



Service Learning: What Faculty Can Learn from the Theory of Coordinated Management of Meaning

Carolyn Kim, Biola University

Abstract:

The idea that education is enhanced through a fusion with real-world community experience that challenges students to integrate theory with application, known as service learning, has taken hold in the academic community. Service learning (SL) challenges educators to integrate projects into a community context directly with course objectives that produce measurable learning outcomes. This paper will examine SL through the lens of the theory of Coordinated Management of Meaning (CMM) in order to provide faculty with insights into curriculum integration and application within the educational process. Findings indicate that, by viewing SL through the theory of CMM, faculty are able to better understand the role in creating meaning for students before SL begins, formulate action that directly relates to academic outcomes and student development, reflect on the process to facilitate the creation of stories and provide measurable results of the learning experience.

The idea that education is enhanced through a fusion with real-world community experience that challenges students to integrate theory with application, known as service learning, has taken hold in the academic community (Gallini & Moely, 2003; Kraft, 1996; Oster-Aaland, Sellnow, Nelson & Pearson, 2007;). Service learning (SL) challenges educators to integrate projects into a community context with course objectives in order to produce measurable learning outcomes. The challenge has been not only defining the parameters of what constitutes SL, but also determining how educators can best implement SL as a pedagogical practice into curricula in effective ways (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996; Shumer & Belbas, 1996). Central to this tension of measurable outcomes interwoven with community based projects is understanding how students benefit from a SL proj-

ect in a manner that constitutes educational advancement toward course objectives, while also allowing instructors to successfully manage the implementation of SL projects, which can be quite time consuming and challenging (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996). This paper will examine SL through the lens of the theory of Coordinated Management of Meaning (CMM) in order to provide faculty with insights into curriculum integration and application within the educational process.

Student-run PR agencies on college campuses provide excellent examples of SL. In this context, students are provided the opportunity to engage the community by utilizing PR skills and expertise via projects for community clients. To truly be SL, however, and not simply a community-service effort, faculty must work closely with students and the com-

munity throughout the entire SL process, to ensure the academic objectives are connected to the service project. Students are brought together in the beginning of the course and introduced to the SL project for the semester where the client's background, need, and situation are all explained. Next, the students are tasked with engaging the client directly. Each week the students not only work with the client but also meet within the class to process the experience, understand how their involvement is influencing the client and community, and receive additional instruction that may enhance their SL experience. To finish the semester, the students typically launch their project for the client within the community. To close the semester out, students present their SL experience to the class and faculty as a means of processing the academic and community learning that took place throughout the course.

An example of SL from Biola University involved the student-run PR agency working with the Union Rescue Mission (URM) in downtown Los Angeles. The students worked with URM on their annual Thanksgiving outreach meal event provided to thousands of homeless individuals living on Skid Row by engaging volunteers, the public and reporters through social media. At the start of the semester, the students were provided with an objective for the SL project as well as tools from the faculty and URM to use for this Thanksgiving event. Throughout the semester the students met with each other on a weekly basis, the client multiple times, and during class to process and discuss the project. In November the students launched the event and saw first hand how PR can have a very real influence on societal issues such as homelessness. This provided an academic component by allowing their education to directly connect to the project. However, SL is about more than simply academic education. It is also about transformation of students as they find their place in society and have a broadening of perspective regarding culture. This experience put a face on homelessness for the students involved. Homelessness was humanized—no longer just an “issue” but real people who were tangibly impacted by the students’ service. By using social media to gain awareness for URM and the community URM serves, the PR students bridged their academic and professional goals with the society around them. The awareness gained provided the potential for more donations, more volunteers and additional resources that would be used to help those whom the students met. In the

end, the students presented the entire project to the class and others at Biola University. Students from the team consistently expressed not only their increased understanding of PR, which reflects the educational component of SL, but also their increased connection and understanding of the city’s homeless population and their ability to help as a fellow human and member of society. The focus of SL, therefore, is immersing students in an educational experience with a community in a way that weaves together the societal, educational and psychological understanding of the student’s place as a human and professional within their world.

