In the Service of What?
The Politics of Service Learning
By Joseph Kahne and Joel Westheimer

"In the service of what?" is a question that inevitably merits the attention of teachers, policy makers, and academicians who take seriously the idea that learning and service reinforce each other and should come together in America's schools, Messrs. Kahne and Westheimer suggest.

IN HIS inaugural address, President John Kennedy challenged the nation with his well-known appeal: " . . . ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country." Two decades later, in a campaign speech, Ronald Reagan asked, "Are you better off today than you were four years ago?" If Kennedy's exhortation reflected the idealism and sense of collective mission that characterized the tumultuous 1960s, Reagan's question epitomized the individualism and materialism of the 1980s. In the 1990s, however, a glimmer of Kennedy's notion of service to the community and the nation is reemerging in schools in the form of service learning.

Educators and legislators alike maintain that service learning can improve the community and invigorate the classroom, providing rich educational experiences for students at all levels of schooling. Service learning makes students active participants in service projects that aim to respond to the needs of the community while furthering the academic goals of students. Students in a service learning project might analyze and monitor the composition of nearby swamplands or produce an oral history of their community. They might work with the homeless or initiate a cross-age tutoring project. In addition to helping those they serve, such service learning activities seek to promote students' self-esteem, to develop higher-order thinking skills, to make use of multiple abilities, and to provide authentic learning experiences—all goals of current curriculum reform efforts.

Recognizing the potential of service learning, policy makers, legislators, and educators have promoted initiatives at the local, state, and national levels. The National and Community Service Act of 1990 and President Clinton's National Service Trust Act of 1993 are some recent and far-reaching examples of this trend. Millions of dollars have been targeted for educators around the country, and many service learning programs are supported by city- and statewide initiatives.1

As is commonly the case with new policy initiatives, however, more attention has been focused on moving forward than on asking where we are headed. While service learning advocates rush to forge coalitions and find a shared vocabulary that accommodates multiple agendas and while practitioners and researchers begin to work on difficult implementation and evaluation issues, educators from schoolhouse to university to state house are neglecting to answer the most fundamental question: In the service of what?

> **With the current interest in service learning comes a need to clarify the ideological perspectives that underlie service learning programs.**

Proponents of service learning have worked to find common ground between Democrats and Republicans, conservatives and liberals, business leaders and community activists. Edward Kennedy, Bill Clinton, George Bush, William F. Buckley, and Ralph Nader have all gone on record as strong advocates of service learning in American schools. Yet controversial issues surrounding the means and ends of service learning have been pushed to the background.

What values do service learning curricula model and seek to promote? What kinds of social and political relations do they ask students to imagine? What kinds of relationships develop between students and those they serve? What kind of society does service learning lead students to work toward? With the current interest in and allocation of resources to service learning comes a growing need to clarify the ideological perspectives that underlie service learning programs.

Drawing on our yearlong study of two dozen K-12 teachers who took part in a university-based effort to promote service learning in area schools, we propose a conceptual scheme that highlights different rationales for service learning. Our goal is not to replace consensus with conflict, but rather to point out the various ideological, political, and social goals that can be promoted by service learning activities in schools. We begin with two examples from our study.2

Two Service Learning Cases

Consider "Serving Those in Need," Mr. Johnson's project for his 12th-grade U.S. government course. As the class studied issues surrounding democracy and citizenship, Mr. Johnson had his students participate in community service projects of their own choosing. For example, one student worked in a center for babies whose mothers had high levels of crack cocaine in their bloodstreams during pregnancy. Another worked in a hospital, running

errands for doctors and helping patients locate the sites for their appointments. A third student prepared and distributed survival kits for the homeless. By finding and engaging in community service activities, Mr. Johnson explained, students would interact with those less fortunate than themselves and would experience the excitement and joy of learning while using the community as a classroom.

Ms. Adams, a seventh-grade teacher at Lexington Middle School, took a different approach. Working together, Ms. Adams and her students identified issues of common concern and then voted to focus their energy on the issue of homelessness. Their service learning unit—"Homelessness Here and Elsewhere"—examined the social, economic, legal, and political determinants of homelessness around the world and in the local school community. The class invited speakers from homeless advocacy groups, created files of newspaper articles on homelessness, and read, among other items, *No Place to Be: Voices of Homeless Children*.3 They developed action plans to aid relief efforts for the homeless in their own communities and raised funds for two homeless advocacy groups that the class had selected. During whole-class and small-group discussions and also in writing, they reflected on the readings, on what they had learned from the invited speakers, and on their own experiences while working on the project.

