

From Charity to Justice

The Potential of University-Community Collaboration for Social Change

SAM MARULLO

Georgetown University

BOB EDWARDS

East Carolina University

The authors synthesize what has been learned from the two-issue series of American Behavioral Scientist on universities' responses to troubled times. They argue that educators and community leaders should channel the vast resources of volunteerism toward social change for a more just society and discuss ways that service-learning endeavors contribute to this process. They contrast the current state of higher education with a vision of a transformed institution they think preferable to the status quo and then focus on the difference between charity and social justice. Through service learning, acts of charity—which typically end up reproducing the status quo—can facilitate the politicization of students and help them to become active promoters of a more just society. Six questions are posed to assess the extent to which community-based education or research endeavors engage in charity or facilitate social justice.

This conclusion synthesizes what has been learned from the two-issue series of *American Behavioral Scientist* that we have edited on universities' responses to troubled times. In the first issue—Volume 42, Number 5 (February 1999)—we focused on the various types of collaborative relationships that universities have been building to address the social and economic problems confronting the community. In this issue, we focused on the microlevel teaching process, examining service learning in its various forms and the impacts that it has on students, faculty, and educational institutions.

As many of our contributors have done, we draw on Boyer's (1990) conception of a scholarship of engagement to synthesize their analyses and findings. For Boyer and the authors in our two issues, American higher education has evolved into an enterprise too narrowly focused on the scholarship of discovery. This primacy has come at the expense of three other types of scholarship: pedagogy, integration, and application. The dominance of the scholarship of discovery, criticized by several of our authors as the paradigm of pure science, has been accompanied by the emergence of reward and incentive systems, selective

recruitment, disciplinary evolution, and institutional structures that discourage the pursuit of the other types of scholarship and hinder their integration into a scholarship of engagement. Boyer holds out the development of a scholarship of engagement as the means through which universities will be reshaped as they enter into collaborative arrangements with community partners to address pressing social, political, economic, and moral ills. In the process, students' learning will be reshaped, as will be the professional life of faculty.

To move toward a scholarship of engagement does not mean to suggest that academia should eschew the science of discovery. Such scholarship will always be needed and presumably will always be valued. Rather, our claim (echoing others, such as Lynton, 1995; Rice, 1991; Schomberg & Farmer, 1994, to name but a few) is that we need to strengthen the value placed on the other three types of scholarship and alter the reward structures accordingly. This will force the academy to rethink its standard criteria for judging scholarship because we are less able to depend on assessments of articles published in scholarly journals or book manuscripts to evaluate the work done in the scholarships of pedagogy, application, and integration.

The scholarship of engagement requires all four types of scholarly activity to be done well. By its nature, it is holistic, integrated, interdisciplinary, and collaborative among diverse participants. The experiences of our authors in creating community-university collaborations, working with colleagues from other disciplines, and engaging their students in the process to enhance their learning attest to the challenges of such work. Through their sharing of how they have proceeded to overcome such challenges, we are afforded the opportunity to learn from their experiences and advance these developments further.

The scholarship of engagement weaves the four strands of scholarship into an unfolding tapestry representative of a rewoven social fabric—a social fabric less flawed by the ills of poverty and injustice. The engaged scholar weaves together local or regional constituencies with enduring ties to specific places with students who are seasonal migrants. Engaged scholars must also play the role of organizer among their university colleagues so that networks of interested faculty, administrators, and staff can collaborate with enduring community-based constituencies and develop innovative “win-win” projects for all parties. Engaged faculty need to be able to publish their learnings from the process in articles and integrate their scholarship into their teaching. Community groups would need to derive benefits that directly enable them to address issues of concern to them. And, over time, a shifting cast of students would acquire knowledge and develop skills from their substantive participation that would prepare them to be committed and engaged contributors to society.

In the remainder of this article, we contrast the current state of higher education with a vision of a transformed academy we think preferable to the status quo. We then focus on an important component of a broader transformational strategy by distinguishing between charity and social justice and discuss ways that through service-learning acts of charity—which typically end up repro-

ducing the status quo—can facilitate the politicization of students and help them to become active promoters of a more just society (Kahne & Westheimer, 1996). Finally, we pose six questions that can help assess the extent to which community-based education or research endeavors engage in charity or facilitate social justice.

TRANSFORMING HIGHER EDUCATION TO TRANSFORM SOCIETY

One of our purposes in compiling these works is to provide a vision of how higher education can become a vehicle for transforming society to make it more just. This is, of course, a value-laden objective, which is why we wish to state our purposes explicitly. It is our claim that some of the social forces that we cited in the introduction to the first volume—particularly the globalization of economies and increased reliance on market mechanisms and their cultural dominance—have the potential to greatly increase inequality and the harmful effects of poverty unless otherwise checked. One of the other dramatic changes that we noted, the expanded attendance of higher education institutions, has the potential to be a counterweight to the former trends but only if the qualitative experience of young people attending such institutions is altered from the dominant mode found today. One vehicle of hope for changing political and economic institutions lies in educational transformations such as those documented by our authors. Moreover, we hope that the community-university collaborative initiatives showcased here—which combine research, teaching, and professional service to address community-defined issues—have the potential to improve the quality of life for those in greatest need. They will do this by transforming university operations in such a way as to make students and faculty become agents of change—by creating teaching, learning, and scholarly processes that explicitly address such problems with the intent of fixing them. In Figure 1, we summarize the many facets of transformation that are described by the authors in this two-issue set.