Literature Review

Development of Service Learning

The term service learning is credited to Robert Sigmon and William Ramsey and dates back to 1967 (Giles & Eyler, 1994, p. 2). While Sigmon and Ramsey are attributed with coming up with the term “service learning,” the Citizenship Education Project (CEP) of the 1950s is noted as the catalyst that began the focus on “active learning” and “community studies” (Kraft, 1996, p. 134). In the years that followed SL’s initial introduction to the academic community, multiple scholars set out to create a uniform definition of SL. These endeavors resulted in Kendall’s (1990) review of literature that found 147 different definitions. A core component of the quest for a uniform definition is identifying the differences between SL, Volunteerism and Community-Based learning. Kraft (1996) explains:

Volunteering alone generally is differentiated from service learning by having an emphasis on service without a formal, structured learning component. Community-Based learning also involves learning that occurs out in the community through outdoor education, field trips, internships, or apprenticeships, but it generally does not involve any service component. (p. 136)

Providing further clarification, the Commission on National and Community Services identified four definitional components to service learning:

1. Participation in actual community needs
2. Integration into students’ academic curriculum
3. Provision of opportunity to use new skills and knowledge in the students’ personal communities and
4. An enhancement of what is taught within the

classroom in a real-world setting. (Kraft, 1996, p. 136)

Additionally, the Johnson Foundation issued 10 principles to assist faculty in creating SL programs, explaining:

Service, combined with learning, adds value to each and transforms both. Those who serve and those who are served are thus able to develop the informed judgment, imagination, and skills that lead to a greater capacity to contribute to the common good. (Kraft, 1996, p. 137)

Pedagogy of Service Learning

Service learning is based on the idea that there is an educational component directly connected to performing acts of service within a community. John Dewey, whose philosophy is often credited with helping form the foundation of SL, explains that “for knowledge to be usable through recall and application, it has to be acquired in a situation; otherwise it is segregated from experience and is forgotten or not available for transfer to new situations” (Giles & Eyler, 1994, p. 79). It is, however, important to understand that the focus is not simply on the situation (community setting) but is also contingent on the educational component. That is why Dewey wrote, “The belief that all genuine education comes about through experience does not mean that all experiences are genuinely or equally educative” (Dewey, 1998, p. 13). The new focus on connecting education with action is what Boyer (1991) recognized when he made SL a core of “The New American College.” Boyer describes the “New American College” as “an institution that celebrates . . . its capacity to connect thought to action, theory to practice” (p. A48). The practice of taking education out into the world in a service setting has radically shifted the traditional approach to education. It has made the teacher “de-centered, facilitated problem-posing education as a model for dialogic search of knowledge” and has resulted in education becoming “a lifelong process carried forward by an individual provided with the proficiencies to be a self-directed learner” (Saltmarsh, 1996, p.15).

Dewey (1916) suggested that a self-directed learner is achieved through incremental learning that corresponds directly to the increased understandings of connections and perceptions with the world in which students are engaged (pp. 82-83). The pedagogical approach to learning that incorporates these connections is what Dewey (2008) defined as “action and doing on the one hand, and knowledge and

understanding on the other” (p. 107). This direct approach to action and education is why SL as a form of pedagogy has been considered especially dynamic for student learning (Vogelgesang & Astin, 2000).