These two service learning projects have much in common. Both provide authentic learning experiences, reflection on matters of social concern, and opportunities for interdisciplinary study linked to curricular goals. Moreover, the goals of both projects have broad-based appeal. They stress the importance of compassion for those in need, and they encourage children and young adults to find ways to help.

But what of the differences? The approach to service learning taken by Mr. Johnson stresses charity and the ways in which participating in service and reflection can develop students' sense of altruism. Mr. Johnson's students gave their time and energy to help individuals and groups in need, either directly (e.g., the student who helped patients in a hospital find their appointment locales) or indirectly (e.g., preparing survival kits for the homeless). Mr. Johnson's curriculum included only minimal attention to any systematic analysis of the ills his students were helping to alleviate. Instead, his class focused on inculcating a sense of civic duty. His high school seniors were not asked to articulate an understanding of the conditions and contexts that might have contributed to the loss of a family's home or to a pregnant mother's decision to turn to crack cocaine.

Ms. Adams' students, by contrast, began their work with a systematic and critical analysis of the causes of homelessness and of the strategies employed to prevent it. The class discussed the growing economic disparity between rich and poor, the impact of homelessness on children, and the difficult

balance between individual rights and collective responsibility. Students read stories by homeless children and wrote essays assessing the impact of homelessness on people like themselves.

These two orientations (and they are by no means neatly distinct from one another) have a long history in debates over curriculum. The "project method" and related approaches often included a service component that emphasized change. For past reformers, such as John Dewey, William Kilpatrick, George Counts, and Paul Hanna, the transformative potential of this approach was of prime importance. These curriculum theorists and education reformers wanted students to engage in service learning projects so that they would recognize that their academic abilities and collective commitments could help them respond in meaningful ways to a variety of social concerns.4

For Dewey, this ideal was the essence of democratic education. He argued for the creation of "miniature communities" in which students would work together to identify and respond to problems they confronted. The value of this approach extended far beyond the service students might provide for the elderly or the ways they might clean up the environment. It lay in the analytic and academic skills, the moral acuity, and the social sensitivity they would develop as they learned to assess critically and respond collectively to authentic problems. The hope was that students' values and beliefs might be transformed by these experiences. As Lawrence Cremin explains, these educators believed that, "by manipulating the school curriculum, they could ultimately change the world."5 Thus *Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order?* was the aptly chosen title of George Counts' widely read book.

In contrast, much of the current discussion regarding service learning emphasizes charity, not change. The claim regarding the relation of service learning to the development of altruism is relatively simple to articulate and, in many respects, compelling. By engaging in meaningful service—whether tutoring children for whom English is a second language, helping patients in a hospital, doing difficult chores for the elderly, or supervising younger children's recreational activities—students will have opportunities to experience what David Hornbeck, former Maryland state superintendent, referred to as "the joy of reaching out to others."6 For example, many students left Mr. Johnson's project aware of the contributions that they could make toward helping others and eager to continue the work they began as part of the course. The argument for the development of altruism was also advanced by the late Ernest Boyer of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Boyer wrote that "altruism can best be appreciated as an experience rather than an abstraction." He endeavored to create "a new Carnegie unit," the requirement that all students take part in volunteer activities in either their school or community as a condition for graduation from high school.7

The Moral, Political and Intellectual Domains

Just as the difference between change and charity may provide an important conceptual distinction for those analyzing service learning curricula, it is helpful to distinguish the moral, political, and intellectual goals that motivate those who support service learning. These goals are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. SERVICE LEARNING GOALS			
	MORAL	**POLITICAL**	**INTELLECTUAL**
CHARITY	*Giving*	*Civic Duty*	*Additive Experience*
CHANGE	*Caring*	*Social Reconstruction*	*Transformative Experience*

In the moral domain, service learning activities tend toward two types of relationships. Relationships that emphasize charity we will call "giving." Those that aim primarily to deepen relationships and to forge new connections we will call "caring." In caring relationships, Nel Noddings asserts, we try to consider the life and disposition of those for whom we are caring. We attempt to "apprehend the reality of the other" and then to "struggle [for progress] together."8 In so doing, we create opportunities for changing our understanding of the other and the context within which he or she lives.