We realize that this goal may be interpreted to run counter to the desires of many of the individual students or faculty in higher education, namely, their ambitions to enrich their own position in the socioeconomic system, relative to and perhaps at the expense of others. However, we reject the logic that the best way to attain the optimal society is for each individual to seek to maximize his or her own personal gain. Rather, the well-being of individuals and societies are reflexive. An unfettered pursuit of individual self-interest will erode the social institutions capable of protecting the interests of relatively less powerful constituencies just as assuredly as the unchecked pursuit of state or corporate interests will erode the freedom of individuals. We believe that social collectives must deliberately organize themselves to ensure that the well-being of the least well off is protected and enhanced. Stated in terms of negative justice, unless the

<i>Level</i>	<i>Status Quo</i>	<i>Transformation</i>
Student	Alienated from self, work, others, place, and generativity Externally driven learning	Integrated and whole Self-motivated learning
Pedagogy and learning	Material, career, credential motivations Banking model Disciplinary, canon-centered	Enrichment of self and community Circle of colearners Interdisciplinary, problems-centered
Faculty	Analytical, recitative Service as extracurricular Pure science scholarship Isolated, atomistic, alienated Respond to disciplinary frontiers Work within paradigms	Applied, synthetic, reflective Service integrated into curriculum Scholarship of engagement Holistic, integrated, complete Responsive to community needs Critical perspective
Institutional	Professional service as add-on Autonomous disciplines Reward system prioritizes the scholarship of discovery	Integrated professional service Interdisciplinary and collaborative Scholarships of pedagogy, application, and integration valued as well
Community relationship	Do for Community as subject Insulated from community Hierarchy, elite institution	Do with Community as partner Engaged with community Egalitarian

Figure 1: Polarities of Universities' Responses

well-being of the least well off is assured at some acceptable level, they pose a threat to those who are better off. Stated as positive justice, a social collective operates to maximize the well-being of all its members when all of its members have the abilities, resources, and opportunities to contribute to the greater good.

We introduce the concept of social justice because it encompasses the themes of empowerment, integration, and transformation discussed by all of our authors. Whether the focus is on the individual student learning in new ways through a service-learning course to become a self-motivated learner or on a university-community collaborative venture involving multiple government agencies and public institutions, several universities, and affecting the lives of thousands of citizens, the author's objective is to facilitate the empowerment of those in statuses that have been traditionally disempowered. Our strategy for accomplishing this is for students and faculty to develop the sensitivities and skills needed to become advocates for those in need. Another strategy is to overcome isolation and alienation through changing social relationships that enable people to become connected and whole. Such changes are to come about through altering institutional arrangements by redistributing resources and enhancing capacities of those with less, so that such institutional operations no longer maintain such inequities.

We contrast this conception of social justice with the concept of charity, which is the more common way to consider universities' activities such as community service and educational outreach. Charity refers to the provision of help or relief to those in need. It consists of an individual or an institution acting voluntarily to transfer some of its resources (money, food, shelter, knowledge, labor, time, etc.) to an individual or group that has fewer resources. When charitable work is well organized, run efficiently, performed lovingly and with integrity, and delivered to those who are truly needy, it can literally save lives, prevent misery, and maintain the dignity of the recipients.¹ Social justice, on the other hand, refers to the state of institutional or structural arrangements in which there are no inequalities that are unjustifiable in terms of the greater social good or that are imposed unfairly. When one's goal is social justice, one attempts to alter the structural or institutional practices that produce excessive or unjustified inequalities among individuals or that treat people unfairly—for example, discriminating among people on the basis of race, sex, social class, religion, nationality, ethnicity, sexual orientation, or disability status. For community service and educational outreach to solve our social problems rather than simply ameliorate their negative consequences for poor or needy individuals and eventually “burn out” those who provide services, it must adopt a social justice approach rather than rely on a charity approach.

Keeping in mind these broader distinctions between charity and justice also helps us to make sense of a paradox of civic life today. On one hand, there has been a surge in volunteerism across the board, engaging citizens and especially students in community service programs in record numbers. On the other hand, there is an outpouring of hand wringing and lamentation about the demise of civic life, the lack of engagement in associations, and the decline of democracy. How to make sense of these contradictory observations and whether there is indeed a decline in civic participation has been the focus of discussion and debate in recent issues of this journal (see Edwards & Foley, 1997a, 1998). Stated baldly, how can we be experiencing greater than ever levels of community service and at the same time be suffering from a decline of civic life? To some extent, these two arguments speak past each other, as the decline-of-democracy prophets tend to look at only some forms of public life (see Foley & Edwards, 1997), whereas the community service and social justice advocacy promoters (ourselves among them) focus on other, often politicized collective actors. The origins of this apparent contradiction can be traced in large part to the outworking of two trends that during the past quarter century have profoundly restructured social life: the globalization of the economy and the retraction of the welfare state (Edwards & Foley, 1997b).