Objectives of Service Learning

Faculty generally agree that the connection between in-class education and real-world application through SL provides value to students through the development of social, academic and interpersonal skills (Bannerjee & Hausafus, 2007; Oster-Aaland et al. , 2004). However, what is often missing in academic integration of SL is the reflective element central to the educational component (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996). It is the engagement of dialogue between the activity and connection to the focus of study that allows for the “potential for learning to broaden and deepen along academic, social, moral and civic dimensions” (Bringle & Hatcher, 1996, p. 112). It is these reflective experiences that bring to life the connection between the theory of a classroom lecture and the application of a student’s intended career focus and life as a citizen in culture (Bringle & Hatcher). Reflective projects, taking on many forms, include students’ journaling throughout an experience, in class opportunity to discuss perceptions of the experience, assigned reflective papers or class presentations. The main goal is to assist students with integrating their experience of SL back into the class and to process it within an applied educational focus.

Institutions that have integrated SL into their programs not only have the goal of achieving their academic objectives within courses but also seek to cultivate civic-minded students. Rockquemore & Shaffer (2000) identified three stages students typically experience within SL that requires careful planning and interaction on behalf of faculty in order to achieve both academic and civic goals. The first stage is shock at what they encounter in a SL situation. Often, SL takes place in lower income neighborhoods, poverty situations or in other locations with which students may be unfamiliar. Stage one is an important step in the SL process as it forces students to challenge their perceptions of reality, society and their role within each. The second stage is normalization, where students move from feeling that those they are serving are completely “other” to the point that they realize those they are interacting with are human beings just like them. One observation Rockquemore & Shaffer (2000) note is that many SL projects stop at the normalization phase, assuming that the full potential of

the experience has been reached. To the contrary, SL should continue until the students reach the engagement phase, where they begin to ask causal questions. The complete process, according to Rockquemore & Shaffer (2000), is what faculty should aim for: “For faculty using service-learning, the ultimate goal is for students to master course content in a way that meaningfully shapes their understanding of reality and impacts their worldview” (p.21).

As more programs begin implementing SL as a key component in their curriculum, faculty look for ways to enhance their courses, increase student learning and measure the outcome of SL initiatives. A key theory that provides a perspective on SL for faculty is The Coordinated Management of Meaning (CMM). To better understand the dimensions of CMM theory, it is helpful to examine its development.

The Coordinated Management of Meaning Theory

Pearce and Cronen (1980) are credited with the development of the Coordinated Management of Meaning theory. Essentially, CMM theory classifies interaction in two steps—first, assigning meaning to what is happening in the situation; and, second, acting based on the assigned meaning. The process of assigning meaning naturally leads to the creation of more meaning and more action (Littlejohn & Foss, 2012). Branham and Pearce (1985) explain the process:

Every communicative act is a text that derives meaning from the context of expectations and constraints in which it is experienced. At the same time, contexts are defined, invoked, and altered by text. Particular communicative acts simultaneously depend upon and reconstruct existing contexts. (p. 19)

The assertion is that communication is not really about a function or mechanized interaction, but a process that creates a unique meaning and “reality” for those who share that meaning (Cronen, 1995). Griffin (2000) suggests that this leads to co-created meaning that not only shapes a social reality for those involved but also actually leads to a changed world. The meaning that is created in the process of interaction naturally results in individuals taking actions that determine changes in the world. CMM has grown to not only be applied as a way to interpret contexts of situations but also as a way to “shift from interpretive to practical theory, in which CMM functions as a guide for practitioners . . .” (Pearce & Pearce, 2000, p. 406). The Coordinated Management of Meaning theory has been used to help explain how individu-

als can be brought into a mutual understanding and move forward with a common perception because of interaction that results in a new co-creation of meaning (Pearce, 2005; Pearce & Cronen, 1980).