In the political domain, the intentions of those promoting service learning activities draw from two different assumptions about political socialization and what it means to be a citizen. Those who focus primarily on charity believe that, to be properly educated in a democracy, students must undergo experiences that demonstrate the value of altruism and the dangers of exclusive self-interest. They stress the importance of civic duty and the need for responsive citizens. Volunteerism and compassion for the less fortunate are the undergirding conceptions of political socialization associated with this vision.

The second notion of political socialization reveals fundamentally different assumptions about the requirements of citizenship. Those promoting this vision of service learning hope to move students toward participation in what Benjamin Barber refers to as a "strong democracy."9 They call for a curriculum that emphasizes critical reflection about social policies and

conditions, the acquisition of skills of political participation, and the formation of social bonds.

In the intellectual domain, a service learning curriculum can further a number of goals. The ability of a service learning curriculum to foster authentic, experience-based learning opportunities, to motivate students, to help students engage in higher-order thinking in contextually varied environments, and to promote interdisciplinary studies has led some, such as John Brisco, a leader in the field, to label service learning "the Trojan horse of school reform." The service component may help us get the support needed for implementation, he argues, but its real impact is seen in its ability to promote powerful learning environments.

Educators who emphasize change would clearly also value the educational benefits of this approach. To tap into the full power of service activities, however, these practitioners would want to combine critical inquiry with action. This process can transform students' understandings of both disciplinary knowledge and the particular social issues with which they are engaged.

The Challenge for Practitioners and Advocates

We do not mean to imply that the contents of Table 1 represent discrete categories. As we will show, the underlying goals and the impact of a given service learning activity can embody commitments to both change and charity and can have relevance for any of the three domains. Indeed, these domains are not discrete; moral, political, and intellectual goals are intertwined. Moreover, the same activities may be experienced quite differently by different students. Finally, this framework is not exhaustive. Service learning can advance other priorities, such as the acquisition of vocational skills.

To note the limits of these distinctions, however, is not to deny their value. These categories can help clarify our understanding of the possible relationships between service learning activities, their outcomes, and the goals that motivate their design.

Moral domain: giving and caring. As was true during the progressive era, many who currently advocate service learning consider its potential as a means of promoting moral development.10 In many service learning projects the emphasis is on giving and on countering the narcissism that is believed to be so prevalent among young people and in the society generally. The idea that educators should foster a volunteer ethic and encourage youths to give something back to their school or community currently receives widespread support. It is voiced by educators and politicians alike.11 Sen. Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.) points out, for example, that "90% of 14- to 17-year-olds

who had been asked to volunteer [for public service] did so."12 And President Bush made famous the image of "a thousand points of light," representing the innumerable efforts of citizens to respond to America's social problems.

One student in Mr. Johnson's class, for example, volunteered at the Veterans' Memorial Senior Center:

> *For Thanksgiving this year my stepmother and I helped serve the*
> *seniors their Thanksgiving dinner. This was a very rewarding*
> *experience helping others in need. It seemed that the dinner was*
> *something special to them; it was a chance for them to get*
> *together with their peers. Many don't have families in the area and*
> *are all alone for the holidays. This made it a little less lonely,*
> *which feels great. Thank you for giving me the chance to help!*

This experience and others like it, quite common in the literature of service learning, emphasize charity more than change. The experience was structured to promote giving rather than to provide the kind of understanding needed for the development of caring relationships. As a result, the student's description of the event lacked the perspective and input of those she was helping.

Similarly, the student in Mr. Johnson's class who assembled "Daily Life Kits," which he then distributed to the homeless in San Francisco, determined the kits' contents without ever talking with homeless individuals or with those who had knowledge on the subject.13 He experienced the joys of service, but he had few opportunities for meaningful interactions through which caring relationships and understanding might develop. When I care, Noddings explains, a relationship develops in which "the other's reality becomes a real possibility for me."14 The distance between the one caring and the one cared for diminishes. Unfortunately, in many service activities, students view those they serve as clients rather than as a resource.