However, another element of this paradox has not been examined very closely. The extent to which people's activities in voluntary associations are geared toward public outcomes also helps to explain the disjunction between increased community activity and simultaneous lack of civic engagement in democracy. Most of the community service that takes place is perceived to be an

act of charity by the actor, intended to achieve a noble (albeit small) outcome that improves the life of individual service recipients at the expense of the volunteer who can afford to make such a private contribution. Such acts are perceived to be moral rather than political acts. Volunteers in a charitable operation do not seek to alter stratification systems that produce inequality, only to temporarily reallocate surplus assets that they control. So, in this sense, community service acts of charity are appropriately ignored by analysts documenting the decline of political engagement because they are personal actions outside the realm of institutional change. What we wish to argue here, however, is that such acts of community service can become political in two ways: (a) as a part of a larger political change strategy or process, in which charitable acts can lead to a redistribution of resources that changes institutions, and (b) as a first step in a process of politicization that puts community service volunteers on the path to becoming active agents of social change.

Both the political socialization process of activists and the redistribution of resources are fundamental components of civic engagement, so it again raises the question of why community service is typically not considered to be political or counted as an indicator of democratic participation. One reason is that such acts are not perceived by most community service actors themselves to be part of a political change process, nor are they seen by many political activists as having political outcomes or even the potential to do so. However, we argue below that these two outcomes—politicization and institutional transformation—can be achieved by properly socializing community service-learning students to understand the political nature of the problems they seek to address and by designing university-community collaborative activities in such a way as to make them part of larger institutional change efforts. As a result, it may therefore be the case that by transforming the perceptions of the actors and engaging them in service strategies that are integrated into a larger institutional change process, then we have the potential of an enormous movement for social justice already in place. The challenge, then, is to better understand the individual politicization process and the service-as-change strategies so that this potential for social change toward greater social justice can be realized.

To clarify the distinction between charity and justice, we will pose six questions that should be asked about any community-based educational or research work. Although we present the questions as though they might have simple yes-no answers or portray the distinction between charity and justice as though it were black and white, the reality is that there are many shades of gray in the world of community-based education work. The elements of social justice can exist in varying degrees in any type of voluntary association. Our goal is not to denigrate charity work but rather to have us move, individually and collectively, from charity to justice. We should build on the widespread appeal, particularly among our students, of charitable community service work as a means of recruiting people into a process that will transform and politicize them into

becoming change activists. At the institutional level, we need to transform our community-based scholarship and teaching so that it becomes that catalyst for larger societal change. The questions below are designed to advance both strategies: (a) the politicization process for the students engaged in service-learning programs and (b) the institutional transformation process that alters faculty roles and university-community partnerships so that they become part of a transformation process.

QUESTIONS ABOUT THE TEACHING AND LEARNING PROCESS

1. Does the community service work undertaken by students in their service-learning classes empower the recipients? One of the oft-quoted adages about service is taken from the biblical wisdom about feeding the hungry: Give people a fish and you feed them for a day, but teach them to fish, and they feed themselves for a lifetime. Charity work tends to stop at feeding the hungry a meal or after presenting a “fishing workshop.”² Justice work, by contrast, sees education as part of an empowerment process, which to extend this analogy would include securing access to productive fishing grounds, an equitable food distribution system, and the political resources needed to advocate for their continuation. Justice work is empowering in that the poor or those in need are treated as equal partners in the determination of what services and resources are needed and how they can be attained. The goal of the justice advocate should always be that those in need will no longer face such needs—colloquially referred to as “working oneself out of a job.” One way to achieve this end is by facilitating the empowerment of clients who will then be able to meet their own self-determined needs. This also protects against one of the dysfunctions of doing charity work: the sense of superiority that can emerge. This feeling of self-satisfaction can become an end in itself—rather than keeping the interests of those in need as primary—and leads to programs that do more to meet the needs of the volunteers or donors than those of the client. At the institutional level, this manifests itself as disempowering professional practice, wherein the needs and interests of the helping professionals (e.g., social workers, counselors) operate in such a way as to create and reinforce client dependency (McKnight, 1996). Apart from the moral and ethical problems arising from such a perspective, we also run the risk of programs simply failing to meet the greatest needs—for example, when times get really tough, when volunteers get tired or bored with their volunteer work, or when clients are insufficiently grateful. If giving is contingent on rewarding the giver, there are too many external factors that may lead the giver to no longer enjoy the act of giving. Figure 2 provides us with a summary of findings from the authors of this two-issue set describing what we know about students’ learning and the politicization process and the areas in which we need to do further analysis.