Meaning and Action in CMM Theory

The premise of CMM is not only that “meaning affects action and action affects meaning” but also those individuals must coordinate their actions with others in an interactive process of communication (Littlejohn & Foss, 2011). In order to explain communication, CMM uses the concept of “rules” that govern interaction; that is, rules of meaning and rules of action (Littlejohn, 2009). Rules of meaning are the guidelines that allow individuals to know what something represents. For example, when someone says, “I’m down with that,” there are a couple ways someone might apply the rule of meaning. It could mean the individual is agreeable with an idea; it could also mean that the person has come down with an illness. Once the rule of meaning is applied, individuals use rules of action to determine the next step (Pearce & Cronen, 1980). In the above example, depending on the meaning assigned to the interaction, the responder may offer to bring chicken soup over or may decide that they will go ahead and act on the idea that was being discussed (Littlejohn, 2009). The result of an individual applying meaning and choosing a rule of action is what is known as “logical force.” Littlejohn & Foss (2011) explain, “Because people behave in a manner consistent with their rules, rules provide a logical force for acting in certain ways” (p. 212).

The concept of coordination within CMM is the idea that “two or more communicators organize their meanings and action into some kind of pattern that makes sense to them” (Littlejohn, 2009, p. 202). However, the term does not only apply to the interaction between communicators. It also applies to the internal process that individuals go through in order to understand the interaction between meaning and action: “The degree to which persons perceive that their actions have fitted together into some mutually intelligible sequence or pattern of action” (Philipsen, 1995, p. 18). Thus, CMM can give insight not only to the group process of communicating meaning and action, but also to an individual’s understanding of meaning and action in a social context.

The entire process of coordinating meaning through the use of rules applied to contexts produce what is known as a “story” in the CMM theory. The telling of stories between communicators produces a

“shared coherence or mutual understanding” (Littlejohn & Foss, 2012, p. 214). There are “six dimensions” included in the concept of stories in CMM, represented by the acronym LUUUTT: “stories Lived, stories Untold, stories Unheard, stories Unknown, stories Told, and story Telling” (Littlejohn, 2009, p. 202). The value of story telling is the shared understanding or cohesion that then exists between meaning and action for individuals. This shared cohesion allows people to understand the social realities in which they live and interact, and provides for the opportunity to understand how experiences connect to deeper meanings and actions. “Coordinated meaning” within CMM provides the context within which to understand the connection between SL and higher education.

Coordinated Meaning in Service Learning

Understanding the role of meaning within CMM allows faculty members to better coordinate and evaluate the SL experience. Three areas where meaning is especially important within the SL process are within the academic experience, the student community and the service context.

The Academic Experience

Because of the long history of volunteerism within American culture, SL is sometimes discredited as legitimate educational pedagogy. While this discrediting of SL within academics is changing, it is important that educators establish the meaning of SL for students within the academic context so as to afford them the most value out of the process. Faculty should create a clear connection of meaning between the SL activity and core objectives of the course. Findings indicate that for SL to be most beneficial, students should have a strong interest in the subject matter. The interest of a student and relation to a strong SL experience is one significant reason why courses within a student’s major should incorporate SL within key learning objectives (Astin, Vogelgesang, Ikeda, Yee, 2000). Additionally, students should be introduced to the overall academic value that participation in SL has on education, including enhanced academic performance, higher GPA and better writing skills (Eyler, Giles, Stenson, & Gray, 2001; Markus, Howard, & King, 1993). By providing meaning of the experience, both in terms of the area of study and the overall value to the student, SL in the academic context becomes a rich academic process for students. Beyond the educational meaning of SL, however, there is also the meaning for the student community.

Student Community

A primary reason institutions implement SL is the cultivation of civic mindedness among students; it is key to provide a context for the interpersonal process that occurs within SL. Students will be introduced to unfamiliar situations and, potentially, placed in a context that generates a great deal of discomfort (Rockquemore & Schaffer, 2000; Schumer & Belbas, 1996; Yeh, 2010;). It is important that faculty help provide the foundation for SL experience prior to engaging in a SL process. Students should be encouraged by the fact that SL experience tends to cultivate stronger self-awareness, deeper appreciation of diversity, both racially and economically, and a greater understanding of individual values (Hatcher, Bringle, & Muthiah, 2004; Hoxmeier, Lenk McCarthy & Tucker, 1998; Parker & Dautoff, 2007). By understanding the meaning behind these experiences as an individual, students will be better prepared for the actual process of SL. Finally, the meaning of the service context is central to the success of a SL initiative.