However, there are numerous ways in which a curriculum focused on giving provides opportunities for students to develop caring relationships, especially when compared to a traditional academic curriculum. For example, a music director at a middle school we studied wanted her suburban, upper-middle-class students to perform at a nearby elementary school in a poor neighborhood. Some of the middle school parents objected, saying that they were concerned for their children's safety. In a written evaluation, the students said that they had imagined "horrifying children running around on a dirty campus." They had expected them to be "rude, tough, noisy, and very unfriendly," and they even thought they would be "mean, gang-related blacks." One of the students wrote, "I was scared because my mom had told me it was a bad neighborhood and to be careful."

After they returned, the students' perspectives on these elementary school

children had changed. They were "surprised at the children's responsiveness and their attentiveness," they found the children to be "extremely polite and surprisingly friendly," and they discovered that they "listened well and had excellent behavior." One student wrote, "Everyone at the school had good manners, and I think more highly of [the neighborhood] now." The experiential and interpersonal components of service learning activities can achieve the first crucial step toward diminishing the sense of "otherness" that often separates students—particularly privileged students—from those in need. In so doing, the potential to develop caring relationships is created.

Political domain: responsible citizens and critical democrats. Rather than tie the service curriculum exclusively to moral development, some advocates of service learning talk about developing citizens for our democracy. While there is widespread commitment to this goal,15 there are important differences in what people mean by "developing citizens." Merging the rhetoric of altruism with notions of citizenship, some argue that good citizens should perform community service as a kind of charity. Many agree with Sen. Kennedy, who writes that democracy "means . . . the responsibility to give something back to America in return for all it has given us."16 Similarly, the chief rationale for the community service requirement in Atlanta was that it would ensure that students recognized "the responsibility of good citizens to help others."17 Mr. Johnson, who shares this logic, explains to his students and their parents that he makes "community service . . . a vital part of the government course [because] part of citizenship is the practice of helping others in the community."

Others argue that educators may miss important opportunities if they disconnect the act of service from a critical examination of the setting in which it occurs. While requiring students to "serve America" (the rhetoric of the federal legislation) might produce George Bush's "thousand points of light," it might also promote a thousand points of the status quo. Indeed, the emphasis on altruism and charity, so common in many recent service learning initiatives, is often used to back a conservative political agenda that denies a role for government. Note President Bush's rhetoric as he voiced his support for the National Community Services Act of 1990:

> *I am particularly pleased that [this act] will promote an ethic of community service . . . . Government cannot rebuild a family or reclaim a sense of neighborhood, and no bureaucratic program will ever solve the pressing human problems that can be addressed by a vast galaxy of people working voluntarily in their own backyards.18*

Bush was advancing voluntary community service as an alternative to government programs. He made no mention of changes that address the structural injustices that leave so many in need. This kind of service runs the risk of being understood as a kind of noblesse oblige – a private act of

kindness performed by the privileged. This distinction is hardly a new one. Paul Hanna in his 1937 book, *Youth Serves the Community*, criticized efforts to serve which provided token amounts of needed aid yet never identified or responded to structural problems. "Time and energy given to such superficial betterment [Hanna gives as an example making Thanksgiving baskets for poor families] could much more efficiently be spent in getting at the basic inhibiting influences which perpetuate a scarcity economy in the midst of abundance."19

> **While requiring students to "serve America" might produce a thousand points of light, it is more likely to promote a thousand points of the status quo.**

Similarly, many contemporary scholars focus on change over charity and argue that the lack of connection between individual rights and communal obligations within our culture has left us with a bankrupt sense of citizenship. Like the programs Hanna criticized more than 50 years ago, many current service activities emphasize altruism and charity and fail to call into question current notions of individualism or to encourage the type of political participation that furthers democracy. "Democratic politics," Benjamin Barber writes, "has become something we watch rather than something we do."20 Our participation in acts of national service, he believes, is a "prerequisite of citizenship" and essential for democratic institutions:

> *The thousand points of light through which the lucky serve the needy may help illuminate our humanity, but they cannot warm or nurture our common soul, nor create a sense of common responsibility connected to our liberty, nor provide integral solutions to structural problems. The model is compassion or charity; [service is optional, a personal choice,] and thus can never be the subject of political duties.21*

This, then, is a fundamental critique of those who market the importance of service learning by referencing both the motivation and joy that come from giving and the importance of altruism. Barber would disagree with Diane Hedin when she writes, "Maybe this [community service] is what citizenship is all about, acting in a decent way toward people who live where we live."22 Citizenship in a democratic community requires more than kindness and decency; it requires engagement in complex social and institutional endeavors. Acts of civic duty cannot replace government programs or forms of collective social action. Citizenship requires that individuals work to create, evaluate, criticize, and change public institutions and programs.