<i>What We Know</i>	<i>What We Need to Know</i>
Students enter into programs or courses from different places; past experiences vary widely.	What are the factors that enhance or limit impact of service-learning pedagogy on students?
Service learning must be grounded in the curriculum.	What is the relative effectiveness on students of various styles of reflection, analysis, and critical questioning?
Students need to have problems explained and questions raised from many perspectives (e.g. moral, analytical, economic, policy) to avoid compartmentalization.	What are the long-term effects of community-engaged learning for students, for example, with respect to their career choices, family patterns, and political participation?
Problems need to be seen as interdisciplinary yet grounded in courses.	What is the durability of short-term changes in values, diversity awareness, citizenship skills, and critical-thinking skills?
Effective learning requires multiple modes (e.g., analytical, emotional, interpersonal) and methods (e.g., visual, physical, active). Impacts are not always immediate or visible. Students need group dynamics to support and process information.	What are the values frameworks that lead to long-term justice activism, and how can these be promoted intentionally in our programs?
Impacts are not only on acquiring disciplinary knowledge but also experienced in values development, diversity awareness, and citizenship skills.	

Figure 2: Social Transformation From Charity to Justice: Empowerment and Politicization of Students, Teaching, and Learning

2. *Are students required to examine whether and how their service work helps to address the root causes of the problem?* It seems to us that this is the major distinction between charity and justice work, with the latter confronting the structural or institutional causes that place people in poverty or need. Although charity work may be quite effective at treating the symptoms of a problem, it may innocently overlook or perhaps even studiously ignore the underlying causes. This is often referred to as placing Band-Aids on hemorrhaging wounds and ignoring the source of the hemorrhage. Granted, such Band-Aids are needed to prevent the victims from bleeding to death, and we have no intention of disparaging those who do this work. The danger lies in equating this type of service with solving the problem.

We can explain these dangers through the use of another widely cited service parable. This one has its roots in African folklore and illustrates the adage that it takes a village to raise a child. In this parable, a swiftly running river is an asset to the village, which sets itself up near the river's banks. However, from time to time, babies get swept away by the river, and the entire village must work together to rescue the baby. Over time, the villagers may become well organized at undertaking such rescues, and they may even decide to post a lookout to watch

the river and to alert the villagers when a rescue effort is needed. Clearly, such a coordinated rescue effort is needed, and no one would disagree that saving babies from drowning is a most valuable use of the village's resources. However, if the villagers pursue no further actions and believe that they have solved the baby-drowning problem, they are not only mistaken, but they have doomed themselves to forever having to rescue babies. What they need to do in addition to organizing well their baby-rescuing efforts is to determine how it is that the babies are getting into the river in the first place and take steps to prevent it from happening. But if they believe that they have solved the problem or if they have expended as many of their available resources as they can afford in organizing the rescue activities, then they will never address the ultimate causes. Babies will forever be at risk, and although a good number of them might be saved by the village's efficient rescue efforts, future babies will continue to be at risk of drowning and some number of rescues will fail. The social justice approach dictates that we expend some of our resources on determining the causes (finding out how the babies are getting or being thrown in the river in the first place) and how to change these causes. One of the ironies of the United States being such a rich nation is that we have come to believe that we can afford to undertake such individual rescue efforts and ignore the prior question of causality. Obviously, this is less cost-effective in the long run, however, than if we altered the problem at its roots, thereby preventing people from being placed in crisis situations in the first place.

3. Does the service learning encourage students to see that the shortcomings of individuals in need are not the sole cause of the problems that service-learning activities attempt to address? If students' causal explanation of a social problem such as poverty, illiteracy, or homelessness points to flaws or weaknesses in individuals' characteristics, it is quite likely that they have missed entirely the social justice dimension of the problem. This indicates a failure of the reflection and social analysis that should accompany students' service learning (Marullo, 1999). This is one of the real challenges of linking charity and social justice work; whereas the assistance to those in need usually goes to the individual or family (and charity work rightly directs assistance to them at the individual level), the cause of their problem resides in institutional or societal operations. We get so caught up in the overwhelming and endless needs of the individuals who present themselves to charitable organizations that we do not have the time, energy, or resources left to step back and look at the underlying causes.

Charity work, well done, provides the needed resources and enables the recipient to move on from there with dignity. But the service provider inevitably notes the differences between the donors and the recipients and is tempted to attribute causality to such differences. This is in fact a key element of our capitalist ideology—that individuals are responsible for whatever life circumstances in which they find themselves. Racism, sexism, classism, and heterosexism indeed

rely on such assumptions of causality, asserting that people of color, women, the poor, and sexual minorities are responsible for whatever disadvantages they might face because of their actions, behaviors, or (lack of) effort. For example, if the volunteers at a soup kitchen are White, suburban church members and the patrons of the soup kitchen are African American, inner-city residents, the volunteers may begin to explain the poverty of the patrons in terms of their race and their geographic location. It is then but a short step in the capitalist ideology-driven rationalization process to infer that poor, inner-city Blacks must be lazy, unskilled, or do not want to work. The larger social problem is thus “explained” in the volunteer’s mind on the basis of the characteristics of the recipients and the volunteer’s understanding of how employment, income, effort, and qualifications are related.