Service Context

The context in which students participate in SL is crucial for the educator. Rather than simply explaining the academic aspect and interpersonal components, the background on the community being served and the role it plays in society allows for a broader educational experience to take place (Hatcher & Bringle, 1999; Papamarcos, 2005). By understanding not only the context of the service, but also the direct connection of their role and potential future participation with the community being served, students are able to contextualize the experience as a holistic educational process rather than simply a course assignment that takes place in the community. It moves from being about the individual student and a class, to being about membership in society and focus on the overall good of the community within an academic context (Gallini & Moely, 2003; Yeh, 2010). After coordinating meaning utilizing the CMM theory, students are able to engage in action that has direct application to their educational objectives while also experiencing growth as individuals and contributing to the betterment of society.

Action in Service Learning

As faculty coordinate meaning within the class context, students are better quipped to understand what they should do in the SL experience. There are two categories of actions that are helpful for educators to

consider: Academic Actions and Student Action.

Academic Action

SL that is tied directly to course objectives should have tangible and defined assignments that allow for measurable learning outcomes. When students are told the meaning of SL and how it connects with their academic instruction, there must be course components that enforce this concept. Assignments should allow students to actively reflect on their experiences. Saltmarsh (1996) explains, "Without fostering reflective thinking, learning cannot move beyond conditioning, beyond the classroom, beyond formal education. Without reflection on activity, the connection between thought and action is dissipated and the ability to formulate further action is lost..." (p. 18). Reflection is a vital part for faculty to integrate into the academic experience for students. It is the bridge that links the value of SL and experiences gained into the context of an academic discipline (Bringle & Hatcher,). The required action by students in the academic process, then, not only helps to formulate a direct connection between academic assignments and SL, but also leads into further development of meaning about the experience as a student reflects on the process. This is where the education inside of a classroom takes root within a student's mind. It is the fact that "an experience...is capable of generating and carrying any amount of theory (or intellectual content), but a theory apart from an experience cannot be definitively grasped as a theory" (Dewey, 1916, p. 169). Students have reported that the process of engaging in reflection, not only at the end of a SL project, but throughout, gives them greater academic understanding regarding course content (Eyler et al., 2001; Galini & Moely, 2003). Academic Action is not the only element to consider in a SL program, however. Action that builds the interpersonal qualities of the individuals is also central.

Student Action

Action within SL is a key component for student growth. It is an opportunity for them to expand in their ability to work on teams (Hoxmeier et al., 1998; Papamarcos, 2005), develop an understanding of others that they might never engage with regularly (Yeh, 2010), and also allows them to appreciate the place they have in the academic and societal community (Astin et al., 2000; Boyer, 1991; Eyler et al. 2001). Some of the actions that are especially beneficial for students in a SL context include directly engaging in dialogue with those they are serving (Hatcher &

Bringle, 1999; Papamarcos, 2005). When students do not have the opportunity to have direct engagement, not only does that academic value diminish, but it also limits the individual's growth as a member of society. The SL process is not only about understanding an academic connection to a real-world context, but also about developing an understanding of humanity and one's role within it. If interaction within the community is limited, the student's understanding of their role in the community and civic responsibility will be equally as limited. Students need the opportunity to not only engage with their academic discipline in a community setting, but also with the community that they are serving. It is not only about the action but also about the interaction with others outside of the class participating. A second action that is important for SL and students is initiative within teams and problem solving. Interpersonal skills are greatly developed within a SL context as students are forced to engage as a team or seek out answers that extend beyond a textbook and into a communication process (Galini & Moely, 2003; Schumer & Belbas, 1996). Both the action in terms of an academic context and an individual student's development are important to keep in mind as faculty prepare SL initiatives. There are many applications that can be drawn based on the integration of CMM with SL.