And such action is unavoidably political. Thus Harry Boyte is critical of current conceptions of service because they meet students' needs for "personal relevance and a sense of membership in a community. [But] volunteers usually

disavow concern with larger policy questions, seeing service as an *alternative* to politics" (emphasis in original).23 This attitude is reflected in the words of a university undergraduate, which were included in the William T. Grant Foundation's influential report *The Forgotten Half*:

> *Students tutor, coach softball, paint playgrounds, and read to the elderly because they are interested in people, or because they want to learn a little about poverty and racism before they head out into the waiting corporate world . . . . We do not volunteer "to make a statement," or to use the people we work with to protest something. We try to see the homeless man, the hungry child, and the dying woman as the people they are, not the means to some political end.24*

By contrast, those oriented toward change embrace the importance of political activity. Boyte, for example, believes that service activities should develop students' abilities at "public speaking, recruiting other students, organizing meetings, analyzing problems, developing action plans, and conducting evaluations."25

The curriculum developed by Katharine Isaac, titled *Civics for Democracy: A Journey for Teachers and Students*, illustrates some of what this approach might imply for today's high school students.26 The first section focuses on profiles of students in action. It describes the efforts of high school students in Florida to limit deforestation in the southern part of their state; an effort by students in Fargo, North Dakota, to boycott the institutionalization of Whittle Communications' Channel One; and a variety of other efforts by which students gained a sense of what activism can accomplish. The curriculum also includes opportunities to study the history of various citizen movements (civil rights movement, labor movement, women's rights movement, consumer movement, environmental movement). Students examine both the substantive themes of these movements and the strategies that actors with diverse agendas employed. Numerous ideas for change-oriented student projects that include research and action are also explored. These projects range from evaluating the representativeness of juries, to analyzing the evening news, to improving the availability of child care. This curriculum highlights the explicitly political nature of service and community action, teaches meaningful skills in a systematic manner, and integrates these ideas with academic investigations.

Intellectual domain: additive and transformative. Given the educational focus of service learning activities, no analysis would be complete without considering the activities from the perspective of intellectual development. Service learning advocates agree that experiential, active pedagogy is often quite powerful. While an additional emphasis on charity might lead to service learning activities that raise self-esteem, impel students into new experiences, and demonstrate the value of scholastic abilities in real-world contexts,

educators who focus on a transformative vision would want to carry this work one step further. For them, it is the combination of service and critical analysis, not either by itself, that seems most likely to promote interest in and insight into these complex social issues.

> **A transformative educational experience requires that students engage in critical thinking in the "strong," not the "weak" sense.**

Of course, neither of these outcomes is assured. Indeed, there is reason for concern that service experiences frequently fail to achieve either additive or transformative goals. Consider again Mr. Johnson's service curriculum in which each student designed his or her own project. By providing materials and access to knowledgeable speakers, Mr. Johnson prompted his students to consider various projects, but the students ultimately had to make their own arrangements. The focus and quality of the projects they developed varied enormously. Some students became an integral part of an organization; others performed busywork. One student's project was to do chores around the house for her grandmother. Some students spoke of new insights; others did not. There was no meaningful reflective component to this project. It required simply that students submit a one- or two-paragraph summary of their efforts. Their grade depended primarily on the number of hours they volunteered. Thirty hours for an A, 20 for a B, and 10 for a C.

