2016

Musings on Change in Leadership, Service-Learning and Civic Engagement

Virginia M. Jagla
National Louis University, vjagla@nl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.nl.edu/ie

Musings on Change in Leadership, Service-Learning, and Civic Engagement

Virginia Jagla

National Louis University, Chicago, USA

As I examine this issue's articles, I am delighted that we have a variety of action research projects. Two of these articles highlight civic action in schools. The use of service-learning (and civic engagement in general) in schools has been a major theme in my own research. Much of this research has been done with my dear colleague and friend, Antonina Lukenchuk. This issue of *i.e.: inquiry in education* marks the passing of the baton of lead editor to Antonina. She is a stellar researcher and brings much to the editorial team. She breathes new life into this journal as it begins its seventh year.

Over the past decade, National Louis University's (NLU) Civic Engagement Team, led by Antonina and I, has been actively engaged in promoting service-learning among NLU faculty and students. Our understanding of service-learning is embedded in our deeply rooted practice and scholarly exploration. We have adopted Bourdieu's (1990, 1999) term *habitus* to designate a model of service-learning as "living theory" (McNiff & Whitehead, 2011) and engaged activity based on shared dispositions and reciprocal and mutually beneficial relationships among the participants.

We developed the *SLH²* (*Service-Learning Habitus & Heterotopia*) model (Lukenchuk, Jagla, & Price, 2013; Jagla, Lukenchuk, & Price, 2010). SLH² includes pragmatic, critical, and postmodern perspectives on service-learning, drawing on the works of Dewey (1916), Bourdieu's (1990, 1999) social theory, relational ethics (Levinas, 1998, 2006; Noddings, 2003, 2005a, 2005b), and Foucault's (1967) metaphor of *heterotopia*. SLH² reflects our practice-based dispositions on service-learning.

We regard service-learning as a synergy of *praxis* (action) and *phronesis* (practical reasoning required for praxis) (Arendt, 1998, 2005). Such understanding challenges the false dichotomy of theory and practice, which still prevails in teacher education, much to the detriment of greater understanding of knowledge of practice (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999).

Bourdieu's social theory of practice inspires our vision of service-learning as habitus that represents a web of shared dispositions, relations, and actions. Practices are consequences of interactions between historically developed dispositions (habitus) and specific fields of contention (institutional dispositions, external structures). Much like Bourdieu's habitus, service-learning represents "embodied history" and "active presence of the whole past of which it is the product" (Bourdieu, 1999, p. 444).

Levinas' (1998, 2006) philosophy and Noddings' relational ethics (2003, 2005a, 2005b) reflect the ethical dimension of SLH[2]. Ethical questions posit infinite responsibility for other human beings. Levinas' ethics stem from the precepts of service-learning pedagogy in scholarship and teaching. Noddings echoes Levinas' philosophy and provides important threads between caring, happiness, community, democracy, and service.

Critical and postmodern paradigms of service-learning uncover its transformative potential. Critical models of service-learning focus on "promotion and empowerment of the voices and practices of disempowered groups in society," while postmodern models center on "how service-learning processes create, sustain, and/or disrupt the boundaries and norms by which we make sense of ourselves and the world" (Butin, 2005, pp. 90-91). Finally, Foucault's (1967) metaphor of heterotopia opens space for additional discourses of service-learning as power.

Reed-Bouley (2002) offers the insight that students make meaning differently, perhaps, than do their faculty and community partners. Reed-Bouley cites "the continuum model" by Eyler and Giles (1999) which suggests movement along a line from a service orientation to a social justice orientation and "the paradigm model" by Morton (1995). We have articulated our interest and work in support of service-learning and the critical conceptual framework that goes along with this concept, and observe our students offering responses "making meaning" from a different stance.