Discussion

The theory of Coordinated Management of Meaning creates a process by which faculty can understand the integration of SL as a pedagogical tool. The CMM process can be understood by looking at the coordination, rules, and stories produced within SL and the impact it has on academic outcomes.

Coordination with Academic Objectives and Measurable Results

The concept of coordinated meaning within CMM is not only relatable to the environment within which a faculty member engages a student, but also to the way a student processes the experience and assigns meaning. Faculty members should consider crafting courses not only to foster dialog that allows the educator to directly engage the experience a student is having within the SL project, but also to encourage students to individually process through the experience and articulate their own perspectives. There are several applications of the idea of coordinated meaning that might be applicable to course assignments. For example, reflection papers followed by a group discussion

allow each student to coordinate their own meaning of the experience, followed by a group interaction that may refine, clarify or enhance a student's perception of the process. Additionally, having students present on their SL project allows the entire class to engage in understanding that individual's perception of the experience, while providing an opportunity for others to ask questions, offer feedback, and dialogue about the overall experience of the class. Evaluation of these in-class projects would include rubrics that incorporate academic theory, terms and principles, while integrating application in the real-world context of the SL experience. Faculty need to have a clear measurement tool, such a course project or paper with a defined rubric, in order to provide tangible evidence of student learning outcomes. Faculty have a strong opportunity through assignments to coordinate meaning by sharing information that can help students shape and define their experience in light of the academic information presented in class.

Rules in CMM Theory

Rules within the CMM theory apply both to the meaning and the action students engage with throughout the process. The core assertion of CMM is that meaning leads to action and action leads to meaning. This is a critical idea to understand for faculty who are engaging in the SL process. When a course first begins, defining the meaning of SL for the course, student and community establishes "rules of meaning" that students use to determine their actions. This benefits students by preparing them to succeed in the course through the completion of assignments, as well as equipping them to understand how to act within the community during a SL experience. Students should be provided with clear guidelines on what is expected in order to exemplify learning through the process, how that relates to assignments throughout the course, and what measurements will be used to evaluate those experiences. Additionally, by having those understandings in place, students will be better equipped to understand what actions they should take in light of the SL experience. The actions students will then take, based on the faculty instruction in class, create a new wave of understanding about the academic discipline, as well as the role of SL. That is why the reflective process is so important in SL. Meaning in the class needs to lead to action in SL, which should return to the formation of meaning through reflection. An example of meaning in SL could be a course for introduction to

journalism that explains the meaning of investigative reporting in the life of the inner city. A faculty member could identify ways that reporters have uncovered hard truths that led to community change. As a result, the SL project could incorporate partnering with inner city projects to find the stories that are being untold. Students would engage with the community, discover the stories, and bring attention to important societal issues. Then, after completing the SL project, the faculty would facilitate a reflective project within the close of the course that allows students to process through the implications of the truth they discovered and the way it could alter society if they are able to utilize their discipline in order to address the issues. Based on the meaning that students obtain through a SL project, what it means for journalists to tell the untold stories of people who are being ignored, they are able to better understand the course material, as well as determine future actions, such as continued community engagement and professional objectives (Pearce, 2007; Saltmarsh, 1996).

Stories in CMM Theory

The process of coordinating the meaning and action of students throughout a SL process will result in stories. Each student will have a unique way of viewing how their meaning and action makes sense in light of their experiences. Ideally, faculty can facilitate dialogue that allows students to share their stories as they are forming thoughts throughout the process, but also to create a shared story that the class as a whole helps create. Individual reflection projects should include evaluation on both the individual's experience and the meaning for the group as a whole. These presentations provide another set of direct measurement for student learning within a SL context.

