, 2003). Rather, SL activities will make students recognize their position on the Poppendieck's river. They will realize that there are many things that need to be changed and that only their active participation (conventional as well as unconventional, as explained by Haste, 2004) can help to achieve social justice. Students will reconnect with one another (Putnam, 2000) and come to understand that they do not need to overcome their differences associated with socio-economic status or preferences about their positioning along the Poppendieck's river. Rather, they will learn how to build upon these differences to make positive social changes while working for the creation of a democratic society.

References

Annette, J. (2006). Community involvement and citizenship education – where is the "political" in citizenship education? In A. Sliwka, M. Diedrich, & M. Hofer (Eds.), *Citizenship education: Theory-research-practice,* (pp. 27-36). Waxmann Münster/New York: München/Berlin.

Arthur, J. & Davison J. (2000). Social literacy and citizenship education in the school curriculum [Electronic version]. *The Curriculum Journal, 11(1),* 9–23. Retrieved from EBSCOhost Database.

Assiter, A. (1999). Citizenship revisited. In N. Yuval-Davis, & P. Werbner (Eds.), *Women, citizenship and difference,* (pp. 41-53). Zed Books: London and New York.

Battistoni, R. M. (1997). Service learning and democratic citizenship [Electronic version]. *Theory into Practice, 36(3),* 150-56. Retrieved January 2, 2007, from EBSCOhost database.

Billig, S.H. (2000). Research on K-12 school-based service-learning: The evidence builds [Electronic version]. *Phi Delta Kappan, 81(9),* 658-664. Retrieved January 6, 2007, from EBSCOhost database.

Boyle-Baise, M., Brown, R., Hsu, M., Jones, D., Prakash, A, et al. (2006). Learning service or service learning: Enabling the civic [Electronic version]. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 18(1),* 17-26. Retrieved January 2, 2007, from http://www.isetl.org/ijtlhe/pdf/IJTLHE70.pdf

CIRCLE (2003). The civic mission of schools. The Carnegie Corporation. Retrieved October 30, 2006, from www.civicmissionofschools.org

Colby A., Ehrlich T., Beaumont E., & Stephens J. (2003). Educating citizens: Preparing America's undergraduates for lives of moral and civic responsibility. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Jossey-Bass.

Crain, W.C. (1985). Kohlberg's stages of moral development. *Theories of Development.* 118-136. Prentice-Hall. Retrieved January 2, 2007, from http://faculty.plts.edu/gpence/html/kohlberg.htm

Crick, B. (1998). Education for citizenship and the teaching of democracy in schools. London: Qualifications and Curriculum Authority. Retrieved December 18, 2006, from http://www.qca.org.uk/downloads/6123_crick_report_1998.pdf

Dewey, J. (1916). Democracy and education. New York: Macmillan.

Fletcher, A. & Vavrus, J. (2006). *The guide to social change led by and with young people*. Retrieved January 2, 2007, from http://www.commonaction.org/SocialChangeGuide.pdf

Furco, A. (2006). Is service-learning really better than community service? A study of high school service program outcomes. In A. Sliwka, M. Diedrich, & M. Hofer (Eds.), *Citizenship education: Theory-research-practice,* (pp. 27-36). Waxmann Münster/New York: München/Berlin.

Haste, H. (1996). Communitarianism and the social construction of morality [Electronic version]. *Journal of Moral Education, 25(1),* 47-56. *Retrieved November 12, 2006, from Academic Search Premier Database.*

Haste, H. (2001). The new citizenship of youth in rapidly changing nations. Essay review of adolescent development and rapid social change, edited by J. Van Hoorn, A. Komlosi, E. Suchar, D.A. Samelson. *Human Development, 44,* 375–381. Retrieved January 5, 2007, from EBSCOhost database.

Haste, H. (2004). Constructing the citizen [Electronic version]. *Political Psychology, 25(3),* 413-439. Retrieved September 20, 2006, from EBSCO database.

Heldke, L. & O'Connor P. (2006). Just food. In B.T. Johnson & C.R. O'Grady (Eds), *The spirit of service: Exploring faith, service, and social justice in higher education.* Bolton, Mass.: Anker Pub.