The example of Mr. Johnson's service curriculum is particularly relevant because its design mirrors large-scale initiatives to promote community service around the country. For example, students in Atlanta must complete 75 hours of volunteer service to graduate. Maryland now requires that all high school students perform 75 hours of community service prior to graduation or participate in an alternative district program approved by the state. There are also major efforts under way in Vermont, New York, the District of Columbia, Pennsylvania, and Minnesota, and the number of initiatives around the nation is growing. Some of these proposals work to integrate reflection on the service activities; others do not. In Atlanta students simply write a 500-word essay describing their experiences. They never discuss their experiences as part of a course. In fact, many of the major legislative proposals have a minimal reflective component – sometimes for fear that such an orientation would diminish the focus on altruism.27

The importance of a meaningful reflective component becomes clearer when one considers the kind of deliberation and student empowerment that such a curriculum can foster. Recall the service project in which middle school music students from an affluent community performed for and met with elementary school students in a nearby poor community. This interaction led some students to report marked changes in their beliefs about children from this

neighborhood. Moreover, when asked what they gained from the experience, many students said simply that it taught them "that people can be different" from what you expect. Others arrived at a variety of deeper insights: "[The neighborhood] isn't as bad as the news makes it out to be." "The rumors I have heard are a big bunch of hogwash . . . .I'm glad I went on that trip because it was a wonderful experience to meet new people and find out about their lives." These statements testify to the transformative power of service learning experiences. The effect could become even greater if students discussed the possible causes of these rumors and their impact.

Almost all discussions of service learning practices emphasize the importance of reflection.28 For the most part, however, descriptions of reflective activities do not include the kind of critical analysis that might help students step outside dominant understandings to find new solutions. Clearly, having students share their thoughts and experiences with one another can be valuable, but reflective activities (commonly in the form of journal entries and discussions) may simply reinforce previously held beliefs and simplistic, if generous, conclusions.29 Moreover, as Richard Paul makes clear, students may use their developing ability to articulate powerful logical arguments to "maintain their most deep-seated prejudices and irrational habits of thought by making them appear more rational."30

A transformative educational experience, on the other hand, requires that students engage in critical thinking in the "strong" rather than "weak" sense. To be critical thinkers, students must be able to consider arguments that justify conclusions that conflict with their own predispositions and self-interest.31 Structured, informed, and systematic analysis of service experiences from a variety of ideological positions will not ensure critical thinking in the strong sense, but such reflection should make that outcome more common.

Service is Political

Efforts to integrate service learning activities into the curriculum have great potential and deserve the support they are now receiving. To date, however, little attention has been given to sorting out the goals and motivations that underlie the spectrum of service learning projects emerging in schools throughout the country. Is it beneficial to point out such differences and risk creating some opposition to service learning? We think so. Clarifying different goals provides educators with an opportunity to consider systematically a range of possible priorities (including some they might otherwise not consider) and the relation of these to their practice.

Moreover, it is important to acknowledge that the choice of service learning activities—like the choice of any curricular activity—has political dimensions. Currently, the most broadly supported (and therefore most politically tenable)

goal for service learning activities is to convey to students the importance of charity. If we focus on the "numerous values we share as a community," writes Amitai Etzioni, the founder of the communitarian movement and a proponent of service learn-ing, "our world would be radically improved."32 While such rhetoric might allow this political scientist to be a trusted advisor to members of Congress on both sides of the aisle, it will not resolve the dilemmas facing practitioners who need to think carefully about the many values that we do not share, about what a radically improved world might look like, and about the different ways one might pursue this goal.

Rather than assume, erroneously, that all educators share the same vision, we think it is better to be explicit about the numerous and different visions that drive the creation and implementation of service learning activities in schools. "In the service of what?" is a question that inevitably merits the attention of teachers, policy makers, and academicians who take seriously the idea that learning and service reinforce each other and should come together in America's schools.