The stories students provide shape a course's reputation, a program's perception within a university and also students' expectations of SL within educational contexts. In order to facilitate the move from individual reflection and story formation into a story that applies to the class as a whole, faculty are challenged to create a mosaic of student experiences into one cohesive narrative. Some ways that faculty may consider incorporating reflection of student experiences is by developing a closing lecture that includes a presentation that categorizes the progress made throughout the semester academically, interpersonally and for the community by drawing in pieces of individual student work. Another approach may be to have students who have previously engaged in a SL project return to visit

the class near the end of a semester and share how their experiences connect them with the larger group of students who have experienced the SL process as well. Whatever the approach, the main goal is for students to realize their connection to a bigger framework, both in learning and within the community.

Conclusion

Service learning has incredible potential to broaden academic education by allowing for the connection of theory and practice. By viewing SL through the theory of Coordinated Management of Meaning (CMM), faculty are able to understand the role in creating meaning for students before SL begins, thereby formulating action that directly relates to academic outcomes and student development and reflecting on the process to facilitate the creation of stories. The determining factor when integrating SL is whether an academic objective is best served through the facilitation of SL or whether it is simply an experience that would not tie back to the educational goal of the course. If students are assigned projects in the community, but no other course component relates that experience back to the course or requires reflection on the process, the assignment is more similar to community-based learning or volunteerism than SL. However, if educators opt to create SL projects that facilitate the completion of course objectives, the value of melding action and theory for student retention and understanding is profound.

Limitations and Implications

This paper examined SL through the lens of CMM theory with limited treatment of John Dewey's philosophical framework. Further examination of the relationship between his philosophical frameworks in light of academic objectives would be beneficial. Additionally, the focus of Dewey on the development of civic individuals due to SL was not fully developed within this paper. Moreover, it would be helpful to employ a study that examines SL in its current status within higher education, particularly in relations to journalism or PR programs. The nature of these professions and the pre-professional engagement provided in many universities makes these ideal to examine through the lens of SL. While this study was a critical reflection on the theory and its history, it would have been beneficial to conduct a current case study analysis. While there are many studies on SL, most engage the concept as a whole rather than looking at institu-

tions with small programs. It would be beneficial to conduct additional research to determine the unique elements that faculty face in small programs and the personal perceptions and assumptions that students have which may influence the SL process.

As faculty grapple with the increasingly stringent measurements of learning outcomes and the strong encouragement to create holistic educational experiences within academic disciplines, SL is a natural focus for many programs. By understanding the necessity to coordinate the meaning and actions of students in relation to course content and SL, faculty will produce academic outcomes that are measurable and strategic. The purpose of education is not simply to help students finish a course but to equip them with knowledge and character that will enhance the future of the profession. SL bridges the students' in-class, theoretical work with real-world, tangible experiences. The powerful duo of knowledge and experience through SL allows faculty to journey with students as they are introduced to the way their academic discipline engages with society. It is through this pedagogical process that faculty remove the confines of learning from the four walls of a classroom and being to saturate a student's educational process directly with the world and culture through coordinated interaction and guided learning.

Carolyn Kim is an instructor at Biola University (correspondence: carolyn.kim@biolanull.edu).

References

- Astin, A., Vogelgesang, L., Ikeda, E., & Yee, J. (2000). *How service learning affects students*. University of California, Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute.
- Bangerjee, M., Hausafus, C. (2007). Faculty use of service-learning: Perceptions, motivations, and impediments for the human sciences. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 14(1), 32-45.
- Boyer, E. L. (1991). Creating the new American college. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. March 9, A41.
- Branham, R. & Pearce, B. (1985). Between text and context: Toward a rhetoric of contextual reconstruction. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 71, 19-36.
- Bringle, R. & Hatcher, J. (1996). Implementing