This element of students "making meaning" is reflected in the first article in this issue. In his article, "Challenges to the Implementation of Youth PAR in a University-Middle School Partnership," Christopher Stillwell (University of California, Irvine) offers essential insights from young adolescents on the issues they experience firsthand every day. The critical case study of participatory action research within a university–middle school partnership makes transparent some of the tensions and contradictions that participants grapple with in such projects.

Lori Morgan (University of the Pacific) voices concern regarding the lack of civic education and involvement among youth in the United States. In her article, "Developing Civic Literacy and Efficacy: Insights Gleaned through the Implementation of Project Citizen," she focuses on the application of knowledge gained by participants in real-world problems. Her study analyzes a curricular program shown to promote civic literacy and efficacy. Morgan identifies collaboration, research practice, and public policy instruction as most influential in developing civic literacy, according to student participants.

The other two action research studies depart from the civic engagement theme. In the article, "Preparing School Leaders: Action Research on the Leadership Study Group," Estelle Kamler (Long Island University, Post) examines the Leadership Study Group, implemented in an introductory course for school leader certification. The study informed her practice, and she offers it as impetus for professors of leadership to conduct action research to evaluate and improve other student-centered learning activities for emerging leaders.

James Pelech (Benedictine University) contends that students wishing to be teachers must actively experience the practices they will implement. In his article, "Comparing the Effectiveness of Closed-Notes Quizzes With Open-Notes Quizzes: Blending Constructivist Principles With Action Research to Improve Student Learning," Pelech explores student

perceptions regarding the effectiveness of different quiz platforms. This exploration was a force for implementing creativity, the integrated curriculum, and assessment.

My time as editor of this journal these past six years has afforded me many opportunities to explore a multitude of ideas through the eyes of interested, caring practitioners as they study their own practice. Action research is a most powerful tool to reflect on and inquire into one's own work, creating new understanding for oneself. This journal allows for the sharing of such compelling information. Enjoy this latest issue!

References

Arendt, H. (1998). *The human condition*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Arendt, H. (2005). *The promise of politics.* New York, NY: Schoken Books.

Bourdieu, P. (1999). Structures, habitus, practices. In C. Lemert (Ed.), *Social theory: The multicultural and classical readings* (pp. 441-447). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The logic of practice*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

Butin, D. W. (Ed.). (2005). *Service-learning in higher education: Critical issues and directions*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (1999). Relationships of knowledge and practice: Teacher learning in communities. *Review of Research in Education*, *24*, 249-305.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education.* New York, NY: The Free Press.

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

Foucault, M. (1967). *Of other spaces*. Retrieved from http://foucault.info/documents/heteroTopia/foucault.heteroTopia.en.html

Jagla, V. M., Lukenchuk, A., & Price, T. (2010). Imagining a better world: Service-learning as benefit to teacher education. *International Journal of Research on Service-Learning & Teacher Education*, 1*(1),* found at http://journals.sfu.ca/ijrslte/index.php/IJRSLTE/article/view/9

Levinas, E. (1998). *On thinking-of-the-Other: Entre nous*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Levinas, E. (2006). *Ethics and infinity: Conversations with Philippe Nemo*. Pittsburg, PA: Duquesne University Press.

Lukenchuk, A., Jagla, V. M, & Price, T. A. (2013). Critical discourse analysis of service-learning perspectives and models: Transforming teacher education. In V. M. Jagla, J. A. Erickson, & A. S. Tinkler (Eds.), *Transforming teacher education through service-learning.* Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

McNiff, J., & Whitehead, J. (2011). *All you need to know about action research* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Morton, K. (1995). The irony of service: Charity, project, and social change in service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service,* Fall 1995. 19-32.

Noddings, N. (2003). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

Noddings, N. (2005a). *Educating citizens for global awareness*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Noddings, N. (2005b). *The challenge to care in schools: An alternative approach to education.* New York, NY: Teacher College Press.

Reed-Bouley, J. (2002). Service and justice: Understanding the relationship through community service-learning. Issue on Teaching and Doing Justice in Higher Education in *Listening: Journal of Religion and Culture, 37*(1) 53–63.