From such a limited perspective, the next logical step is to address the problem thus defined by enhancing the patron’s job worthiness through programs such as job training, increasing résumé-writing skills, or improving the attitude of the nonemployed. Such individual-based programs may in fact be successful in terms of improving the chances of the participants getting a job or becoming economically self-sufficient. However, if we fail to alter the economy, which routinely maintains a surplus labor force of 6 to 10 million people and pays poverty-level wages to one fifth of those who are working, then we are merely reshuffling who among the lower classes will be in such programs at any given moment. As soon as these individually based programs move one person or family off of assistance (whether private charity or public welfare), there is another to replace them. To continue with our analogy of teaching a person to fish, providing the fishing pole and knowledge of bait and casting techniques will, most likely, increase the person’s ability to feed oneself through fishing. But if there are too few fish in the lake for all of those fishing to catch enough fish to feed themselves and their families, then we will be forced to provide better and more fishing equipment and know-how to others who were previously able to catch adequate fish to feed themselves but now find themselves unable to do so. Such a process virtually ensures that we will exhaust ourselves and the limited resources we have available for this purpose as we distribute ever more and better fishing poles and bait without ever ensuring that everyone will have sufficient fish to eat. Eventually, we start to blame the unsuccessful fishers for their failure to feed their families.

The social justice perspective applied to this parable indicates that we need to address several structural matters, such as ensuring that there are adequate stocks of fish in the lake, restocking and/or conserving the supply of fish, restricting people who are overfishing the lake by taking out more fish than they know what to do with, and ensuring that we are not polluting the lake so that it is not capable of sustaining an adequate fish population. Applying these insights to our real-world social problems of poverty, unemployment, hunger, and homelessness, we can see that the structural causes of these problems lie in the way the economy operates, the manner in which wage levels are set, and the market-

based distribution of survival essentials such as food and shelter. Unless we assure that there are sufficient numbers of jobs that pay adequate wages for all potential and current workers, and there is a sufficient supply of housing, then individually based programs are doomed to failure. Worse yet, such futility creates volunteer burnout, donor dry up, and overall cynicism that is likely to produce a blame-the-victim mentality that justifies cutting back such efforts or doing nothing to address these problems. The rollback of the welfare state during the past quarter century and the disintegration of public support needed to sustain it can be understood by this failure in our popular culture to understand the structural causes of poverty.

QUESTIONS ABOUT INSTITUTIONAL OPERATIONS AND TRANSFORMATION

4. Are the institutional operations of the university-community partnerships organized in such a way as to support and sustain the collaborative efforts of faculty, students, and community members? It is clear that the collaborative research and teaching activities described by the authors in our two-issue set took a good deal of time to establish and required expenditures of effort in ways that are not routine within either the university or community organization. Such efforts required to achieve institutional change are unlikely to be maintained by sizable numbers of participants over the long haul unless the operating norms and rewards systems are altered to accommodate such activities. Of course, there are likely to always be a small number of individuals who will engage in such transformative efforts regardless of the personal costs imposed on them—in return for which we might label them as heroes, rebels, saints, martyrs, lunatics, prophets, or revolutionaries—but for such initiatives to succeed, there needs to be a critical mass of individuals so engaged. This suggests that such activities need to be supported by the organizations of which they are a part through the various rewards systems that operate within and the norms that define such behavior as acceptable and desirable.

A number of challenges mitigate against the successful establishment of such university-community collaborations. Even among people of good intentions that enjoy rhetorical support from their institutions, there are dramatic differences in the subcultures and operating procedures of universities and community-based organizations and likely differences in the race, class, and educational backgrounds of the individuals who need to work together on a regular basis. As Wallace (1999 [this issue]) points out, the academic calendar of three or four distinct time blocks per year, with wholesale student turnover for each quarter or semester and few students available during summers and break periods, does not correspond to the community's more continuous level of service needs.³ Problem definitions, measures of success, and sense of urgency are likely to differ depending on one's institutional setting. The rewards and

incentives for faculty, as discussed in the article by Bringle, Games, Ludlum, Osgood, and Osborne (1999 [this issue]) and in the previous issue by Stoecker (1999) and Nickman and Keele (1999), are not only typically nonsupportive of such community-based teaching and research but may actually work as disincentives to professionally punish those so engaged. From the community agency perspective, to have staff members engage in roles such as educating university students, designing research studies with university faculty collaborators, analyzing underlying structural causes of problems, empowering clients, and advocating for political change might be seen as a diversion from one's real job responsibilities, likely to be defined in terms of services delivery.