- service learning in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 67(2), 221-239.
- Bringle, R. & Hatcher, J. (1999). Reflection in service learning: Making meaning of experience. *Educational HORIZONS*, 77(4), 179-185.
- Cronen, V. E. (1995). Coordinated management of meaning: The consequentiality of communication and the recapturing of experience. In S. J. Sigman (Ed.), *The consequentiality of communication*, (pp. 17-66). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and Education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York: The MacMillan Company.
- Dewey, J. (1998). *Experience and education*. West Lafayette, IN: Kappa Delta Pi.
- Dewey, J. (2008). The moral development of the greeks. In J. A. Boydston, (Ed), *The later works, 1925-1953*. (pp. 99-111). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Eyler, J., Giles, D., Stenson, C., & Gray, C. (2001). *At a glance: What we know about the effects of service-learning on college students, faculty, institutions, and communities, 1993-2000*: Third Edition. The Corporation for National and Community Service.
- Gallini, S. & Moely, B. (2003). Service-learning and engagement, academic challenge, and retention. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 10(1), 5-14.
- Giles, D. & Eyler, J. (1994). The theoretical roots of service-learning in John Dewey: Toward a theory of service learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 1(1), 77-85.
- Griffin, E. (2011). *A first look at communication theory*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Hatcher, J., Bringle, R. & Muthiah, R. (2004). Designing effective reflection what matters to service-learning? *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 11(1), 38-46.
- Hoxmeier, J., Lenk, M., McCarthy, A., & Tucker, M. (1998). Community service learning increases communication skills across the business curriculum. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 61(2), 88-99.
- Kendall, J. C. & Associates. (1990). *Combining service and learning: A resource book for community and public service*. Vol II. Raleigh, NC: The National Society for Internships and Experiential Education.
- Kraft, R. (1996). Service learning: An introduction to its theory, practice, and effects. *Education and Urban Society*, 28(2), 131-159.
- Littlejohn, S. (2009). Coordinated management of meaning. In S. Littlejohn, & K. Foss (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of communication theory* (pp. 200-203) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage..
- Littlejohn, S. & Foss, K. (2011). *Theories of human communication*. Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.
- Markus, G. B., Howard, J. P. F., & King, D. C. (1993). Integrating community service and classroom instruction enhances learning: Results from an experiment. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 15(4) 410-419.
- Oster-Aaland, L., Sellnow, T., Nelson, P. & Pearson, J. (2004). The status of service learning in departments of communication: A follow-up study. *Communication Education*, 53(4), 348-356.
- Papamarcos, S. (2005). Giving traction to management theory: Today's service-learning. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 4(3), 325-335.
- Parker, B. & Dautoff, D. (2007). Service-Learning and study abroad: Synergistic learning opportunities. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 13(2), 40-53.
- Pearce, W. B. (2005). The coordinated management of meaning (CMM). In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Theorizing about intercultural communication*, (pp. 35-54). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pearce, W. B. (2007). *Making social worlds: A communication perspective*. Malden, MA. Oxford: Blackwell Pub.
- Pearce, W. B. & Cronen, V. E. (1980). *Communication, action and meaning: The creation of social realities*. New York: Praeger.
- Pearce, W. B. & Pearce, K. (2000). Extending the theory of the Coordinated management of meaning (CMM) through a community dialogue process. *Communication Theory*, 10(4), 405-423.
- Philipsen, G. (1995). The Coordinated management of meaning. In D. Cushman & B Kovacic (Eds.), *Watershed research traditions in human communication theory* (pp. 13-43). Albany, NY: SUNY Press..
- Rockquomore, K. & Schaffer, R. (2000). Toward a theory of engagement: A cognitive mapping of service-learning experiences. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 7(1), 14-25.
- Saltmarsh, J. (1996). Education for critical citizen-

ship: John Dewey's contribution to the pedagogy of community service learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 3(1), 13-21.

Schumer, R. & Belbas, B. (1996). What we know about service learning. *Education and Urban Society*, 28(2), 208-223.

Vogelgesang, L. & Astin, A. (2000). Comparing the effects of community service and service-learning. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 7, 25-34.

Yeh, T. (2010). Service-learning and persistence of low-income, first-generation college students: An exploratory study. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 16(2), 50-65.