Notes
1. Major initiatives with links to graduation requirements are under way in Atlanta, New York, Maryland, Vermont, Pennsylvania, the District of Columbia, and numerous other districts throughout the country.
2. We draw on data from interviews and surveys of teachers and students, from classroom observations, and from project reports submitted by teachers. We would like to thank all those who participated in the service learning mini-grants program, but the names of teachers and schools discussed here have been changed.
3. Judith Berck, *No Place to Be: Voices of Homeless Children* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1992).
4. John Dewey, *The School and Society*, in idem, *"The Child and the Curriculum" and "The School and Society"* (1900; reprint, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956); idem, *Schools of Tomorrow* (New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, 1916); William Kilpatrick, "The Project Method," *Teachers College Record*, September 1918, pp. 319-35; George Counts, *Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order?* (New York: John Day, 1932); and Paul Hanna, *Youth Serves the Community* (New York: Appleton Century, 1936), p. 187.
5. Lawrence Cremin, *American Education: The Metropolitan Experience, 1876-1980* (New York: Harper & Row, 1988), p. 187.
6. In Charles Harrison, *Student Service: The New Carnegie Unit* (New Jersey: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1987), p. 2.
7. Ernest L. Boyer, foreword to Harrison, p. ix.
8. Nel Noddings, *Caring: A Feminine Approach to Ethics and Moral Education* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), pp. 14-15.
9. Benjamin Barber, *Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics for a New Age* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984).
10. For the progressive era, see John Dewey, *Moral Principles in Education*, in idem, *The Middle Works, 1899-1924*, Joann A. Boydston, ed. (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1909); and Hanna, op. cit. For contemporaries, see Philip Cognetta and Norman Sprinthall, "Students as Teachers: Role Taking as a Means of Promoting Psychological and Ethical Development During Adolescence," in Norman Sprinthall and Ralph Mosher, eds., *Value Development as the Aim of Education* (Schenectady, N.Y.: Character Research Press, 1978); and Amitai Etzioni, *The Spirit of*
MAY 1996 14
Community: Rights, Responsibilities, and the Communitarian Agenda (New York: Crown Publishers, 1993).

11. For the voices of educators, see Boyer, op. cit.; Dan Conrad and Diane Hedin, "School-Based Community Service: What We Know from Research and Theory," *Phi Delta Kappan*, June 1991, pp. 743-49; and Joe Nathan and Jim Kielsmeier, "The Sleeping Giant of School Reform," *Phi Delta Kappan*, June 1991, pp. 738-42.

12. Sen. Edward M. Kennedy, "National Service and Education for Citizenship," *Phi Delta Kappan*, June 1991, p. 772.

13. The kits included items for personal grooming (a comb, a razor, a toothbrush, toothpaste, soap, and shampoo) and a small Bible.

14. Noddings, p. 14.

15. Kennedy, op. cit.; Boyer, op. cit.; Benjamin Barber, *An Aristocracy for Everyone* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1992); Katharine Isaac, *Civics for Democracy: A Journey for Teachers and Students* (Washington, D.C.: Essential Books, 1992); Etzioni, op. cit.; and Harrison, op. cit.

16. Kennedy, p. 772.

17. Harrison, p. 11.

18. Quoted in Howard Radest, *Community Service: Encounter with Strangers* (Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 1993), p. 8.

19. Hanna, p. 40.

20. Barber, *Strong Democracy*, p. 235.

21. Ibid.

22. Quoted in Harrison, p. 5.

23. Harry C. Boyte, "Community Service and Civic Education," *Phi Delta Kappan*, June 1991, p. 766.

24. Commission on Work, Family and Citizenship, *The Forgotten Half: Pathways to Success for America's Youth and Young Families* (Washington, D.C.: William T. Grant Foundation, 1988), p. 81.

25. Boyte, p. 767.

26. Isaac, op. cit. See also Fred Newmann, *Education for Citizen Action: Challenge for Secondary Curriculum* (Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan, 1974).

27. Fred Newmann, quoted in Harrison, p. 21.

28. For a fine example, see Ellen Honnet and Susan Poulsen, *Principles of Good Practice for Combining Service and Learning: Wingspread Special Report* (Racine, Wis.: Johnson Foundation, 1989).

29. For example, the Council of Chief State School Officers' report on service learning states that a service learning curriculum "should provide for a structured period for reflection after the service experience, when the students can think, talk, and/or write about what they saw and did." It does not mention the need to consider these experiences in relation to systematic academic work. See *Community Service Learning by Doing* (Washington, D.C.: Council of Chief State School Officers, 1989), p. 5.

30. Richard Paul, *Critical Thinking: What Every Person Needs to Survive in a Rapidly Changing World* (Rohnert Park, Calif.: Center for Critical Thinking and Moral Critique, 1990), p. 370.

31. Ibid., p. 373.

32. Etzioni, p. 97.