The academic reward system, as we have already noted, values most highly the science of discovery and offers fewer incentives for faculty to engage in the scholarships of application, integration, and pedagogy. How to alter this reality poses a considerable challenge for which our authors provide only modest suggestions. Having senior faculty and administrators engaged in community-based intellectual work lobby their colleagues to alter the factors weighed in merit reviews and tenure and promotion considerations is a first step. Creating faculty development opportunities to encourage such work, service-learning offices to support the work, and earmarked grants programs to allow the time for such collaborations to evolve are also needed. The development of faculty portfolios that articulate goals, assessment strategies, and performance measures represents an alternative mechanism through which faculty members establish criteria on which their work will be judged but which is tied to the community in addition to the discipline. The glaring omission in each of these alternatives is the lack of community voice in evaluating what is important and valued to the community. With respect to teaching, there is no mechanism for assessing the impact that the course had on the development of the whole student, particularly the student as citizen, as political participant, and as moral agent of change. Paralleling this is the lack of rewards and incentive systems for community partners in such collaborations, rewarding them for the educator, researcher, analyst, advocate, and empowerment roles they fill (see Figure 3 for a summary of these issues).

Finally, lest we be naive in our consideration of obstacles, we must consider the political power of intentional opposition to such change efforts. Institutional elites currently benefiting from the status quo have a self-interest in opposing such transformational initiatives and possess considerable resources with which to do so. Students who aspire to be successful within current institutional frameworks will similarly resist educational initiatives that threaten to undermine the status quo or limit their chances of individual success. And, as McKnight (1996) so clearly articulates, even the helping professions and agency personnel charged with assisting those in need have developed institutional practices and professional reward systems that in fact disempower their clients. Formulating effective political change strategies that build on local initiatives yet contribute to large-scale political and economic change remains a major challenge to movements seeking greater social justice.

<i>What We Know</i>	<i>What We Need to Know</i>
Faculty rewards and incentives need to change to accommodate sustained scholarship of engagement.	What are the most effective means of changing institutional rewards systems? Is top-down change effective? Can bottom-up change lead to university-wide change?
Faculty need training and support to develop courses and research based in the community.	What are the most effective ways to support faculty's continued development?
To address real community problems, faculty need to develop reliable community partners and interdisciplinary approaches.	What forms of evaluation can be used to assess effective community-based research and teaching?
Community-based work cannot be sustained as an add-on but should be part of a complete and connected, integrated faculty life.	Even if professional education becomes more problem and community oriented, how do we ensure that community needs take precedence over professional self-interest?
Faculty roles, research methods, and theoretical frameworks are different in community-based research.	
There needs to be a reallocation of resources to sustain such work—it cannot rely on the vagaries of soft-money support.	

Figure 3: Social Transformation With Respect to Faculty, Research, and Disciplines

5. *Does the university-community collaboration build community, increase social capital, and enhance diversity?* Each of these outcomes are just and desirable and should be by-products of any university-community collaboration. In addition, these desired goals should inform the operating procedures and strategies of volunteer organizations. Precisely how a given organization attempts to achieve these goals needs to be determined by the leadership and members of the organization, but discussing these goals in itself is a social good. Progressives, educators, and social activists have a key role in this intraorganizational discussion to ensure that the organization's activities abide by the following principles:

- The population being served should have a determinative role in all decision making.
- Community residents should be empowered to do as much of the work as its resources allow.
- The resources of the community should be developed and expanded as a top priority (taking precedence over the enrichment or gains experienced by the volunteers).
- The social, civic, and political participation skills of clients and volunteers should be enriched for the purpose of expanding the greater collective good.
- The problem solving, critical thinking, organizational know-how, and communication skills of volunteers and clients should be developed.

- Participants should operate within small groups that are diverse; getting to know and respect others occurs best when people with different characteristics work together face to face toward a common goal.

Presently, we are fortunate that the younger generation is comfortable with and experienced in undertaking community service. According to the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) National Seniors Survey, nearly three fourths of graduating high school seniors report having done at least some volunteer work during high school (Astin, 1998). This number is likely to grow as increasing numbers of schools and states implement service requirements as a graduation requirement. However, we run the risk of turning well-intentioned young people into cynics and burnouts if we do not heed the warnings raised above. Furthermore, if we ignore the goals of enhancing community, social capital, and diversity, we forego one of the best potential educational processes available to us to teach values and more fully realize grassroots democracy. In their private, everyday lives, young people are surrounded by a culture that promotes individual consumption, unabashed pursuit of self-interest, achievement for self-enrichment, and a homogenization of standards. Cornel West (1993) has called this a culture of nihilism—the unbridled pursuit of property, power, and pleasure. Yet all our anthropological and sociological research demonstrates the need for values such as altruism and mutual support for human survival, our reliance on networks of others to sustain ourselves and achieve our goals, and the richness and progress of social life due to differences. Participation in community service that is guided by the social justice principles of community, social capital development, and diversity is an effective means of countering the excessively individualized, nihilistic cultural values of U.S. society. (Figure 4 summarizes the findings related to university-community collaboration.)

6. Do educational institutions operate their community partnership programs in accord with social justice principles? Community service programs are promoted or sponsored by virtually all Roman Catholic schools, many other private schools, and by increasing numbers of public schools. Most community colleges and 4-year colleges and universities support community service activities, ranging from rhetorical support as part of the institution's mission statement to active promotion by the institution's presidents through their membership in the national Campus Compact.⁴ The question posed here is whether these educational institutions provide adequate intellectual and developmental support for these activities.