Hicks, D. (2001). Re-examining the future: the challenge for citizenship education [Electronic version]. *Educational Review, 53(3),* 229-241. Retrieved December 8, 2006, from EBSCOhost database.

Holland, B. (2005). *Assessment of service-learning: Principles and techniques*. National Service-Learning Clearinghouse. Retrieved January 3, 2007, from http://servicelearning.org/filemanager/download/Long_Beach_Assess.ppt#315,9,Learning Objectives

Jacoby, B. (1994). Service-learning in higher education: Concepts and practices. Jossey-Bass Publishers: San Francisco.

Johnson, C. (2006). Deep learning and the big questions: Reflection in service-learning. In B.T. Johnson & C.R. O'Grady (Eds.), *The spirit of service: Exploring faith, service, and social justice in higher education.* Bolton, Mass.: Anker Pub.

Kahne J. & Westheimer J. (2003). Teaching democracy: What schools need to do [Electronic version]. *Phi Delta Kappan, 85(1),* 34-66. Retrieved November 23, 2006, from EBSCOhost database.

Keeter, S., Zukin, C., Andolina, M., & Jenkins, K. (2002). *The civic and political health of the nation: A generational portrait*. Retrieved October 28, 2006, from http://www.pewtrusts.com/pdf/public_policy_youth_civic_political_health.pdf

Knefelkamp, L., Widick, C., and Parker, C. A. (1978). Editors' Notes: Why Bother with Theory? In L. Knefelkamp, C. Widick, and C. Parker (Eds.), *Applying new developmental findings.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Morgan, W. & Streb, M. (2001). Building citizenship: How student voice in service-learning develops civic values. *Social Science Quarterly, 82(1),* 154-169. Retrieved December 15, 2006, from EBSCOhost database.

NSLC (National Service-Learning Clearinghouse). (n.d.). *Service-Learning is...* Retrieved December 19, 2007, from http://www.servicelearning.org/welcome_to_service-learning/service-learning_is/index.php

NSLASG (National Service-Learning and Assessment Study Group). (1999). *Service-learning and Assessment: A Field Guide for Teachers.* Washington, D.C.: Learn and Serve America. Retrieved January 5, 2007, from http://servicelearning.org/resources/online_documents/assessmentevaluation/service-learning_and_assessment_a_field_guide_for_teachers/

Owen, D. (2000). Service learning and political socialization [Electronic version]. *PS: Political Science and Politics, 33,* 638-64. Retrieved December 21, 2006, from JSTOR database.

Putnam, R.D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Reed, J. & Koliba, C. (1995). Facilitating reflection: A manual for leaders and educators. *Retrieved January 3, 2007, from* http://www.uvm.edu/~dewey/reflection_manual/

Reich, R. (2005). Service learning and multiple models of engaged citizenship [Electronic version]. *Boston University Journal of Education, 186 (1),* 23-28. Retrieved December 21, 2006, from EBSCOhost database.

Rhoads, R. (1997). *Community service and higher learning: Explorations of the caring self.* New York: SUNY.

Youniss, J. & Yates, M. (1997). *Community service and social responsibility in youth*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Youth Service America. http://www.ysa.org/index.cfm

Westheimer, J. & Kahne, J. (2003). Reconnecting education to democracy: Democratic dialogues [Electronic version]. *Phi Delta Kappan, 85,* 8-14. Retrieved January 2, 2007, from ERIC database.

Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. (2004). Educating the "good" citizen: Political choices and pedagogical goals [Electronic version]. *Political Science & Politics, 37 (02),* 241-247. Retrieved January 2, 2007, from Cambridge Journals database.

Weston, Mc Alpine, and Bordonaro (1995). *Formative v.s. summative evaluation*. Northern Arizona University. Retrieved January 6, 2007, from http://jan.ucc.nau.edu/edtech/etc667/proposal/evaluation/summative_vs._formative.htm

Williams, D. (2002). Political Engagement and service learning – A Gandhian perspective [Electronic version]. *Encounter: Education for Meaning and Social Justice, 15(2),* 6-13. Retrieved December 22, 2006, from EBSCOhost database.