At the most basic level, we must ensure that the educational institution is not merely using the community as a social laboratory with human guinea pigs whom students can go out and look at, prod, and snicker at as they “learn” about social problems in the classroom. This is the community service equivalent of the Hippocratic oath: First, do no harm to the community. Beyond that, the university must enter into partnerships with community actors, ceding authority

<i>What We Know</i>	<i>What We Need to Know</i>
Long-term sustainable partnerships entail sharing resources and expertise, creating a rough parity of partners.	What are the effective exchange mechanisms that will sustain partnerships for the long term? For example, are technical agreements and joint contracts durable? Will shared personnel work? Can we establish virtual funding to pay community members as coteachers and allow it to be used to pay for college credits?
Community partners need to be empowered to participate in decisions affecting them.	What are the strengths and weaknesses of various institutional partnership arrangements? For example, are social welfare agencies viable partners, or are they part of the disempowerment process oppressing the poor?
The academic calendar is not conducive to addressing urgent issues confronting the community or establishing enduring relationships.	How can the short-term effects be sustained over the long haul (especially when 3- to 5-year grant cycles expire)?
Such partnerships need to be grounded in the context and history of place, building on links already in place and addressing urgent needs as defined by the community.	Could a national service program be built to achieve such transformational goals?
National policies can have immediate and powerful short-term effects on building such collaborations and effecting change at the local level.	How do we ensure that community resources are not co-opted to enhance faculty's research and students' learning interests more than benefiting the community's empowerment interests?

Figure 4: Social Transformation With Respect to University and Community Relationship

and control to the community partners as needed to provide sufficient equality among the partners to ensure that the needs of and protections for the service recipients are granted highest priority. In fulfilling its educational mission toward the students, the institution must provide not only material and logistical support to facilitate the students' service but also the supportive environment for the students to reflect on and analyze their volunteer work. Some of the ways in which the educational institution can best support this work are

- orienting the volunteers to the service work that they will be undertaking, including an introduction to the larger social issues surrounding their work and sensitivity training regarding the diversity issues they are likely to encounter;
- providing a framework for observing and reflecting on the volunteer work that the students undertake;
- raising the values questions and justice issues (the preceding Questions 1-5) that enable the students to develop their own values choices, citizenship skills, social capital, compassion, and empathy;
- posing the structural questions of causality and exploring alternative solutions; and
- providing multiple venues for participation that support social change.

Ideally, some of this support work should be done within the formal curriculum of the institution. Service-learning programs accomplish this linkage, providing the intellectual and academic book learning and classroom discussion needed to help students explore these issues. Unfortunately, there are not nearly enough of these model service-learning programs or courses in operation to support the volunteer work of the vast majority of students who do community service. All educational institutions that support community service should have an advisory body consisting of community partners, students, and teachers/professors to ensure that these issues are addressed adequately. The work of the Campus Compact, Campus Outreach Opportunity League (COOL), the Invisible College, the American Association for Higher Education, and the National Society for Experiential Education supports educational institutions in their efforts to link their service activities with supportive contexts to best promote students' learning.⁵ Even outside of the classroom, however, the adults responsible for administering the service program—whether they are found in campus ministry, student affairs, counselors' offices, sports teams' offices, or wherever—should assume the responsibility for raising the issues discussed here.

CONCLUSION

Gandhi taught that it is not enough to do the right thing for the wrong reasons. One's reasons for doing good works must also be good. Many pragmatically minded readers might question this position, as do some of our community service-engaged students and colleagues. Their argument would be that one's motives for doing service do not matter as long as the hungry person is being fed or the homeless person is being sheltered. They reason that even service for purely selfish motives (e.g., enhancing one's résumé, fulfilling a graduation requirement, publishing a Curriculum Vitae-enhancing article, or just simply feeling better about oneself) provides those in need with something rather than nothing. The questions that we posed above help to illustrate why Gandhi's dictum must be taken seriously. Quite apart from the insensitivity, disrespect, or indignity that might be imposed on those in need by volunteers operating on faulty motives, charity work that is not guided by social justice values will reproduce unjust structures and fail in the long run to stem the tide of injustice. If the service activity is not empowering the recipients, it further alienates those in need, separating them from their just place in society. If some portion of voluntary resources are not directed at solving the root causes of social problems, we exhaust our ability to create the social structures that operate for the greater good and create a permanent underclass. To the extent that we focus on changing individuals, we will end up blaming the victim and reinforcing invidious distinctions amongst us (Ryan, 1971). If we fail to invest in the collective goods of community, social capital, and diversity, we will be confronted with the Hobbesian world of war of all against all. If we do not advance the politicization of our

students and the social change agenda of the university-community collaborative, then we socialize our students to accept statuses in institutions that generate inequalities unjustly and reinforce cultural beliefs regarding the immutability of such problems. And if we fail to alter the university-community institutional operating systems, then we doom such collaborative efforts to limited duration and failure.

As educators and community leaders, we must channel the vast resources of volunteerism toward social change for a more just society. To forego this opportunity would represent a squandering of vast resources and even greater potential. More ominously, if we do not address these issues, we run the risk of allowing the defenders of the status quo to define all collective action as futile and to define communal values and goals as quaint anachronisms at best or even evil, thereby further disempowering ordinary people. University-community collaborative efforts afford us opportunities we cannot afford to miss: (a) helping to develop community service volunteers into social justice activists and (b) transforming institutions of higher education into agents of social transformation. The authors in these two issues have described pioneering efforts toward these ends. We challenge ourselves and our readers to take Stoecker's (1999) advice "to think about the possibilities, give it a shot, and learn from it" (p. 846).

NOTES

1. We have no intention of taking cheap shots at charity work or setting up a "straw person" to serve as a whipping post for the sake of this argument. It is not our intention to disparage those who do volunteer charity work or discourage them from doing so. It is our hope, however, that those so involved can be transformed into undertaking social change work.

2. Occasionally, a single meal or limited intervention is all that is needed, for example, in response to natural disasters. This type of charity work—providing temporary assistance in the wake of natural or human disasters—is not the focus of this discussion. Such charitable assistance will always be needed, even in a just, utopian social system.

3. With respect to youth programming, there is even greater need during the summer and school break periods for support, but this is a time when university students and faculty are most difficult to engage, given the current academic calendar.

4. The Campus Compact is a membership organization of community college, college, and university presidents who have committed their institutions to support community and public service as part of their mission. It was founded in 1986 by the presidents of Brown, Georgetown, and Stanford universities. Since then, it has grown to more than 600 member institutions, and it organizes semiannual conferences of university presidents to promote their agenda.

5. Additional information about these organizations can be attained by contacting them directly: Campus Compact, Box 1975, Brown University, Providence, RI, 02912-1975, e-mail: campus@compact.org (regarding institutional/presidential commitment); COOL, 1101 15th Street, NW, Suite 203, Washington, D.C. 20005, e-mail: homeoffice@COOL2SERVE.org (student association); Invisible College, Georgetown University, 306 New North, Washington, DC 20057-1131; e-mail: guerinj@gusun.georgetown.edu (faculty support network); American Association for Higher Education, 1 Dupont Circle, Suite 360, Washington, D.C. 20036-1110, e-mail: info@aahe.org (professional association); NSEE, 3509 Haworth Drive, Suite 207, Raleigh, NC 27609-7229, e-mail: nsee@interpath.com (professional association).

REFERENCES

- Astin, A. W. (1998). The changing American college student. *Review of Higher Education, 21*(2), 115-135.
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professorate*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Bringle, R. G., Games, R., Ludlum, C., Osgood, R., & Osborne, R. (1999). Faculty Fellows program: Enhancing integrated professional development through community service. *American Behavioral Scientist, 42*, 882-894.
- Edwards, B., & Foley, M. W. (Eds.). (1997a). Social capital, civil society and contemporary democracy. *American Behavioral Scientist, 40*, 547-677.
- Edwards, B., & Foley, M. W. (1997b). Social capital and the political economy of our discontent. *American Behavioral Scientist, 40*, 669-678.
- Edwards, B., & Foley, M. W. (Eds.). (1998). Beyond Tocqueville: Civil society and social capital in comparative perspective. *American Behavioral Scientist, 42*, 1-139.
- PLEASE CITE IN TEXT OR DELETE Edwards, B., & Marullo, S. (Eds.). (1999). Universities in troubled times—Institutional responses. *American Behavioral Scientist, 42*, 743-901.
- Foley, M. W., & Edwards, B. (1997). Escape from politics? Social theory and the social capital debate. *American Behavioral Scientist, 40*, 549-560.
- Kahne, J., & Westheimer, J. (1996). In the service of what? The politics of service-learning. *Phi Delta Kappan, 77*(9), 593-599.
- Lynton, E. (1995). *Making the case for professional service*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Marullo, S. (1999). Sociology's essential role—Promoting critical thinking in service-learning. In J. Ostrow, G. Hesser, & S. Enos (Eds.), *Cultivating the sociological imagination: Concepts and models for service-learning in sociology* (pp. 11-27). Washington, DC: Association for Advancement of Higher Education.
- McKnight, H. (1996). *The careless society: Community and its counterfeits*. New York: Basic Books.
- Rice, R. E. (1991). The new American scholar. *Metropolitan Universities, 1*(4), 7-18.
- Ryan, W. 1971. *Blaming the victim*. New York: Random House.
- Schomberg, S., & Farmer, J. (1994). The evolving concept of public service and implications for rewarding faculty. *Continuing Higher Education Review, 58*(3), 122-140.
- Stoecker, R. (1999). Are academics irrelevant? Roles for scholars in participatory research. *American Behavioral Scientist, 42*, 834-848.
- Wallace, J. (1999). A popular education model for college in community. *American Behavioral Scientist, 42*, 756-766.
- West, C. (1993). *Race matters*. New York: Random House.