Yates, M. (1999). Community service and political-moral discussions among adolescents: A study of a mandatory school-based program in the United States. In M. Yates, & J. Youniss (Eds), *Roots of civic identity: International perspectives on community service and activism in youth* (pp. 16-31). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Received: 2008-05-02

[1] By democracy I mean the government by the people, committed to equal opportunities for people to develop their full potential. I share Dewey's (1916) definition, when he distinguishes three roots of democracy: free individual existence, solidarity with others and choice of work and other forms of participation in society.

[2] Haste (2001) provides precise explanation of the processes developing in former Soviet bloc countries when writing that the task of these countries has been to re-invent national identity and citizenship together with democracy.

[3] In this paper, I sometimes use the research about community service to talk about SL because community service is one part of SL. Although SL is a broader phenomenon, because it includes the learning component, it encompasses all the positive sides of community learning.
[4] It has been noted that there is a clear danger for SL to become apolitical and even send an anti-political messages, encouraging students to volunteer instead of political participation (CIRCLE, 2003).
[5]A good example of such program is Inside-Out Prison Exchange Program - http://www.temple.edu/inside-out/ This will be a justice-oriented service. Students will learn about the issues of crime and justice (Pompa, cited in Boyle-Baise et al, 2006). They will see what the prison is like. They may start thinking of initiating change efforts and get involved in social action.
[6] Jean Piaget, William Perry and David Kolb theories indicate that students learn by combining actions with thought, reflection, and practice. SL provides the opportunity for actions, reflection, and practice. Theoretical knowledge base (thought) will have to be gained at regular civics classes, as mentioned before.
[7] Community is an elastic concept which allows for diverse range of meanings. From four comprehensive ways of conceptualizing community (Annette, 2006), in this paper I will use the final one – community as a political ideal which is connected to participation, citizenship, and involvement.
[8] SL proves to facilitate cognitive development which can be conceptualized as a sequence of stages involving shifts in the process of an individual's perception of the world (Knefelkamp et al., 1978). And although the further stages of thinking become more complex, there are times when one thinks in less complex ways because of one's access to previous ways of thinking (King, cited in Jacoby, 1994). Parry's scheme of intellectual and ethical development is a good example of these simple and complex stages of thinking which facilitates individual's personal meaning-making (more about this in Jacoby, 1994).
[9] By political engagement I do not mean anti-government activism or participation in the elections only. Westheimer & Kahne's (2003) words that "patriots in a democracy should be encouraged to challenge as well as support the government" (p.12) best express my attitude towards political engagement as instigated by SL.
[10] Youniss and Yates (1997) would not agree with this argument because they maintain that any involvement in community service helps students develop long-lasting civic engagement habits.
[11] Taken from *Educating the "good" citizen: Political choices and pedagogical goals*, by J. Westheimer, & J. Kahne, 2004.
[12] From American authors one could select Martin Luther King, F.D. Roosevelt, J.F. Kennedy, Dorothy Day, etc. Readings could include some Georgian and European writers as well. The teacher may introduce adaptations or originals, depending on students' level of cognitive development.
[13] This would probably require the time commitment of 1-2 hrs a week. It may require more during the week of the actual on-site implementation of the selected SL activity.
[14] Reed & Koliba (1995) provide an interesting manual for instructors who are supposed to facilitate reflection. The manual can be used by teachers to learn about being a successful facilitator.
[15] Differences between program/activity evaluation and student assessment are presented in Figure 3. In the US, general evaluation of the entire program/activity (what was done) has usually been more of a focus in SL than student learning assessment (what was learned) (NSLASG, 1999).
[16] The summative document can include descriptive information, analytic information, case studies, evidence of impacts, principles of good practice, ideas for program improvement. Anything than can be useful for the teachers in the following years.
[17] Besides these three methods of assessment teachers will be free to use any other methods and comment how useful they were in the final summative report. Giving freedom to teachers in selecting additional methods of assessment will enrich their professional experience.
[18] This can be a non-profit and schools will not be accountable to this organization in any way.
[19] The information from this database can be used by students who will decide to participate in community service on their own (or in groups) on weekends or in summer.
[20] A similar organization in the US is Youth Service America.